

Brevard Public Schools

Herbert C. Hoover 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	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Herbert C. Hoover Middle School

2000 HAWK HAVEN DR, Indialantic, FL 32903

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

Demographics

Principal: Catherine Mcnutt M

Start Date for this Principal: 7/2/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 7-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	38%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: A (69%) 2015-16: A (64%) 2014-15: A (71%)
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	N/A
* 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	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Herbert C. Hoover Middle School

2000 HAWK HAVEN DR, Indialantic, FL 32903

<http://www.hoover.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	31%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	21%

School Grades History

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

Hoover Middle School develops students through rigorous, relevant education and co-curricular programs. We encourage students to become reflective, critical thinkers who communicate effectively, take risks, learn from their efforts, and meet challenges. The Hoover community fosters meaningful relationships and instills students with a desire and commitment to contribute to an ever-changing, diverse community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Hoover Middle School is a learning community that inspires students to be innovative, collaborative, and self-directed citizens who embrace diversity, value education, build character, and own their futures.

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
McNutt, Catherine	Principal	
Linde, Erik	Assistant Principal	
Yon-Perdomo, Zulay	Instructional Coach	
Gutches, Annette	Other	

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	244	247	0	0	0	0	491
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	69	0	0	0	0	142
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	35	0	0	0	0	67

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	64	76	0	0	0	0	140

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	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

34

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/10/2019

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	58	83	0	0	0	0	141
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	35	0	0	0	0	63
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	41	0	0	0	0	70

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	23	36	0	0	0	0	59

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	68%	59%	54%	68%	60%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	62%	56%	54%	63%	57%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	48%	47%	51%	47%	44%
Math Achievement	73%	66%	58%	77%	65%	56%
Math Learning Gains	64%	55%	57%	63%	56%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	45%	51%	55%	46%	50%
Science Achievement	57%	52%	51%	71%	56%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	86%	75%	72%	87%	76%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey			
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)		Total
	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	244 (0)	247 (0)	491 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	73 ()	69 ()	142 (0)
One or more suspensions	2 (0)	1 (0)	3 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	3 (0)	3 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	32 (0)	35 (0)	67 (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	63%	58%	5%	52%	11%
	2018	65%	56%	9%	51%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	70%	63%	7%	56%	14%
	2018	69%	65%	4%	58%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2019	74%	62%	12%	54%	20%
	2018	70%	62%	8%	54%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	34%	43%	-9%	46%	-12%
	2018	29%	41%	-12%	45%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-36%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	56%	53%	3%	48%	8%
	2018	64%	55%	9%	50%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
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	86%	74%	12%	71%	15%
2018	75%	73%	2%	71%	4%
Compare		11%			

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	93%	61%	32%	61%	32%
2018	80%	62%	18%	62%	18%
Compare		13%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	60%	40%	57%	43%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	100%	60%	40%	56%	44%
Compare		0%			

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	38	57	51	31	42	33	27	63			
ELL		70			60						
ASN	55	82		58	82						
BLK	50	53		44	53	45					
HSP	50	61	60	61	55	69	56	69	60		
MUL	65	63		72	50		56	77	93		
WHT	71	62	51	76	66	42	60	88	85		
FRL	53	54	46	62	52	39	35	83	74		

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	28	42	32	28	43	44	26	49			
ASN	45	55		55	55						
BLK	28	47	58	28	50	69					
HSP	58	61	67	61	63	62	45	81	81		
MUL	76	57		76	57			67			
WHT	71	59	38	73	57	47	69	80	80		
FRL	49	47	42	54	49	47	39	63	53		

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	30	46	39	34	45	44	32	59	60		
BLK	13	40	45	21	21	25					
HSP	62	61	53	65	64	64	75	95	71		
MUL	63	33		69	50						
WHT	71	65	53	81	64	57	72	88	86		
FRL	56	58	46	68	57	47	64	81	74		

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	66

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	592
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
----------------------	--

Students With Disabilities	
-----------------------------------	--

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	43
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
----------------------------------	--

Federal Index - English Language Learners	65
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	69
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	49
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
--------------------------	--

Federal Index - Hispanic Students	60
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	68
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	67
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	55
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.

The data component that showed the lowest performance was math learning gains for the lowest 25% of our student population (44%). This area has trended downward for the last three years, decreasing 10% over that time span. Although this area was also low for our ESE students (33%), the gap was not as significant as other gaps between ESE and non-ESE students. Majority of our math students in the lowest 25% of our student learning gains data were in either Grade 7 Math or Pre-Algebra. Large numbers of these students were ESE students who needed additional support to successfully master grade-level content.

Other low areas of performance were gap data between our total student population and our ESE and economically disadvantaged student subgroups. Language Arts proficiency for all students was 68%, but proficiency in this area for ESE students and economically disadvantaged students was 38% and 53%, respectively. Math data revealed similar discrepancies: 73% proficiency for all students, 31% for ESE students, and 62% for economically disadvantaged students. Overall math learning gains data also had large gaps: 64% of students made learning gains in comparison to 42% and 52% of ESE and economically disadvantaged students. Science proficiency gaps were the largest at 57%, 27%, and 35% for those student groups.

These deficiencies were a result of many factors, including a struggling teacher, limited ESE support in classrooms, and very few opportunities for additional remediation during the school day, which negatively impacted our economically disadvantaged students who required bus transportation.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline was overall science proficiency, which dropped from 65% to 56%. While many schools across the district experienced a decrease in this category, it was the largest science decline our school has experienced in several years. Several factors influenced this change. Science students had fewer opportunities for additional support both within and outside of the classroom. No science classrooms had an ESE teacher or instructional assistant pushing in to support students consistently, and fewer morning tutoring sessions were available in this content area. Proficiency gaps for ESE students (27%) and economically disadvantaged students (35%) were significant.

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.

When comparing Hoover Middle School data with state data, our largest gaps were in language arts and social studies achievement. Hoover students outperformed students in Florida by 14% in both areas. Factors that contributed to this success were professional development and implementation, teacher collaboration, and classroom support. Each of these departments had teachers who participated in professional development opportunities focused on engagement and curriculum. These teachers shared their learning (during common department planning and collaboration days) and applied it to lesson planning and instruction in their classrooms. Our social studies department developed and used common assessments and frequently reviewed students' progress on standards-based curriculum. Additionally, teachers in these departments most often utilized the support of our literacy coach (we increased her hours) and our media specialist. Language arts teachers received the most ESE support in their classrooms, either through a support facilitation teacher or an instructional assistant.

The only area below state data was math learning gains for the lowest 25% of students, which was 44% compared to 51%. Factors contributing to this gap were previously addressed.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was the trend in closing the proficiency gap for our economically disadvantaged subgroup, which decreased substantially in all content areas. For this subgroup, the language arts gap declined from 32% to 15%; the math gap from 19% to 11%, the algebra gap from 22% to 6%, the science gap from 42% to 21%, and the civics gap from 14% to 3%. While these gaps still need to be attacked, our school made tremendous strides in supporting our economically disadvantaged students. One area that led to these results was placement; we strove to challenge students with the courses they took, particularly Algebra, Geometry, and Digital Information Technology. Our school-based professional development focused on student engagement, and we built on our belief in growth mindset to begin exploring restorative practices. Several of our teachers attended professional development focused on teaching students in poverty. We saw teachers taking risks and trying new strategies or using new technology to engage every student. Our schedule allotted for a small block of time each week for intervention and reading. We dedicated funds to increase our literacy coach's hours, so she was available more days to support teachers and model lessons. Most significantly, our school mentoring program took root, and our community mentors changed our students' lives by offering them consistent support, motivation, confidence, and a sense of self-worth.

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

Two areas of concern are the early identification and support of students who have two or more early warning indicators and scaffolding to support students who have struggled on statewide assessments so that they can master grade-level material.

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

1. Closing the achievement gap for our students with disabilities.
2. Continuing to close the achievement gap for our economically disadvantaged students.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	<p>Closing the achievement gaps for our students with disabilities and those who are economically disadvantaged.</p> <p>Subgroup data for all categories of language arts, math, and science emphasize the importance of focusing on our students with disabilities and continuing to support or economically disadvantaged students.</p>
Rationale	<p>Other data support this focus, including Hoover’s school-level assessment of Best Practices for Inclusive Education 2018-2019 (BPIE), the Fall 2018 Insight Survey Data, and 2018-2019 evaluation results. Our BPIE school priority indicators were for administrators to facilitate professional development on inclusive practices and for instructional staff to use formative assessment to analyze and evaluate data about effective instruction and behavior interventions. Insight Data revealed the following needs: students supporting answers and explaining thinking (71%), explaining ideas across all subject areas (75%), instructional leaders reviewing student work (59%), and collaborating on student responses to tasks (64%). Evaluation data highlighted a higher-order thinking, differentiation, and diversity with assessments.</p>
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	<p>Improve student achievement for our students with disabilities, closing the gap between these students and our total population by at least 10% in language arts proficiency (to 48%), math proficiency (to 41%), and science proficiency (to 37%). Additionally, math learning gains for ESE students will improve by 10% (to 52%). The proficiency gap in language arts and math for our economically disadvantaged students will decrease 5% to 10% and 6%, respectively, and the science proficiency gap for this population will drop 10% (to 11%). Hoover’s leadership will also monitor Reading Plus and MAP data to converse with teachers about students’ growth and set an expectation for teaches to share these results with students and families to help them monitor progress and set goals.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	<p>Catherine McNutt (mcnutt.catherine@brevardschools.org)</p>
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>Hoover Middle School will target these subgroup gaps through the following evidence-based strategies: high expectations for every student, challenging every student with grade-appropriate curriculum and scaffolding to support struggling students, and engaging every student in productive struggle in all classrooms.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	<p>According to TNTP’s “The Opportunity Myth” (2018), in many classrooms across America, administrators, teachers, and staff “perpetuate a cycle of inequity and mediocrity in our schools” by choosing to let many students work below their grade level. The article outlines four key resources students need in their daily school experiences: consistent opportunities to work on grade-level assignments, strong instruction where students do most of the thinking, students deeply engaged in what they are learning, and teachers holding high expectations for every student to master grade-level standards (22). These practices are supported by the research of Fisher, Frey, and Hattie who emphasize that three aspects of learning should be considered in every learning situation: challenge, self-efficacy, and learning intentions with success criteria (21). In order to target our struggling subgroups, Hoover must begin with high expectations for these students. and support them through their struggle to master grade-level content.</p>
Action Step	
Description	<p>1. Hold every student to high expectations a. Explore our school’s achievement data by subgroup, discuss the disparities, and reflect</p>

on our current practices

- b. Share student stories on how teachers' expectations discouraged or encouraged them to be successful
 - c. Evaluate and craft our core beliefs and establish a shared vision of expectations
 - d. Rewrite our school vision and mission statements
 - e. Review research on the impact of high expectations and examine data from other, successful BPS schools
 - f. Clarify administrative expectations regarding high expectations for all students
 - g. Offer observational feedback to teachers targeting their expectations for students with disabilities and economically disadvantaged students.
2. Ensure every student receives rigorous coursework and support to master grade-level assignments
 - a. Focus and continuously reemphasize an expectation that all students can master grade-level assignments with support (in department and team meetings and individual conversations with teachers)
 - b. Offer monthly professional development on standards and scaffolding strategies so that teachers feel comfortable supporting all students in grade-level mastery of material
 - c. Conduct leadership observations that offer teachers specific feedback on what students are doing in class, whether the work is on grade level, and students' productive struggle
 - d. Expect PLC meetings to be a collaborative effort between teachers and leadership, focused on developing grade-level assignments and analyzing student work samples to determine what strategies ensure mastery for all students
 - e. Monitor students' progress on assessments (Reading Plus, MAP, and science skills day activities), helping them understand growth and setting goals for improvement.
 3. Develop Hawk Hour intervention, offering remediation and enrichment during the school day
 - a. Create a school-based team to observe other school-based intervention hours
 - b. Review student data to determine students who need remediation and enrichment and assign locations
 - c. Determine appropriate social-emotional curriculum to include in Hawk Hour
 - d. Develop Hawk Hour bell schedule and plan for second semester implementation
 - e. Implement Hawk Hour and monitor students' grades and benchmark progress

Person Responsible Catherine McNutt (mcnutt.catherine@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).

Hoover Middle School will continue to use its PBIS matrix and reward system to encourage positive behavior across campus. Additionally, we are focusing on fostering connectedness between our students and the school to improve attendance and engagement. This year our teacher teams share seventh and eighth grade students and have common planning to more effectively use the MTSS process to support students, especially those with two or more early warning indicators. Our mentoring program has grown and continues to thrive, providing students with an adult advocate from the community. Hoover continually assesses how to best support the transition of our students from sixth to seventh grade and eighth to ninth grade. This year, we have worked closely with the elementary schools to identify potential mentees before they arrive on campus, and our feeder high schools are working with our mentors to transition with their mentees. While we will continue to work with our feeder schools during registration (Hoover students' lunch visits to talk with sixth graders, high school tours for students with disabilities), we are strengthening this process by coordinating some teacher shadowing at the elementary and middle levels to better understand the student experience at both levels and high academic expectations. We are also adding a community outreach day in January so that our students, families, and community members work toward a shared purpose helping others. Hoover administration, faculty, and staff will continue to encourage our parents to sign up for and use focus so that we can partner to offer focused interventions. This year, Hoover also added the Home Base program to support our students with autism, which targets social-emotional skills and academic success. We are investigating options for a no-zero zone during the school day to help prevent course failures and ensure every student receives the support necessary for academic success. We will continue to host parent night events (based on feedback from our parent survey), and this year, we will target our families of students with disabilities to offer an educational evening reviewing some tools to support their children at home.