Brevard Public Schools

Herbert C. Hoover Middle School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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: 6/16/2020

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	38%
2019-20 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%)
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

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)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 7-8	No	34%

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	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
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.
(Revised 2019-2020)

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.
(Revised 2019-2020)

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
McNutt, Catherine	Principal	Principal is responsible for the school vision and mission. Additionally, principal is responsible for supervising the leadership team in analyzing school wide data, identifying areas of strength/improvement, and developing an action plan. Finally, the principal is responsible for presenting and leading collaboration among stakeholders and to finalize the SIP document.
Yon-Perdomo, Zulay	Instructional Coach	The literacy coach is responsible for assisting teachers in interpreting data (i.e. Reading Plus, MAPs and Lexia), and implementing instructional practices to support students' academic needs. In addition to that, the literacy coach presents school wide data to the leadership team, and collaborates in the decision making process.
Gutches, Annette	Other	The testing coordinator's major responsibility is to help teachers prepare for state-mandated tests and progress monitoring assessments. The testing coordinator also collaborates with the leadership team, making school-wide decisions, based on school-wide data.
Ferreira, Paloma	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal is responsible for presenting school wide-data to stakeholders and analyzing how the data represents students' academic development. The assistant principal also works with the leadership team in identifying areas of focus and developing an action plan. Finally, the assistant principal monitors the action plan and evaluates its impact on students' academic progress.
Callinan, Brian	Dean	The dean is responsible for presenting discipline and attendance data to the leadership committee. The dean is also responsible for analyzing the data and discussing how it can impact students' academic progress. Further, the dean collaborates with the leadership team in making school-wide decisions and presenting the SIP to stakeholders.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 6/16/2020, Catherine Mcnutt M

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.*

0

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.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

34

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	38%
2019-20 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%)
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.	

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	231	230	0	0	0	0	461
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	6	0	0	0	0	15
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	25	0	0	0	0	36
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	29	0	0	0	0	32
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	18	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	14	0	0	0	0	39

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	25	22	0	0	0	0	47

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	4	2	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/16/2020

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	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	

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	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	

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	
	(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.

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%				
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%
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
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%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	65

English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	69
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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%	0

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%	0

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%	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	67
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	55
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.

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.

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?

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 of students with disabilities
2. Continue to close the achievement gap of economically disadvantaged students.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Leadership specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Upon reviewing the data, the leadership team identified math achievement as an area of concern for students with disabilities. As the data suggests, math learning gains for the lowest 25% of students has trended downward in the last three years. The majority of math students in this group were either in Grade 7 Math or Pre-Algebra. A large number of these students is ESE.
Measurable Outcome:	Math learning gains for the lowest 25% will move from 44% to 47% in 2021, as represented in FSA scores.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Paloma Ferreira (ferreira.paloma@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Algebra 1 Exposure in Middle school: The opportunity to take Algebra 1 in middle school is supported by the common sense idea that exposure to advanced curriculum will improve students' opportunities to grow academically. In more specific terms, research suggests that by taking Algebra 1 in middle school, students have the opportunity to take more advanced math and science courses in high school. Further, in the event a student takes Algebra 1 in middle school and fails the course, they are better prepared to take the course in high school. Tier 2 Support during School day: The decision to make intensive math courses available to struggling math students is based on the notion that tier 2 support in math should be explicit and systemic. Additionally, it should include providing models of proficiency word problem solving, verbalization of thought process, guided practice and corrective feedback. It becomes very challenging to implement these components during class, or during morning tutoring (also considering some student cannot attend tutoring due to lack of transportation). Thus, the best way to support our struggling math students is by offering an intensive math class, where students can (1) take math both semesters, and (2) receive supplemental instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The downward trend in the learning gains (math) for the lowest 25% suggests that students need opportunities to take math courses, and review grade level material. Thus, struggling students will be able to take intensive math, in combination with completing their grade level math course. We believe this scheduling method will increase their chances of showing learning gains.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Students who are taking Grade 7 Math and Pre-Algebra are scheduled to take Intensive Math the following semester.
2. Pre-Algebra teacher will provide list of students ready for Algebra 1 Honors in the following semester.
3. Assistant Principal will present the opportunity to take math both semesters during Open House and Algebra Night.
4. Algebra 1 Honors will be offered to all students who are ready for Algebra 1. Not only can students accelerate with this option in block scheduling--taking Accelerated Math or Pre-Algebra in the fall and Algebra 1 Honors in the Spring--it also allows more eighth grade students the opportunity to take an honors high school course in middle school.
5. Students interested in taking a second math course, in the form of acceleration (Algebra 1 Honors or Geometry Honors) will have the opportunity to take it during Virtual Lab, if schedule conflicts arise.
6. Additional math support will be offered in the form of tutoring and Saturday boot camp before EOC/FSA math.
7.ASP budget allocated for tutoring and possibly Saturday boot camp sessions.

Person Responsible	Paloma Ferreira (ferreira.paloma@brevardschools.org)

#2. Leadership specifically relating to Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Hoover's data show that ESE students and students with free and reduced lunch underperform when compared to other peers. This discrepancy is clear when considering the math learning gains for the lowest 25% of our student population (44%). The majority of students in this subgroup are ESE and economically disadvantaged students. Similar discrepancies are found in English Language Arts scores; the proficiency percentage for all students was at 68%, while the proficiency percentage for ESE and economically disadvantaged students was 38% and 53% respectively. Student survey data stated that engagement and academic rigor are two areas for growth on campus, so focusing on engagement strategies and standards-based instruction with tier one support is important to our students' success.
Measurable Outcome:	Math learning gains for the lowest 25% of ESE student will go from 25% to 28th. The ELA proficiency percentage of ESE student will increase from 38% to 41%. The ELA proficiency percentage of economically disadvantaged students will increase from 53% to 56%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Paloma Ferreira (ferreira.paloma@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Monthly professional development sessions implemented by administration and teachers. These sessions are going to cover a wide range of topics that support students' mental health and engagement. MTSS - A more efficient MTSS process is being implemented by the leadership team, focusing on identifying students who need support and following up with classroom strategies to support them.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The need for more professional development and a stronger MTSS process is evident when analyzing student data (subgroups). In ELA achievement, for example, only 48% score a level 3 or higher; and 53% of students with free and reduced lunch scored a level 3 or higher. Similarly, only 33% of students with disabilities scored a level 3 or higher in math; and 52% of students with free and reduced lunch scored a level 3 or higher in math.

Action Steps to Implement

1. School counselor presents PD series: Trauma Informed Classroom
2. Assistant Principal and teachers present on classroom engagement, as it pertains to block schedule
3. Principal recognizes teachers for using classroom strategies that promote student engagement, and social emotional components.
4. Hoover staff gives feedback on PD's through surveys
5. Hoover leadership analysis survey results and interprets student data (2021)
6. Dean will present on MTSS process and introduce MTSS committee (school counselor, AP, reading coach and ESE staffing specialist)
7. MTSS committee will meet monthly to discuss students in danger
8. Dean will present MTSS process and student updates during faculty meetings
9. Teachers will be invited to participate in MTSS committee, and asked to create a toolbox of strategies that can be used to support students.

Person Responsible	Paloma Ferreira (ferreira.paloma@brevardschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The downward data trend in Hoover Middle School shows a specific need for more support in math and science. Math achievement percentage for the lowest 25% went down from 48% (2018) to 44% (2019); science achievement went down from 65% (2018) to 57% (2019). Similarly, the math learning gains for the lowest 25% (SWD) went down from 44% (2018) to 33% (2019). Economically disadvantaged students also show a decrease in math learning gains for the bottom 25% from 47% (2018) to 39% (2019). Additionally, our Insight Survey data suggested that our teachers needed a dedicated time to analyze student work and assessments and plan for future instruction.
Measurable Outcome:	Hoover Middle School students' math percentage for the lowest 25% will improve from 44% to 47%, and the science achievement will go from 57% to 60%. The math learning gains for the lowest 25% (SWD) will move from 44% to 47%; and the math learning gains for the lowest 25% (FRL) will move from 39% to 41%. On the Insight Survey, teachers will rate dedicated time for analyzing student work and assessments higher: the percentage will increase from 64% to 75%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Catherine McNutt (mcnutt.catherine@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Professional learning communities will be an opportunity for teachers to discuss classroom data, develop common assessments, and share/collaborate on lesson plans that address students' learning needs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The idea to implement a structured time (PLC) for teacher collaboration originates from the need to have more data-driven conversations. By implementing this strategy, teachers will have a monthly meeting to share classroom data, common assessments and/or how to implement the appropriate strategies to address learning deficits. PLC time is also supported by our Insight Survey data. Dedicated time for teachers to analyze student work and plan for future assessments and develop standards-based curriculum were both lower rated areas (64% and 39%, respectively). .

Action Steps to Implement

1. Principal and assistant principal schedule monthly PLC meetings.
2. Principal and assistant principal will provide guidelines and flexible timelines to support teachers use their time efficiently
3. Leadership team (including all department chairs) will meet prior to PLC meetings to set consistent expectations and focus areas.
3. Administrative team will attend/monitor PLC meetings.
4. Administrative team will discuss student data, and common assessment scores during evaluations.
5. Leadership team will discuss feedback about PLC process during leadership team meetings.

Person Responsible	Catherine McNutt (mcnutt.catherine@brevardschools.org)

#4. Leadership specifically relating to Walkthroughs	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Hoover's Insight Survey data highlighted a need for more administrative interaction and feedback in classrooms. Only half of our teachers said that an administrator regularly reviews student work. Thirty nine percent of teachers noted that they use adopted curriculum, and teachers rated students' ability to support their answers and explain their thinking at 45%. Increases in these areas will ensure our students are receiving standards-based instruction, are progressing on benchmarks, and are demonstrating higher-order thinking skills. On the Youth Truth survey, our students also highlighted the need for increased academic rigor in their classes, which is a focus area for administrative walkthroughs.
Measurable Outcome:	On the next Insight Survey, 70% of our teachers will report that an administrator regularly reviews student work. Fifty percent of teachers will state that they use adopted curriculum, and 70% will report that their students can support their answers and explain their thinking.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Paloma Ferreira (ferreira.paloma@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Classroom walkthrough - The administrative team will routinely (every two weeks) conduct classroom walkthroughs, and complete a new informal observation on ProGoe. Administrator will communicate with teacher if a conference is needed.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Classroom Walkthroughs - Classroom walkthroughs can be an effective tool to "drive a cycle of continuous instructional improvement." In other words, when administrators routinely walk classrooms, they become familiar with the school's curriculum and teachers' classroom practices. This can be beneficial because it gives teachers relevant, real-time feedback on their teaching practices. Coaching Cycle - Leading teachers through coaching cycles increase student achievements by helping teachers improve instruction. Classroom walkthroughs are one of the main components of the coaching cycle. Other components of the coaching cycle include giving teacher feedback, collaborating and setting goals, reflection and next steps.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Principal will briefly discuss the focus of walkthroughs during administrative meeting.
2. Administrative team will conduct walkthroughs every two weeks
3. Each walkthrough will have a specific focus
4. Administrators will conduct a coaching cycle with teacher.
5. Administrators will meet with teacher for a feedback session
6. Administrative team will post their observation on ProGoe
7. Administrative team will discuss trends during administrative meeting

Person Responsible	Catherine McNutt (mcnutt.catherine@brevardschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

n/a

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.

Hoover Middle School will continue to use its PBIS matrix and reward system to encourage positive behavior across campus. To increase teacher buy-in and improve consistency across the campus, our Behavioral Matrix will be reviewed by teacher and student committees to update wording and create more consistent classroom management practices. Additionally, all supporting signage around our campus will be updated to reflect the outcome of committee meetings These changes will enhance the school climate, which was already rated very positively in student and parent survey data.

To address serving all students with fidelity, we are developing and implementing thorough MTSS/IPST processes. The focus of development will begin by identifying students with two or more early warning indicators and implementing specific interventions to increase student success. After the MTSS team troubleshoots initial flaws in the process within Hoover, our focus will shift toward developing a teacher MTSS/IPST referral process that can be effective for our campus. In the past, our teachers have used MESH teams to identify students in need of additional support. This year, due to block scheduling, our departments have common planning, and we disbanded our teams, so the process must be adjusted for referrals to support our students.

Our parent survey data highlighted a need for academic and technology support to help with learning at home. To meet the needs of brick and mortar students as well as e-learners this year, Hoover will invest resources into one laptop per student (including implementing a Bring Your Own Device contract). Through Zoom conferences and Focus and Google Classroom support, our teachers will provide a wealth of academic resources for parents to help their students. Additionally, to address parents' concern about responsiveness to emails, phone calls, and grade posting, Hoover faculty will document all contact in Focus and adhere to posting at least four grades per week.

Review of PBIS and and development MTSS/IPST processes on Hoover campus will be dependent on overall parental and community involvement. All stakeholders being involved in the processes will be essential to creating a system of accountability that will support student growth and maturity.

While this school years serves to be a difficult one due to a pandemic and having brick and mortar, as well as e-learners, we intend to have processes to support all students. Stakeholders have presented the disconnect felt by our e-learner students due to not being on campus. To increase the the morale of our e-learners, administration will implement opportunities for students to virtually spend time with administration and feel a part of the activities that take place on campus. Our staff will continue to be the welcoming, supporting, inviting staff that is consistently highlighted in our parent survey data.

Hoover will continue to utilize the Home Base program to support our students with autism, which targets

development of social-emotional skills necessary to increase academic success. Virtual tutoring also will be offered as a support to struggling learners.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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