

Brevard Public Schools

Herbert C. Hoover Middle School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	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: 11/1/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 7-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	38%
2021-22 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	2021-22: B (58%) 2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: A (63%)
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	ATSI
* 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	10
Planning for Improvement	14
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)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 7-8	No	38%
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	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	B		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.

At Hoover Middle School, our mission is to help students meet challenges and achieve personal and academic excellence.

(Revised 2022-2023)

Provide the school's vision statement.

Hoover Middle School is an inclusive learning community, fostering individuals fully engaged in education and growth. We empower students to excel academically, build character, and contribute to their community.

(Revised 2022-2023)

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
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.
Callinan, Brian	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.
Patterson, JoAnne	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

Friday 11/1/2019, Catherine McNutt M

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.*

2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

36

Total number of students enrolled at the school

507

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

3

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

4

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	234	272	0	0	0	0	506	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	27	0	0	0	0	53	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	27	0	0	0	0	39	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	17	0	0	0	0	27	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	23	0	0	0	0	36	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	38	0	0	0	0	58	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	24	0	0	0	0	43	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	42	0	0	0	0	87	

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	25	45	0	0	0	0	70

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	1	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	5

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/20/2022

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	271	232	0	0	0	0	503
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	52	0	0	0	0	92
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	7	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	14	0	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	21	0	0	0	0	47
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 ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	21	0	0	0	0	46
LEVEL 1 ON 2021 MATH	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	19	0	0	0	0	46

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	50	57	0	0	0	0	107

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	9	2	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	4

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	271	232	0	0	0	0	503
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	52	0	0	0	0	92
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	7	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	14	0	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	21	0	0	0	0	47
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
LEVEL 1 ON 2021 ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	21	0	0	0	0	46
LEVEL 1 ON 2021 MATH	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	19	0	0	0	0	46

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	50	57	0	0	0	0	107	

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	9	2	0	0	0	0	11	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	4	

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	64%	50%	50%				68%	59%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	51%						62%	56%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	35%						54%	48%	47%
Math Achievement	65%	33%	36%				73%	66%	58%
Math Learning Gains	44%						64%	55%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	38%						44%	45%	51%
Science Achievement	69%	53%	53%				57%	52%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	78%	48%	58%				86%	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	63%	58%	5%	52%	11%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2022					
	2019	70%	63%	7%	56%	14%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2022					
	2019	74%	62%	12%	54%	20%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2022					
	2019	34%	43%	-9%	46%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-74%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2022					
	2019	56%	53%	3%	48%	8%
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	86%	74%	12%	71%	15%

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	93%	61%	32%	61%	32%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	100%	60%	40%	57%	43%

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	21	33	25	36	39	23	29	55	32		
ELL	39	41		50	39			30	64		
BLK	20	12	18	25	29	27	40		36		
HSP	57	53	33	54	40	47	68	62	74		
MUL	69	67		53	50				69		
WHT	67	51	36	70	46	41	70	83	77		
FRL	53	39	30	51	38	31	59	66	62		
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	27	26	16	31	39	32	24	60	28		
ELL	60	30		70	60						
BLK	33	50		43	57	64		67			
HSP	59	58		74	54		59	87	77		
MUL	68	42		71	33		73	45	92		
WHT	67	49	32	67	40	31	63	89	66		
FRL	55	46	35	54	37	39	48	75	56		
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					

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
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		

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	58
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	519
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	96%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
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	44
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	

Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	26
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	54
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	62
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	60
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	48
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?

On the 8th grade science assessment, proficiency increased 6% to 69%. The last three years, 8th grade ELA proficiency has consistently decreased and was 64%. Seventh grade math proficiency significantly decreased from 2019, dropping 19%. Learning gains of lowest 25% of students in ELA and math remained low in the 30% range. Students with disabilities (SWD) and African American students performed as our lowest student subgroups. While our ELA learning gains and learning gains of the lowest 25% increased for our SWD subgroup, overall proficiency did not. Proficiency and learning gains for African American students both decreased in ELA, 13% and 38% respectively. In math, both subgroups decreased in learning gains for the lowest 25%. These subgroups of students continue to perform lower than their peers in ELA and math achievement.

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

Progressing monitoring data from Reading Plus and MAPs support the greatest needs identified in the 2022 state assessments. Hoover's focus area is improving learning gains of the lowest 25% of students in ELA and math. Many of our students with disabilities and African American students fall into the lowest 25%. Thirty-four percent of our ELA and math lowest 25% is SWDs. Thirteen percent of ELA lowest 25% is African American, and this subgroup makes up 6% of our math lowest 25%.

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

Last year, our ELA department, which included our reading teacher, adjusted to new curriculums. We also had a new seventh grade math teacher who struggled with limited curriculum and support to meet the large range of differentiation required in his classroom. While we utilized homeroom and targeted tutoring as partial intervention tools, these supports were not as structured and focused as we hoped. Both homeroom and targeted tutoring will be better utilized this year and more frequent monitoring. Also, our departments did not frequently and consistently discuss common assessment data to help monitor student progress and determine interventions or acceleration. Also, we placed all eighth grade students in Algebra 1, Algebra 1 Honors, or Geometry to accelerate students and address gaps in foundational algebra skills when students enter high school. Considering this change, our Algebra EOC scores were higher than the year prior; however, because of the new Pre-Algebra standards, which are better aligned with algebra skills, we have added two Pre-Algebra sections back to our schedule.

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

Hoover's science proficiency increased 6%, and middle school acceleration points either improved or were accrued for the first time in three years across all subgroups. Additionally ELA learning gains and learning gains of the lowest 25% increased for SWDs, 7% and 9% respectively.

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

The science department has progressed with the PLC process, identifying some common assessments and regularly discussing those results. They also use and share common curriculum from the district resource page. Additionally, science homerooms focused on eighth grade bubble students completing skills day lessons, focused on challenging concepts. Because the science test has not changed recently, the department also has a strong understanding of test questions and utilizes state resources such as sample questions and frequently tested items. In ELA, our teachers worked hard to incorporate AMPLIFY and offer all students grade-level curriculum. Having an Intensive Reading course is an additional intervention. For students who participated in certain targeted tutoring, we saw large improvements. Finally, Hoover's focus on Kagan training led to increased student engagement and

success in classrooms who used cooperative learning effectively. Insight Survey data listed professional development as one of Hoover's strongest areas last year (it was one of the weakest the year prior), and teachers rated Kagan training very high.

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

Preparing struggling students for core course lessons prior to classroom exposure is an important strategy to accelerate learning within the classroom. Targeted tutoring is an effective strategy if it is implemented with focused fidelity and monitored frequently. Our lowest 25% in ELA and math need opportunity for remediation, which will occur in homeroom. All of these students will be assigned to a literacy or math-rich homeroom to provide additional support. PLCs will also support each other with SMART goals that support our school-wide goals.

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.

Hoover's professional development will continue to include Kagan strategies (all new teachers will attend two full days of training and PD will model strategies for all faculty) to increase student engagement. We will also focus on the MTSS resource application to review and implement Tier 1 interventions to support all students. Elective teachers will receive training and support from the literacy coach and media specialist so that their homerooms can reinforce literacy. Other PD will strengthen the PLC process to ensure student remediation and acceleration where needed and provide accountability measures for PLCs.

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

Hoover will continue to use targeted tutoring and homeroom for purposeful remediation and acceleration for struggling students. Consistent classroom walkthroughs and feedback from administrators and coaches, including Kagan coaches, will allow school leadership to determine if PD has been effective and if strategies are implemented with fidelity. Focused work on improving the PLC process will help our teachers work smarter, not harder. The school leadership team has identified student engagement and grade-appropriate curriculum as two high-yield opportunities for academic improvement, and PLCs will focus on these areas and specifically address the learning needs of the lowest 25%. PLC PD will continue for several years to continue to improve the process and support student achievement.

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 Professional Learning Communities**Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

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

With the exception of science proficiency, Hoover's progress monitoring and assessment data showed some significant declines, especially for our students with disabilities and African American students. With learning gains of our lowest 25% in ELA and math being so low and honest reflection on the school's implementation and monitoring of evidence-based practices, a change was needed.

Measurable Outcome:

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

For our lowest 25% in ELA and math, Read 180/Systems 44 benchmarks will show consistent improvement from fall to winter to spring. Overall learning gains for this group will increase 5% on the state assessments.

Monitoring:

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

PLCs will report monthly student progress and instructional adjustments aligned with their SMART goals. Administrators will meet with individual teachers and PLCs to discuss student progress and monitor the effectiveness of goals.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Catherine McNutt (mcnutt.catherine@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

An effective, focused PLC process that consistently and frequently monitors students' progress to adjust instruction in response to learning will be our vehicle to improve learning gains. Through school leadership team meetings and monthly PLCs, departments will enhance the PLC process and develop and monitor SMART goals.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Hoover is following DuFour's Learning by Doing to evaluate and improve its PLC process. This text, along with other resources from Solution Tree is evidence-based and considered one of the most recognized resources for effective PLC implementation.

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.

Assess the current state of shared mission, vision, commitments and school goals and revise based on stakeholder survey data.

Person Responsible

Catherine McNutt (mcnutt.catherine@brevardschools.org)

Leverage teacher leaders to build PLCs around the following characteristics: collaborative, results oriented, focused on learning, guided by formative assessment, and responsive. PLCs will develop action steps to achieve their SMART goals and hold members accountable for students' success.

Person Responsible

Catherine McNutt (mcnutt.catherine@brevardschools.org)

Monitor the effectiveness of PLC action steps according to the four major questions of PLCs: what do we want students to learn, how do we know they are learning it, what do we do if they are learning it, what do we do if they are not. Monthly, PLC leaders will review documented results for these questions with evaluating administrators and the leadership team.

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

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Our students with disabilities comprise 34% of our ELA and math lowest 25%. This student group's proficiency and learning gains show significant gaps in achievement from their peers.

Measurable Outcome:

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

For SWDs, the gap in ELA learning gains will decrease 10% (43% gains), and the gap in math will decrease 10% (33% gains).

Monitoring:

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

Hoover's ESE team will collaborate with the ELA and math PLC to determine students' progress every four weeks and make recommendations for homeroom and targeted tutoring adjustments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brian Callinan (callinan.brian@brevardschools.org)

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

In targeted tutoring sessions, teachers will accelerate learning by exposing students to components of upcoming lessons prior to the core courses. Homeroom teachers across subject areas will use skills activities, common literacy strategies or online, adaptive programs to remediate and accelerate students, depending on the room.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

The school-wide resources for homeroom and targeted tutoring are selected from research-based literacy strategies, acceleration tools (Learning in the Fast Lane), and district-vetted software programs such ALEKS and IXL.

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.

Assign students to homeroom and targeted tutoring based on data and immediate need. Ensure that students are receiving proper ESE support in scheduled courses.

Person Responsible

Brian Callinan (callinan.brian@brevardschools.org)

Compile students' progress data from ESE team (gathered from other teachers in PLCs) and adjust placements based on successes.

Person Responsible

Brian Callinan (callinan.brian@brevardschools.org)

Review ESE team recommendations for students who need more intensive tier two and three supports based on stagnant or declining student progress and implement interventions, depending on specific need.

Person Responsible

Brian Callinan (callinan.brian@brevardschools.org)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Thirteen percent of ELA lowest 25% is African American, and this subgroup makes up 6% of our math lowest 25%. This student group's proficiency and learning gains show significant gaps in achievement from their peers.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The ELA learning gains gap for African American students will decrease 12% (24% gains), and the math learning gap for this subgroup will decrease 7% (36% gains).

Monitoring:

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

Hoover's administrative team will collaborate with the ELA and math PLC to determine students' progress every four weeks and make recommendations for homeroom and targeted tutoring adjustments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brian Callinan (callinan.brian@brevardschools.org)

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

In targeted tutoring sessions, teachers will accelerate learning by exposing students to components of upcoming lessons prior to the core courses. Homeroom teachers across subject areas will use skills activities, common literacy strategies or online, adaptive programs to remediate and accelerate students, depending on the room.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

The school-wide resources for homeroom and targeted tutoring are selected from research-based literacy strategies, acceleration tools (Learning in the Fast Lane), and district-vetted software programs such as ALEKS and IXL.

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.

Assign students to homeroom and targeted tutoring based on data and immediate need. If students are also ESE students, ensure that they are receiving proper ESE support in scheduled courses.

Person Responsible

Brian Callinan (callinan.brian@brevardschools.org)

Review targeted tutoring lessons and evaluate students' progress data with targeted tutoring teachers every four weeks. Review homeroom lessons and evaluate students' progress data with PLC leaders monthly.

Adjust placements based on successes and recommend tier two and three interventions for struggling learners.

Person Responsible

Brian Callinan (callinan.brian@brevardschools.org)

Assign African American students to an on-campus mentor for weekly Check and Connects to address academic concerns and recommend adjustments.

Person Responsible

Catherine McNutt (mcnutt.catherine@brevardschools.org)

#4. 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.

Overall ELA proficiency, learning gains, and learning gains of the lowest 25% have decreased since 2019 (4%, 11%, and 19%, respectively).

Measurable Outcome:

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

Hoover's goal is to increase the learning gains of the lowest 25% in ELA by 5%. For the three rounds of progress monitoring, we expect to see gains for 95% of students in the lowest 25% from fall to winter to spring.

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

The administrative team and literacy coach will monitor the implementation of PLC literacy SMART goals and look for improvement in students' ELA common assessments and progress assessments. Additionally, the administrative team will review classroom walkthrough data to ensure appropriate implementation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

JoAnne Patterson (patterson.joanne@brevardschools.org)

**Evidence-based
Strategy:**

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

The campus literacy team will work with the PLCs to accomplish their literacy-based SMART goals and ensure that classes are using strong instruction where students do most of the thinking with grade-appropriate texts.

**Rationale for
Evidence-based
Strategy:**

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

In TNTP's "The Opportunity Myth," the research details four key resources in students daily school experiences to support them in making valuable learning gains. These four key resources are consistent opportunities to work on grade-appropriate assignments, strong instruction where students do most of the thinking, deep engagement, and teachers' high expectations of students meeting grade-level standards.

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.

Continue our implementation of Kagan cooperative learning strategies by training new teachers, modeling strategies in meetings and classrooms, and providing teachers with feedback on engagement.

Person Responsible

JoAnne Patterson (patterson.joanne@brevardschools.org)

Offer specific literacy-based professional development to teachers throughout the year and monitor the implementation of these strategies in classroom walkthroughs and homeroom lessons in applicable classes.

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

Ensure that grade-appropriate material is being used with all students (specifically district-adopted curriculum) and provide feedback to teachers regarding their implementation in post-observation conferences or during walkthroughs.

Person Responsible Catherine McNutt (mcnutt.catherine@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.

Several key sources of data were utilized when planning for the 2022-2023 school year which include school-wide parent surveys, the faculty and staff "Insight Survey" and the student "Youth Truth" survey. These data sets were invaluable when looking at the various areas of culture and promoting a positive environment.

The parent survey results indicated a positive response in the following categories: feeling welcome at school, effectiveness of school's information being sent online and information being sent from the principal. Areas of improvement included: Increase in parent/teacher communication, and more resources relating to classroom assistance. Focus areas for improvement planning include ensuring that FOCUS & Google classroom resources are available for all parents with relevant information. Weekly parent academic resources will be sent with the Principal's newsletter to provide extra resources for parents to help their children with standards.

Student data from Youth Truth indicates that we showed a decrease in the following categories as it pertains to environment, and culture: school safety, overall culture, and relationships. These focus areas will be addressed by reinforcing behavioral expectations through PBIS, developing positive relationships with students, and raising the level of rigor in daily instruction. Monthly PBIS team meetings will include specific action analysis of which practices are most effective. Additionally, in an effort to improve our environment and overall culture, Hoover will implement its own version of "Student Voice," allowing students to express their concerns in the specific fields identified on the Youth Truth survey. Each administrator will have a different student leadership group, focused on varying facets of our campus, including the following: identifying students' campus concerns, creating a safe space to respectfully explain feelings and opinions, and working with students to teach them how to advocate for change.

Insight Survey data highlighted areas of strength that included "Leadership", "Professional Development" and "Evaluation". Target areas for improvement include "learning environment" and "academic opportunity,"

which we are targeting through focused work on developing our PLC process.

Student voice and faculty concerns will continue to drive decisions made within the administrative team. At our regularly held meetings, a system of process checks take place to ensure review of data is taking place. Administration will monitor discipline concerns as it relates to safety among the campus, as well as, identify behavior patterns of all students, in addition to academic progress of specific sub-groups.

We will continue to implement research based SEL curriculum to provide targeted instruction to help ease the impact of COVID19's emotional hardships. Examples include Lion's Quest SEL materials with content to be delivered by our classroom teachers.

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

Implementation of PBIS and MTSS/IPST processes with fidelity on Hoover campus is dependent upon overall involvement of all stakeholders. All stakeholders being involved in the processes will be essential to creating a system of accountability that will support student growth and maturity. Each group of stakeholders has a significant role in the overall school climate.

The vision for a positive school climate is outlined and carried out by administration. Throughout the school year administration is responsible for continuous monitoring and making necessary adjustments to improve the climate of staff and students. Collecting feedback and insight from various groups of stakeholders throughout the school year, particularly SAC and PTO, and then using that information will help ensure a positive school climate is achieved.

Faculty, staff, parents, students and community members are essential to drive the vision of administrations in regard to school climate. While the goal of administration is to provide necessary support to all faculty members, we depend on the feedback provided from a broad perspective of stakeholder input.