Herbert C. Hoover Middle School

2021-22 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: 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
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	*[Data Not Available]*
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White 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	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	[not available]

* 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Hoover Middle School develops students through rigorous, relevant education. 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 society.
(Revised 2019-2020)

Provide the school's vision statement.

Hoover Middle School is a learning community that inspires students to be innovative, collaborative 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	Overall school management
Ferreira, Paloma	Assistant Principal	Curriculum
Callinan, Brian	Assistant Principal	Dean and Operations

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 11/1/2019, 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.*
9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
36

Total number of students enrolled at the school

503

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

3

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

4

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 9/19/2021

2020-21 - 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	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

2020-21 - 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	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

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	66%			68%	59%	54%	68%	59%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	50%			62%	56%	54%	58%	52%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	36%			54%	48%	47%	43%	45%	47%
Math Achievement	67%			73%	66%	58%	70%	65%	58%
Math Learning Gains	43%			64%	55%	57%	57%	56%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	35%			44%	45%	51%	48%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	63%			57%	52%	51%	65%	54%	52%
Social Studies Achievement	85%			86%	75%	72%	77%	72%	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	2021					
	2019	63%	58%	5%	52%	11%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	70%	63%	7%	56%	14%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2021					
	2019	74%	62%	12%	54%	20%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	34%	43%	-9%	46%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-74%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	56%	53%	3%	48%	8%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	86%	74%	12%	71%	15%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	93%	61%	32%	61%	32%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	60%	40%	57%	43%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

Reading Plus data is used to progress monitor English Language Arts for seventh and eighth grade, MAPs data is used to progress monitor math for both grades, common benchmark assessments are used to progress monitor Civics, and common formative assessments are used to progress monitor science.

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	107	90	104
	Economically Disadvantaged	28	21	26
	Students With Disabilities	8	7	9
	English Language Learners	o	o	o
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	127	114	121
	Economically Disadvantaged	29	31	27
	Students With Disabilities	8	7	5
	English Language Learners	1	o	o
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Subgroup Data Review

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						

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
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		

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	[not available]
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	513
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	95%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
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	55

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
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	52
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	67
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	61
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students 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
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	56
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	49
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

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?

There is a downward trend in ELA achievement scores. In 2019, 68% of students scored at least a level 3 in FSA ELA; however, in 2021, 66% of students earned a passing score. Similarly, there is a downward trend in math achievement scores, in 2019, 73% of students scored at least a level 3 in FSA Math, while in 2021, 67% students scored at least a level 3. More specifically, there is a downward trend in math achievement in 8th grade, as 34% of 8th graders earned a passing score in FSA Math in 2019, while 74% of 7th graders earned a passing score in FSA Math in the same year. A downward trend is also noticeable in the Algebra EOC scores. In 2019, 93% of students passed the EOC; however in 2021, 59% of students passed the same assessment.

Among subgroups, students with learning disabilities (SWD) show a downward trend in ELA achievement. In 2019, 38% of SWD students passed FSA ELA; while in 2021, 21% passed FSA ELA. In FSA Math scores, SWD students showed an upward trend - in 2019 31% of students passed FSA Math; while in 2021, 38% passed the same assessment. Students with free and reduced lunch (FRL) also show a downward trend. In 2019, 53% of students passed FSA ELA; however, in 2021, 48% passed the same assessment. Students who are FRL showed a downward trend in math. In 2019, 62% of FRL students passed FSA Math; 55% passed the assessment in 2021.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Based off progress monitoring tools, 27% of Hoover Middle School students scored in the proficient level in reading (READ 180) and 28% scored in the advanced level - which means that 32% of students scored at the basic level and 13% scored below the basic level. In math, 22% of our 7th graders in accelerated math scored in the high percentile rank (MAPS), while the greatest percentage of students (29%) scored in the average percentile rank. In the case of 7th graders taking Algebra 1 Honors, 33% scored in the high percentile rank, while the greatest percentage of students (43%) scored in the average percentile rank.

Twenty four percent of eight graders taking Algebra 1 scored in the high percentile rank. Twenty four percent of eighth graders taking Geometry scored in high percentile rank, while the majority of these students scored in average percentile rank (39%).

In terms of standardized testing, the greatest need for improvement is in math scores. Math achievement scores have consistently shown a downward trend since 2018. In 2019, 64% of students showed learning gains, while in 2021, 43% of students showed learning gains. Furthermore, in 2019, 44% of the lowest 25% quartile students showed learning gains, while in 2019, 35% showed learning gains. Algebra EOC scores have also displayed a downward trend. In 2019, 93% of students passed the EOC, while in 2021, 59% passed the EOC. This is a difference of 34% points.

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

There were two contributing factors for the downward trend in FSA Math scores and Algebra EOC scores. The first was attendance. Many students did not attend in-person school due to the pandemic and decided to do remote learning. Remote learning was not the best type of learning for students who need one-on-one attention and reinforcement. Within the group of remote learners, there were students who struggled considerably with technology, family support and at-home motivation. The second contributing factor was block scheduling. In block schedule, most of the the students who took math in the Fall (yearlong content in one semester) did not take another math course in the Spring. Besides a few math boot camps, these students lacked opportunities to practice math until FSA math testing.

Some of the new actions to support math students will include: targeted tutoring, master schedule development, and homeroom. Targeted tutoring aims to provide Tier 2 instruction to support classroom acceleration. As part of this process, core class teachers were asked to identify struggling students, based on standardized and classroom data. This group of students will participate in targeted tutoring as another opportunity to fill in instructional gaps while having the opportunity to engage with grade-level materials. Targeted tutoring will also be different than regular tutoring in the sense that teachers will keep attendance and track student data. Parents will also be informed about targeted tutoring by receiving a phone call from teachers and a letter from Hoover administration.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Science achievement showed the most progress. In 2019, 57% of students earned a proficient score. In 2021, 63% of students earned a proficient score, which shows a 6% point increase.

THE FOLLOWING IS CONTINUED FROM BOX E BELOW DUE TO WORD LIMITS:
The 2022 master schedule was developed to support math growth, especially among SWD students. At the basis of our master schedule is the concept that students have a higher chance of passing the Algebra EOC in middle school than in high school. Additionally, we also considered that students who pass the Algebra EOC in middle school have access to more challenging courses in high school. We also analyzed our math scores and realized that 8th graders traditionally underperform in standardized assessment. Data analysis indicated that there were two main reasons for 8th grade underperformance: most students who struggle with math are grouped together, which creates an underperforming environment and curriculum concerns. Eighth graders who take Pre-Algebra, are not better prepared to take Algebra in 9th grade.

CONTINUED FROM BOX B:
Looking at math scores across grade levels, it is clear that 8th graders consistently underperform, when compared to 7th graders. In 2019 for example, 34% of 8th graders passed FSA Math, which is is significantly lower than the state average (46%) and the district average (43%). In 2019, 74% of 7th graders passed FSA Math, which is 12% points above the district level, and 20% points above the state level.

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

The science department's focus during department meetings and PLC meetings was standard-based instruction. During these meetings, teachers shared standard-based lesson plans and common assessments provided by the district. As a new action, Hoover organized collaboration day for all MESH courses. The goal is to bolster academic rigor and Tier 1 instruction in all classes, an area in which our students ranked second lowest in the student survey Youth Truth. The science department is going to spend their day analyzing student data, developing formative assessments based on the

major standards, and developing a timeline to implement and discuss these assessments. In terms of data analysis, the science department will focus on the 2021 science scores by strands and FSA ELA scores. Additionally, the science department has two teachers who volunteered for targeted tutoring, which means that more students will receive tier 2 instruction in science.

Homeroom will also provide an extra layer of support to students. A large majority of Algebra 1 students will be placed in math during homeroom (every Wednesday for 45 minutes) to receive extra math instruction and EOC preparation. Each department had teachers create lessons for homeroom; however, the math department has elected to use IXL as tier 2 instruction. Many level 1 students will be placed in math during homeroom as well.

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

Homeroom Instruction: Students will have the opportunity to receive tier 2 instruction during Homeroom. Each MESH course teacher will receive lessons to be implemented, and teachers will have the opportunity to fill in gaps, while students work on grade-level assignments. Every 9 weeks, teachers, the curriculum assistant principal and school counselor will have the opportunity to review homeroom rosters, and, based on student data, and student input, make changes. Homeroom will also be used to conduct district mandated mental health lessons, protecting instructional time. Homeroom will also support students who have been retained. All students who have been retained are grouped under the same teacher - this teacher is building an extra support for these students, tracking their data, and communicating with parents. Additionally, some students in this homeroom are in the check-in/check-out system.

Kagan Strategies: During pre-planning, Hoover faculty participated in a 2-day training on Kagan's cooperative strategies. During the training, teachers learned how to turn their classrooms into a cooperative learning environment. Cooperative learning will give teachers the opportunity to have students work on grade-level materials, while helping each other fill in any learning gaps during instruction. This PD was selected based on student feedback from the Youth Truth survey, which ranked engagement as the school's lowest category.

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.

We will offer alternating professional development, focused on instructional strategies and social-emotional learning. A data-driven professional development will give teachers the opportunity to dive into their students' data and target specific subgroups. For example, SWD, FRL, and retention students will be a focus. Kagan professional development will give teachers an opportunity to review new strategies and receive feedback from a trainer. Fostering students' social-emotional growth will also be part of our focus, specifically geared toward Sources of Strength.

THE FOLLOWING IS CONTINUED FROM BOX E BELOW DUE TO WORD LIMITS:
Data analysis indicated that the majority of students have to retake the Algebra EOC in high school multiple times. In reality, the standards covered in Pre Algebra are not the main standards covered in the Algebra EOC, therefore making Pre-Algebra students unequipped to pass the Algebra EOC. Based on this knowledge, 8th graders were scheduled in either Algebra 1 for regular Algebra. students who scored level 1 and low level 2, while students who scored high level 2 and up were scheduled in Algebra 1 Honors. There are two main goals in the regular Algebra class: to have students pass the EOC and to give students who traditionally struggle an opportunity to be successful in math. Finally, we provide tier 2 instruction to students with learning disabilities (SWD). To provide this support, an ESE teacher is scheduled to push-in during all Algebra 1 classes, to give small group instruction to students.

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

Homeroom: Hoover has organized Homeroom as a sustainable program, as we hope to move into different phases every year. During its implementation year, teachers were given general lessons for the first 9 weeks of school. These lessons include technology, team building and student organization. All the lessons will be reviewed and possibly re-used next year. The reason for these lessons was to give teachers an opportunity to get used to the Homeroom process before having to give subject-specific lessons. As we move to the second year, the plan is to start off the school year with subject-specific lessons, especially because they are currently being created and implemented. ESSR funds are being used to pay teachers to develop lessons plans for HR; we are currently hoping to reuse them, especially if ESSR funds are no longer available.

Targeted Tutoring: Budget is the main obstacle in maintaining targeted tutoring. During 2022, we will use ESSR funds to pay teachers involved in this program; however, if ESSR funds are no longer available next year, we will allocate a portion of the ASP budget. This will impact how we pay for other programs/resources for our students, including IXL.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The downward trend in ELA and math scores indicates a need for more wrap-around services for students who traditionally struggle academically. In 2019, 68% of students scored at least a level 3 in FSA ELA; however, in 2021, 66% of students earned a passing score. Similarly, there is a downward trend in math achievement scores, in 2019, 73% of students scored at least a level 3 in FSA Math, while in 2021, 67% students scored at least a level 3. In more specific terms, there is a downward trend in math achievement in 8th grade, as 34% of 8th graders earned a passing score in FSA Math in 2019, while 74% of 7th graders earned a passing score in FSA Math, in the same year. A downward trend is also noticeable in the Algebra EOC scores. In 2019, 93% of students passed the EOC; however in 2021, 59% of students passed the same assessment.
Measureable Outcome:	ELA achievement percentage will improve from 66% to 70% and math achievement percentage will improve from 67% to 71% in 2022.
Monitoring:	Homeroom will be monitored both weekly and quarterly. The subject-based lessons will monitored for standard-alignment and organization. Students' classroom data will be analyzed every quarter, to make decisions about moving students to a different homeroom.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Paloma Ferreira (ferreira.paloma@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Homeroom - Students are going to participate in Homeroom every Wednesday for 45 minutes. During the quarter, teachers are going to implement general lessons (i.e. team collaboration, using technology responsibly, and PBIS). Starting in the second quarter, students are going to be assigned to subject-specific core classes depending on their standardized assessment scores, teacher feedback, and student input. These lessons will be created by departments chairs, and reading coach, and shared with all MESH Teachers. Homeroom will also be used to target our most vulnerable population: SWD and students who were retained. Our group of students who failed one or more courses will receive extra support in a group that targets classroom grades, instructional strategies, and implements a check in/check out system. SWD students are also receiving particular support - our ESE push-in teachers conduct small group instruction during homeroom.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Homeroom was selected based on last year's experience - Friday tutoring allowed students who had Ds and Fs in core classes to receive extra academic support. However, most of the students who had Ds and Fs could not stay after school due to transportation, so, we identified a need to offer academic support during the school day.
Action Steps to Implement	

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The need for more wrap-around services for Hoover Middle School students is evident in the achievement scores of the bottom quartile students in ELA and in math. In 2019, only 54% of the bottom quartile students passed FSA ELA. In 2021, this percentage dropped to 36%. In math, Hoover's bottom quartile students face similar challenges - in 2019 only 44% showed learning gains. In 2021, only 35% of the bottom quartile students showed learning gains.
Measureable Outcome:	In 2022 , we hope to improve the learning gains for bottom quartile students in ELA from 36% to 40% and in math from 35% to 39%.
Monitoring:	The Assistant Principal will track the following sources of data: (a) MAPS assessment for math progress, (b) READ 180 for ELA progress, and standardized test scores. Teachers will track classroom grades.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Paloma Ferreira (ferreira.paloma@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Targeted Tutoring - This strategy will be implemented to support the bottom quartile students, who need more individualized support. Hoover Middle School core class teachers selected students who need to improve their classroom grade or students who need support getting ready for standardized assessments. The Assistant Principal and teachers will track data, and students' rosters will be fluid, in the sense that students will enter and exit the program based on classroom scores and progress monitoring scores (MAPS and READ 180).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Due to the decrease in the learning gain percentage in 2021, it is evident that a group of students at Hoover Middle School need more services than robust Tier 1 instruction and homeroom. Some students, especially SWD, need a tutoring in a one-on-one setting to prepare for standardized tests.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. Leadership specifically relating to Instructional Leadership Team	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Hoover Middle School students rated teachers lowest (Youth Truth Survey) in classroom engagement. In addition to that, the downward trend in data implies a significant need of more classroom engagement.

Measureable Outcome:	There are two goals we hope to achieve with this strategy: (a) an improvement of 4 percentile points on classroom engagement, as measured by the Youth Truth survey and (b) an improvement of 4 percentile points in standardized assessment scores.
Monitoring:	To monitor student engagement as part of our teachers' instructional practices, we will run ProGoe reports on the teacher evaluation, specifically dimensions two and three. The goal is that at least 80% of teachers are earning "distinguished" in dimension III (Lesson Implementation) elements III (Applies a variety of strategies) and IV (Delivers engaging and challenging lessons). In addition to that, we will implement a teacher survey after the Kagan professional developments (pre-planning and February 2022). In addition to that, we will continue to monitor student progress in MAPS and READ 180.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Brian Callinan (callinan.brian@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Classroom Walk-Thrus: The assistant principal of discipline has created a weekly administration walk-thru schedule. In the weekly schedule, an administrator conducts a classroom observation and feedback with a different teacher every week, and one observation as a team every other week. Administrators discuss the results of their observations during admin meetings (every other week).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	In order to insure the Hoover Middle School faculty is increasing the amount of classroom engagement, the administrative team created a schedule of observations to follow. By implementing this strategy, we will be able to recognize the teachers who are being successful in implementing Kagan structures and the teachers who need more support.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The downward trend in ELA and Math scores indicates a need for more "wrap around" services for students who traditionally struggle academically. In 2019, 68% of students scored at least a level 3 in FSA ELA; however, in 2021, 66% of students earned a passing score. Similarly, there is a downward trend in Math Achievement scores, as in 2019, 73% of students scored at least a level 3 in FSA Math, while in 2021, 67% students scored at least a level 3. In more specific terms, there is a downward trend in Math Achievement in 8th grade, as 34% 8th graders earned a passing score in FSA Math in 2019, while 74% of 7th graders earned a passing score in FSA Math, in the same year. A downward trend is also noticeable in the Algebra EOC scores. In 2019, 93% of students passed the EOC; however in 2021, 59% of students passed the same assessment.
Measureable Outcome:	Hoover Middle School is expecting to see an improvement in standardized scores for all Hoover students. In ELA an improvement from 66% to 70% and in Math from 67% to 71% achievement rate.
Monitoring:	There are two areas currently being monitored: (a) READ 180 scores, ELA progress and MAPS scores, math progress, (b) and PLC's. We will use READ 180 and MAPS to track any improvements in student data, and administrators will attend PLC's, as a follow up on the collaboration day outcomes produced. Our goal is that all core departments PLCs are focused in discussing standard-based instruction and student data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Paloma Ferreira (ferreira.paloma@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Collaboration Day: Each core department will have a day to collaborate, while students meet in the gym for a different school-wide presentation. The assistant principal met with each department chair to discuss an agenda for the day. Although each department settled on a different product (outcome) for the end of the day, every department started the day with data analysis. The science department's outcome, for example, involved formative assessment, while the ELA department focused on lesson planning with their new curriculum.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	More than half of Hoover Middle School teachers reported not having enough time conduct a through data analysis before the beginning of the school year. This issue was particularly evident this year due to Kagan training. Historically, teachers have time during pre-planning to analyze data, group students according to abilities, and identify students who will need wrap-around services. However, this year, the time originally allocated to data analysis was used for Kagan training.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In the Insight Survey, for the last two consecutive years, teachers have rated professional development as one of their lowest categories. In addition to that, teachers have specifically requested for professional development from outside providers, rather than Brevard County recourses. Similarly, students have rated teachers low in classroom engagement (Youth Truth Survey). Finally, the downward trend in ELA (stagnant at 68% for the last two years) and math (add here) clearly shows a need for more classroom engagement, as it can possibly improve learning.
Measureable Outcome:	We hope to see an improvement in how students rate teachers' engagement (Youth Truth Survey) by 4 percentile points and an overall improvement in ELA and math standardized scores. In more specific terms....
Monitoring:	The principal will meet with a group of students, representative of different subgroups, and receive feedback on engagement. Additionally, we will track MAPS (math progress) and READ 180 (ELA progress).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Catherine McNutt (mcnutt.catherine@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Kagan strategies: Hoover Middle School faculty underwent a two-day training on Kagan strategies, and will attend another professional development on February 2022. Kagan training involves how to organize structures of classroom collaboration and engagement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Kagan training includes a multitude of strategies to set cooperative learning structures in the classroom. During the two days of training, teachers became familiar with different structures that can be used to achieve different academic goals. During the follow up PD in February, teachers will have the chance to meet with a Kagan trainer one more time, and ask questions.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Hoover Middle School's primary area of concern throughout the school year will be to continue addressing our Drug/Public Order incidents that has been an ongoing issue throughout the last few years on campus. Our state ranking for safety on campus was 545 out of 553 schools last data collection period. Within the Drug/Public Order incidents, drug use or possession and tobacco use or possession categories, in the 2020 school year, Hoover recorded 1 incident of drug use or possession and 21 incidents of tobacco. In the 2021 school year, we showed an increase to 6 incidents of drug possession, but a decrease in incidents of tobacco to 13.

This school year, administration in conjunction with our School Resource Officer will maintain a focus of keeping the campus safe by educating students and parents about the harmful effects of drugs and tobacco use. Utilizing the district implementation of the P3 Campus app and Speakout tip-line, we will encourage students to inform the school of new information.

In addition, Hoover will look to decrease the number of suspensions that take place on campus, increasing the amount of time students spend receiving instruction. In 2020, there were 70 total suspensions, of 14.2 per 100 students, ranking us 2 out of 69 schools in the county and 251 out of 553 schools in the state. In 2021 our suspensions increased to 76 reported incidents. Focusing on a thorough implementation of PBIS on the Hoover, campus and rewarding students for positive behaviors and interactions will decrease the number of suspensions that take place.

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.

Hoover Middle School will continue to implement a Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS) and reward system to enhance and develop positive behaviors of all students. To increase teacher buy-in and improve consistency, all current processes and procedures are under review by teacher and student committees . These committees will update wording and create a more relevant behavior management system.

Moving through the school year our PBIS team consisting of teachers and administration will focus on providing insight into which behaviors are deserving of praise or reward, while continuing to address negative behaviors that need to be corrected. Based on observations from the 2020-2021 school year,

when the focus is pointing out and addressing solely negative behaviors, the climate of the campus declined. Moving into this school year, there is a greater focus on recognizing students and staff members exhibiting positive behaviors with hopes that the behavior will be repeated, and duplicated by peers. Emphasis will be put on the use of Hawk Tickets across the campus to acknowledge all students who are abiding by the Hawk Code of Conduct.

Overall, these changes will continue to improve our overall school climate, which showed improvements last school based on our Youth Truth survey data. In January of 2020 our data showed a 25% positive rating, which increased to 36% in 2021. Adversely, focusing on positive praise of teachers and acknowledgement of exemplar professionals will increase peer culture, which dropped from 7.1 to 6.5 between the 2019 and 2020 Insight Survey.

To address serving all students with fidelity, we are continuing to develop and implement 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. In the past, our teachers have used MESH teams to identify students in need of additional support. We have moved away from MESH teams this school year and will utilize PLCs to identify struggling students.

PBIS and MTSS/IPST processes have two significantly different purposes on Hoover's campus. PBIS will continue to focus on development of the whole student while MTSS/IPST will provide any and all support necessary to ensure academic success for each student. Despite having different focuses, PBIS and MTSS work hand in hand toward the overall empowerment of the whole student.

Deeper implementation of PBIs and MTSS will provide a sound foundation to identify specific mental health and social-emotional needs of our students. With this foundation we are focused on providing all students additional resources when necessary by making it a point to complete district implemented Mental Health Referrals for specific students.

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. Additionally, we will offer multiple student and staff trainings on working with students with autism.

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

Implementation PBIS and 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.

Part V: Budget

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Instructional Leadership Team	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning	$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**