

Brevard Public Schools

Cocoa High School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	22
Positive Culture & Environment	27
Budget to Support Goals	28

Cocoa High School

2000 TIGER TRL, Cocoa, FL 32926

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

Demographics

Principal: Rachad Wilson T

Start Date for this Principal: 1/17/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 7-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
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)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: C (45%)
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.

The mission of the Cocoa High School Community is to prepare all students for college and career readiness and provide the necessary supports to succeed.

Provide the school's vision statement.

All students at Cocoa High School will graduate with the knowledge and skills necessary to be successful in their post-secondary education and the workforce. Courses will be academic, engaging, and standards-based, with a focus on the learner.

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
Wilson, Rachad	Principal	Overall Site Management, Budgeting, SAC, Oversees Administration, Instructional Coaches and Department Leads, Community Liaison, Instructional Leader
Stewart, Denise	Assistant Principal	Cohort 2022 Admin; Master Schedule; Academic Records Management; Oversees all Curriculum, Testing, & Parent Communications; Instructional Leader
McGriff, Yolonda	Other	Reading and Math Interventionist, Leads MTSS, Assigns Title I IAs to place strategically for student support in content classes for math and reading intervention, Title I compliance, ESE Scheduling
Primus, Steve	Other	Math Interventionist for Middle School, Manages Early Warning System, Works with Social Workers, District Truancy, and Administration to Monitor Students with Extreme Attendance Issues
Hoffman, Tamara	Instructional Coach	Literacy Coach for grades 7-9, works with all content teachers to help them learn ways to support struggling readers with content literacy skills and strategies, tutors, proctors, small group pull-out for intervention assistance, supports new teacher development as Lead Mentor
Biery, Margaret	Instructional Coach	Literacy Coach for grades 10-12, works with all content teachers to help them learn ways to support struggling readers with content literacy skills and strategies, tutors, proctors, small group pull-out for intervention assistance, supports teacher development, mentor teacher
Mattson, Dennis	Instructional Coach	Science Coach for grades 7-12, works with all content teachers to help them learn ways to support struggling readers with content literacy skills and strategies, tutors, proctors, small group pull-out for intervention assistance, supports teacher development, mentor teacher, leads science PLC in creating common assessments and progress monitoring for Science state assessments
McDonald, Jollette	Instructional Coach	Math Coach for grades 7-12, works with math teachers to help them learn ways to support struggling math students with skills and strategies, tutors, proctors, small group pull-out for intervention assistance, supports teacher development, mentor teacher, creates common assessments and curriculum to align course instruction

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities	
			across teacher classrooms, progress monitoring for Math Graduation Requirement
Powers, Timothy	Assistant Principal		Cohort 2023 Admin, Oversees Facilities & CTE
Mitchell, Ivor	Assistant Principal		Cohort 2025 Admin; Oversees ESE, Competency Based Program & Credit Retrieval, Attendance for EWS
Rosado, Jennifer	Assistant Principal		Cohort 2024 Admin; Oversees AVID, ESOL, Title I, PBIS, & COVID Contact Tracing
Olivo, Vidal	Assistant Principal		Middle School Admin
Jursa, Ruth	Other	Testing Coordinator	Coordinates all State required assessments for students 7-12

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 1/17/2017, Rachad Wilson T

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.*

2

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.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

112

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,513

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

19

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

16

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	285	267	299	269	201	188	1509
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72	80	69	86	40	42	389
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	72	64	55	23	15	267
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	34	27	44	7	10	140
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	36	43	38	14	13	154
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80	69	88	88	31	43	399
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102	60	66	60	24	16	328
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	11	11	0	0	0	35
LEVEL 1 ON 2021 FSA ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93	63	113	103	68	48	488
LEVEL 1 ON 2021 FSA MATH	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	83	128	89	35	28	463

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	97	100	123	107	43	38	508

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	27	40	36	50	13	34	200
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	28	37	44	25	29	189

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/1/2021

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	282	274	281	302	240	190	1569
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	85	94	100	80	53	470
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	69	90	101	49	22	387
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	6	4	7	2	28
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	8	5	0	20
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80	69	88	88	31	43	399
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102	60	66	60	24	16	328

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	90	85	110	110	71	38	504

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	21	8	14	33	29	8	113
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	14	20	21	2	73

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	282	274	281	302	240	190	1569
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	85	94	100	80	53	470
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	69	90	101	49	22	387
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	6	4	7	2	28
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	8	5	0	20
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80	69	88	88	31	43	399
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102	60	66	60	24	16	328

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	90	85	110	110	71	38	504

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	21	8	14	33	29	8	113
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	14	20	21	2	73

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).

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	31%	58%	-27%	52%	-21%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	40%	63%	-23%	56%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-31%				
09	2021					
	2019	40%	62%	-22%	55%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				
10	2021					
	2019	35%	59%	-24%	53%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2021					
	2019	44%	62%	-18%	54%	-10%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	36%	43%	-7%	46%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	31%	53%	-22%	48%	-17%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	46%	66%	-20%	67%	-21%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	45%	74%	-29%	71%	-26%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	61%	71%	-10%	70%	-9%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	45%	61%	-16%	61%	-16%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	43%	60%	-17%	57%	-14%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Reading Plus was used to Progress Monitor reading proficiency in grades 7-12. The data and numbers for Fall Sy2021 testing indicate a higher number of students tested than the other two test sessions. In reality, the first time a student took the Reading Plus test during the year (for example, a new student who enrolled in February after the first two testing windows had passed), it is recorded in Performance Matters as Benchmark 1, hence the lower numbers as the year progresses.

Math Progress Monitoring was managed through MAPS for middle school math courses, Algebra 1, Geometry, and Liberal Arts Math. We did not progress monitor consistently in other math courses as a

result of teachers and instructional coaches trying to learn and navigate the emergency hybrid and block schedule instructional demands as part of the SY2021 COVID-19 BPS Secondary School Plan, and because district requirements did not dictate we do so. Additionally, district resource personnel were not able to come to our school to provide in-person training to our teachers on adjusting pacing guides and to help review local assessment due to social distancing restrictions.

It is important to note that trying to get e-Learners to come to school to progress monitoring test proved very difficult, and so the tested numbers are lower than the number of students enrolled in courses. Additionally, with the emergency schooling moving us from a traditional 7 period day to Block schedule, students did not have year long instruction in math or ELA/ Reading.

Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	41/249=16%	28/188=15%	21/171=12%
	Economically Disadvantaged	31/202=15%	22/156=14%	13/138=9%
	Students With Disabilities	3/50=6%	3/36=8%	4/37=11%
	English Language Learners	0/30=0	1/27=4%	0/26=0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	52/263=20%	47/206=23%	43/195=22%
	Economically Disadvantaged	37/222=17%	34/177=19%	29/165=18%
	Students With Disabilities	5/7=7%	4/58=7%	1/53=2%
	English Language Learners	2/34=6%	1/27=4%	1/25=4%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 9				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 10				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	45/238=19%	36/174=21%	28/163=17%
	Economically Disadvantaged	34/191=18%	26/142=18%	21/132=16%
	Students With Disabilities	1/56=2%	1/44=2%	2/45=9%
	English Language Learners	0/18=0	0/10=0	0/16=0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 11				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	40/170=24%	30/112=27%	9/73=12%
	Economically Disadvantaged	25/120=21%	20/87=23%	6/57=11%
	Students With Disabilities	0/17=0	0/14=0	1/8=13%
	English Language Learners	0/18=0	0/14=0	0/12=0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 12					
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		2/33=6%	0/21=0	0/6=0
	Economically Disadvantaged		2/25=8%	0/18=0	0/6=0
	Students With Disabilities		0/7=0	0/5=0	0/1=0
	English Language Learners		0/5=0	0/5=0	0/1=0
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students				
	Economically Disadvantaged				
	Students With Disabilities				
	English Language Learners				
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students		0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged		0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities		0	0	0
	English Language Learners		0	0	0
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students		0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged		0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities		0	0	0
	English Language Learners		0	0	0

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	9	22	24	12	27	31	13	16	14	69	24
ELL	11	27	30	15	23	34	9	27	33	44	
BLK	14	22	20	14	28	41	16	26	46	82	39
HSP	28	37	24	18	22	28	24	38	41	79	51
MUL	36	29		29	28		38	58	43	83	55

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
WHT	40	39	30	29	26	30	44	49	48	76	57
FRL	27	32	26	20	25	34	27	39	45	79	47
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	12	32	31	26	53	52	20	21		60	23
ELL	9	30	33	23	57	60	13	31			
BLK	22	35	37	30	39	50	22	33	65	80	23
HSP	35	41	41	42	50	56	47	60	76	73	36
MUL	45	44	10	53	56		40	65	57	77	65
WHT	49	49	41	50	57	66	54	58	72	81	62
FRL	34	40	38	42	48	56	37	51	69	78	39
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	12	28	29	8	20	21	15	16		70	18
ELL	18	41	37	18	42	45	19	20		37	
BLK	26	40	40	23	30	22	23	31	35	82	16
HSP	44	46	35	39	42	42	40	46	59	62	35
MUL	43	53	45	30	27	36	31	54	45	82	43
WHT	52	50	42	45	39	34	56	59	55	81	66
FRL	41	46	39	35	36	34	41	48	49	76	40

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	38
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	37
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	450
Total Components for the Federal Index	12
Percent Tested	91%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	22
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	26
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	32
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	36
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	44
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	43
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	37
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?

In all subject areas, all grade levels, and all subgroups, Cocoa HS saw significant drops in student achievement on SY2021 FSA, EOC, AP, and CTE tests. Progress Monitoring data from Reading Plus and MAPS, as well as mid-year EOC test scores indicated to school leadership and PLC teams during SY2021 that this would be the most likely outcome.

There were many contributing factors, to include a shift to Block schedule and teachers teaching the hybrid in-person and eLearning students at the same time, COVID social distancing restrictions on many best practice instructional strategies, a drop in attendance rates due to quarantines and family mobility due to a significant rise in job loss, being without teachers in ten classrooms until mid-year when we were finally fully hired, and as a result of the overwhelming need for teachers to help cover classes, we also had our instructional coaches being used as substitute teachers which meant that they could not help support students and teachers in their areas of concentration. Of the ten teacher vacancies for the first half of the school year several were in tested subject courses, and all teachers and admin had to be used to help cover classes rather than attend to the academic and social-emotional needs of our students.

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

Though CHS students performed at proficiency levels well below district and state averages on the SY2021 assessments, the SY2019 assessment indicators demonstrated a much greater level of success. At that time, we identified that it was important that we focus primarily on increasing reading proficiency rates because we were close to being below the Federal Index of 41% for all students and we were well below that average for our SWD, ELL, and African American Students. Progress Monitoring data from SY2021 supported a SY2022 focus on both reading and math.

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

Pandemic schooling was very detrimental to our school community. According to the Department of Education's study "Education in a Pandemic: The Disparate Impact of COVID-19 on America's Students "... we know from early studies that for many students, the educational gaps that existed

before the pandemic—in access, opportunities, achievement, and outcomes—are widening. And we can see already that many of these impacts are falling disproportionately on students who went into the pandemic with the greatest educational needs and fewest opportunities—many of them from historically marginalized and underserved groups." (9 Jun 2021, <https://tinyurl.com/2v5eramw>).

CHS is a Title I HS (grades 7-12), with a 62% minority rate and 80% FRL rate. We had a 25% eLearning rate in SY2021, and 25% of our students were at <90% attendance. It was very difficult for most of our students to attend school consistently due to quarantines and the need for many high school students to take on jobs to help support their families. Due to teachers being quarantined or absent to care for quarantined family members, or leaving the district or profession for other opportunities which created the ten teacher vacancies, we had classroom coverage issues. SY2021 was Crisis Schooling: Our teachers and staff did their best to support our students in the midst of trying to support themselves and their own families. High-quality instruction took a necessary back seat to trying to help a school community in upheaval as a result of the pandemic.

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

In SY2019, we had an overall 56 point gain related to school grade calculations, with our greatest gains in math and MS Acceleration. In SY2021, we saw no improvements on progress monitoring data, and in fact saw a decline in achievement scores on mid-year EOC test scores as well as a decline in proficiency measures on progress monitoring.

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

In SY2019, our scores improved because we had specific action plans in place for all tested subject courses that were led and monitored by our instructional coaches as well as supported by district resource team members. In MS, the MOS certification was an option to earn MS Acceleration points in CTE, but that is no longer available as an option. We also emphasized the implementation of AVID WICOR strategies school wide, and admin conducted frequent classroom observations to support and provide feedback to teachers. In Biology and Social Studies, the implementation of Skills Days that focus on EOC tested content and skills helped raise achievement scores in those subject areas.

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

1. In our PLC teams, teachers will be diagnosing essential missed learning using local classroom assessment data and progress monitoring data as applicable. This data will help teachers provide Differentiated Instruction to students individually and in small groups keeping target grade-level course standards as the ultimate learning goals for every student.
2. Instruction will include scaffolding content and skills intentionally, building background knowledge and vocabulary through frequent and repeated content reading in all classes, and in classes that have a specific EOC or FSA test associated with it, we will be prioritizing standards and monitoring student progress through common and formative assessments. Additionally, we are working with district resource teachers to help provide support to our teachers in their classrooms through modeling and co-teaching of acceleration strategies. We continue to emphasize the research work of Fisher, Frey and Hattie and Visible Learning for Literacy (2016) by focusing on high yield instructional strategies so that we can effectively manage instructional time for both remediation and acceleration.
3. Administration will be more present in classrooms to provide teachers with specific and immediate feedback on instruction, ensuring that our SIP goals are being implemented in every classroom and with fidelity.

4. Not losing sight of our goal to become an AVID school of distinction and possibly a demonstration school, we are including in our SIP goals a plan for AVID WICOR strategies to be implemented in all classrooms schoolwide.

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.

Our Professional Development relies heavily on the AVID WICOR Professional Learning Modules. We will be providing five different required AWPL PDs during the year and also provide specific teacher training based on walk-through and observational recommendations by administration. District resource teachers will work with teachers as PLC teams by grade level or course subject, and also provide one-to-one support as needed. Instructional Coaches will work with PLC teams to gather and analyze common assessment data and help teachers identify opportunities to remediate while also accelerating the learning through specific bell work or Skills Days for review so that pacing is not interrupted. Title I funding will allow us to provide specific core subject area parent engagement nights focused on helping parents support student acceleration in core subject classes throughout the year (T). Student academic engagement has been a challenge during pandemic teaching with so many distractions and changes, and so we will once again bring Kagan back to our school to assist with helping teachers learn ways to engage students in authentic and meaningful collaborative learning activities for our February 2022 school PD day (T).

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

Through Title I, we have purchased technology that will assist students and teachers with accessing web-based curriculum resources and learning software that will help enhance and accelerate learning for students, such as laptops and Promethean boards (T). There are several software programs that we purchase using Title I funds to help provide teachers the means to provide high quality instruction while also saving time for Differentiating Instruction for students based on data. For example, Grade Cam gives teachers the ability to quickly grade common assessment data then share it with PLC team members for data analysis and instructional planning (T). Flocabulary helps provide additional vocabulary instruction to our below grade level readers as part of the instruction in non-ELA and reading courses (T). No Red Ink is an online adaptive learning tool for teaching writing and grammar that our ELA and Reading teachers use with students (T). We also have a MS Math Interventionist, Dr. Steve Primus, a Reading and Math Interventionist Dr. Yolanda McGriff, 2.5 Title I paid Reading Teacher positions, and six Title I Instructional Assistants to help with push-in and pull-out support of students (T).

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Other specifically relating to Raising Student Achievement Scores

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: As a result of the significant decline in all state and progress monitoring assessment data from SY2021, it is critical that we work to raise student performance on high stakes and progress monitoring assessments. Whether the test scores dropped due to true decline in student academic performance, or was in part the result of student test apathy in the midst of a pandemic, it is important that we help raise student academic proficiency rates while at the same time teaching students of the importance of taking any test taking situation seriously and doing one's best at all times academically.

Measureable Outcome: As a result of our work in this goal area, we will raise student test scores on state assessments back to pre-pandemic rates. Our progress monitoring data in ELA, math, Biology, and social studies EOC courses will reflect learning gains for every student across the school year.

Monitoring: All EOC and FSA course teachers will participate in common assessment and progress monitoring implementation and data analysis with the assistance of our instructional coaches and district resource personnel. Data will be shared during PLC meetings attended by administration and teachers. Teachers will conduct data chats with students about individual student performance.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Denise Stewart (stewart.catherine@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Brian A. McNulty and Laura Besser's book "Leaders Make it Happen! An Administrator's Guide to Data Teams" (2011), discusses the importance of PLC teams also being Data Teams, whereby course, grade, and/or content same or similar teams of teachers come together to review data for the purpose of aligning instruction to meet target Priority Standards. McNulty and Besser stress the importance of school leadership helping guide PLC Data Teams towards an "Improvement Framework," that contains six components (pg 36):

1. Use data well and in an ongoing way.
2. Limit the number of goals and strategies, and focus on them.
3. Develop shared instructional practices.
4. Implement deeply.
5. Monitor, provide feedback, and give support.
6. Create supportive learning environments for everyone in the 'school system.'

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The decision to work within an Improvement Framework is based on the previous success our math teachers and students had in SY2019 with the large gains made in state math assessment. Our Math Instructional Coach led the math PLC team using the Improvement Framework model. As a result, we saw an overall 45 point gain combined in Math Proficiency, Learning Gains, and Bottom Quartile Performance. This led the administrative team to the decision to replicate this work in all tested subject courses (ELA, Reading, US History, Civics, Alg 1, Geometry, Biology, MS science and math, AP classes, and CTE).

Action Steps to Implement

1. Instructional Coaches analyzed state assessment and progress monitoring data to identify target standards by course during summer between SY2021 and SY2022.
2. Teacher PLC teams reviewed and analyzed school data during pre-planning to understand where students were and then looked at course standards to determine where they needed to be by the end of the year.
3. Teacher PD during pre-planning for SY2022 focused on AVID WICOR, Differentiated Instruction and Visible Learning for Literacy high yield strategies.

4. PLC teams meet once a month to review common assessment data and discuss instructional strategies used by those teachers who had the highest proficiency rates on common assessment data.
5. Administration walks classrooms weekly using an observation tool that collects instructional data that we then share with the individual teachers as well as the composite data with the faculty as a whole during faculty meetings.

Person Responsible Denise Stewart (stewart.catherine@brevardschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our reading proficiency rates have declined since SY2018, and since reading is a foundational skill for all content area course success as well as high stakes assessment, we are focusing on developing literacy skills by emphasizing student independent reading of content-rich, grade-level text every day, in every class for a minimum of 5 minutes a day (that's a total of 35 minutes a day, and over four hours by the end of a school week). The goal is to both build up reading skills, such as content vocabulary and fluency, while helping students with "testing fatigue" by providing regular practice with timed reading and response. Because we are an AVID school, we are using WICOR strategies as our foundational work. WICOR (Writing, Inquiry, Collaboration, Organization, and Reading) aligns with the work of Fisher, Frey, and Hattie's "Visible Learning for Literacy" (2016), which we use to help teachers maximize their instruction by helping them identify high yield WICOR strategies, and making sure that we are implementing our daily reading goal with fidelity through classroom observations with immediate feedback.

Measureable Outcome: As a result of our emphasis on increased independent reading for every student, we will meet the ESSA minimum of 41% proficiency rate for all students in all subcategories on state and progress monitoring assessments by the end of this school year.

Monitoring: Our administrators are monitoring implementation of this SIP goal by doing weekly classroom observations and providing immediate teacher feedback. Our Literacy Coaches are assisting teachers who need help with finding content-rich, grade-level text, as are the district resource teachers as part of their one-to-one teacher support.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Denise Stewart (stewart.catherine@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: All teachers, in every class, will provide students the opportunity to read content-rich, grade-level text that helps provide instruction on core course standards for a minimum of 5 minutes every day. Students will be expected to be individually engaged in the reading process as well as the learning task assigned to the reading. AVID WICOR strategies will help teachers with instructional design related to literacy skills development.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: John Hattie's Visible Learning effect sizes provide educators guidance on what influences student achievement, both positively and negatively, according to his meta-analysis of thousands of research articles. Based on his work, we know that Repeated Reading has an effect size of .75 and that Exposure to Reading (.43) and Deliberate Practice (.49) also have a positive impact. A whole school approach to incorporative daily reading in every class will help raise the influence of these practices. Also, according to Fisher, Frey and Hattie (2016):

1. Literacy is among the major antidotes for poverty.
2. Literacy makes your life better.
3. Literate people have more choices in their work and personal lives, leading to greater freedom.
4. Literacy is great at teaching you how to think successively -- that is, making meaning one step at a time to then build a story.
5. Literacy soon becomes the currency of other learning.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on SY2021 Youth Truth and Insight Survey data, students and teachers both identified the need for more specific efforts to build positive school culture and provide positive campus experiences for every student and staff member this school year. The Youth Truth Survey, which we had 100% participation on in both middle school and high school, indicated that only 38% of students felt that received support and personal attention from their teachers. The Insight Survey results indicated that 67% of teachers felt that the interactions between teachers and students was positive. Discipline data indicated that in our middle school, there is a need for PBIS due to high referral rates, and specifically non-violent, academic related referrals (being off task and out of area). Attendance is also a concern with our attendance rate being less than 90%.

Measureable Outcome: As a result of our work on building a more positive campus experience for all staff and students, we will see a 5% increase in positivity ratings on both the Youth Truth Survey and the Insight Survey in SY2022.

Monitoring: We will be conducting quarterly Google surveys to students and staff asking for similar feedback as these two district surveys, and also providing an opportunity for feedback and suggestions on those surveys.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Denise Stewart (stewart.catherine@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Our focus is on encouraging staff to build positive, caring relationships with students that focus first on the student's social-emotional needs and making sure students know that they are valued members of our school community. We implemented a middle school service learning class to help start students develop a community civic mindedness, and are also providing mentoring for our middle school female students by our high school female students through a Female Mentorship program. We are restoring our pre-pandemic efforts of utilizing PBIS points to reward students for demonstrating positive school behavior and work ethic, especially in our middle school classes. We also implemented a Teacher and Students of the Week to provide opportunities for students and staff to nominate one another for exhibiting Tiger PRIDE (Perseverance, Respect, Integrity, Discipline, and Empathy).

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: John Hattie's research tells us that positive student-teacher relationships have a .48 effect size on student learning, and that Teacher Credibility has a 1.09 effect size. School climate has a .43 effect size, and that building the skills of concentration, persistence, and engagement has an effect size of .54.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.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.

According to the data shared on [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), Cocoa High, in SY2020, had an incident rate of 4.3 per 100 students, or 69 reported SESIR incidents out of an enrollment of 1610. Using this data, the reporting site ranked Cocoa High School as a High Risk school. However, when you go to the actual school comparisons and select Brevard county, High Schools, and look by individual reported incident, Cocoa HS is at the top of the list for specific types of incidents in only three categories: Disruption on Campus, Physical Attack, and Other Major Offenses. When you break down the numbers, with 69 incidents reported out of 1610 students, that is only a 4% reporting rate, and the reality is that there are a low number of students out of the 1610 total enrollment that produce the referrals. So while the reporting of the data is important and we use that data to help us plan how to better provide social and emotional support and monitor specific students through mentoring and administrative check-ins, the data does not reflect the day-to-day experience of our students and staff.

We are, however, focusing on building a more positive school culture by encouraging teachers to use Relationship-Based Discipline strategies (<https://tinyurl.com/4uwmvapk>), PBIS rewards, and through specific mentoring efforts with our students who demonstrate the most at risk behaviors (lack of attendance, high referral rates, classroom engagement referrals, student conflict reports). One such mentoring effort is focused developing a female mentorship program at Cocoa HS that partners a HS female student with a MS female student recommended to the program based on referral rates and types.

Additional Title I Schoolwide Improvement Priorities include increasing the intervention support for students in core classes through Title I Instructional Assistant support, the hiring of Math and Reading Interventionists and Reading Teachers, the purchase of specific learning technology and online tools, and investment in professional development for teachers such as Kagan, AVID, and APSI.

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.

CHS utilizes Insight Survey, Youth Truth, Parent Survey, and local Google Survey data to help us understand the unique needs of our school community. Our Youth Truth data showed that we had a 29%

average positivity rate related to school culture, and our teacher Insight Survey results indicated that 79% of our teachers thought Cocoa High was a good place to teach and learn (the district average was 82%). Follow up Google Surveys of teachers indicated that there is a need for more recognition of teachers and students for demonstrating work and learning success. Our Parent Survey data indicated that 98% of our families feel welcome at Cocoa HS, but we have only a 50% attendance rate from parents at school academic events. The comments from parents indicated communication and work schedules most impeded greater attendance at events such as Title I Academic Nights, Parent Conferences and Open House.

Based on survey data, we identified that both our teachers and students identified a need to focus on building positive school culture. In response to that data, we have developed a 3 Tier process for developing a more positive school culture and environment. Our Tier 1 (schoolwide) efforts to build positive school culture includes AVID and Kagan team building strategies training during all faculty PD sessions, led by our AVID Coordinator Cassi Sheron. These strategies are then observed being implemented by teachers during AP classroom walkthroughs. Our PBIS team, led by teacher Lucy Ninko, utilizes the PBIS online points awarding system to identify, recognize, and reward students who demonstrate TIGER PRIDE (Perseverance, Respect, Integrity, Discipline, Empathy) across their school day. AP Denise Stewart leads efforts for our Teacher and Student Tiger of the Week, which is a system whereby teachers, students, and staff recognize one another for demonstrating TIGER PRIDE in an exemplary way and AP Stewart announces a weekly Middle School student, High School student, and teacher nominee on the morning announcements. As part of the Tier 1 efforts, we reach out to our PIE partners, SAC, and Cocoa City Council for help in providing special recognition for our students and staff. Additionally, we try to encourage participation in school activities as a way to engage students in the school culture and provide extra positive experiences beyond the classroom as part of the Cocoa HS community.

For those students who show evidence of disengagement in school through attendance and behavior referrals, or referrals directly to our social workers or counselors by concerned staff members, we implement Tier 2 and Tier 3 efforts to provide extra support. Tier 2 support may include referrals to our MTSS process through Cohort meetings, Students at Risk coordinator for attendance related concerns, mental health counselor or social worker as appropriate. Additionally, APs will work with students on a one-to-one mentoring basis and may refer some students to our school-based personnel for mentor support.

Our Tier 3 support includes outreach to our district level resource supports as well as mental health and/or social work referrals. In some cases, assistance of our SRO or Cocoa PD may be needed, who approach working with our at risk students outside of law enforcement referrals from the perspective of community outreach efforts.

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

At CHS, each Assistant Principal (AP) is assigned a Cohort to oversee the social-emotional, academic, and behavioral growth of each student. APs work with the Cohort teachers, the Cohort counselor (who is assigned to that Cohort and rolls with their students from one year to the next), our SAC committee, our business partners through the Partners in Education (PIE) network, Cocoa City Council, our AVID Coordinator Cassi Sheron, and our PBIS Coordinator Lucy Ninko on our Tier 1 Positive School Culture Supports and Social Emotional learning for all students.

Our Tier 2 and Tier 3 supports are provided by our Students at Risk Coordinator Dr. Steve Primus, our Social Worker Mariah Washington, our Mental Health Counselor Alexis Furlough, our MTSS Coordinator Dr. Yolanda McGriff, and our SRO Sal Fugo and other Cocoa PD support as needed.

Part V: Budget

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Raising Student Achievement Scores	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	\$0.00
			Total: \$0.00