Cocoa High School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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)	78%
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	TS&I

> * 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.](http://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	Budgeting, oversees department chairs and meets monthly with them, SAC meetings, oversees instructional coaches and meets monthly with them, community liaison, oversees administrative team
Stewart, Denise	Assistant Principal	All student and teacher scheduling, organizes parent conferences and Open House events, textbook ordering, oversees all curriculum and testing, administrator for Cohort 2021, oversees registration process, IPPAS point of contact, professional development for all staff, Focus school editor, FA process facilitator, FTE oversight, data corrections, roster verification, parent and community outreach via school website management, Blackboard Connect, and Focus messenging
Primus, Steve	Other	Guidance Service Professional oversees attendance and monitors Early Warning System, works with social worker and counselors to monitor and track 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 teacher development, mentor teacher
Biery, Margaret	Instructional Coach	Literacy Coach for grades 10-129, 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, Jolette	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 across teacher classrooms, progress monitoring for Algebra EOC

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
McGriff, Yolanda	Other	Reading and Math Interventionist, leads MTSS process, assigns Title I IAs to place strategically for student support in content classes for math and reading, leads Title I compliance efforts
Enneking, Jayne	Teacher, K-12	Intensive Language Arts Instruction for middle school students, SAC Chairperson
Rosado, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	Administrator overseeing ESOL and PBIS, Cohort 2023
Mitchell, Ivor	Assistant Principal	Administrator overseeing ESE, Credit Retrieval, and Attendance, Cohort 2021
Powers, Timothy	Assistant Principal	Administrator overseeing facilities, CTE programs, and Cohort 2022
Olivo, Vidal	Assistant Principal	Administrator overseeing Middle School

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.*
12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
111

Demographic Data

2020-21 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)	78%
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	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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

Date this data was collected or last updated
Wednesday 9/30/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	311	258	329	281	212	208	1599
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	29	47	26	38	27	200
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	106	113	86	30	21	398
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	60	98	73	34	8	295
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115	103	114	116	64	38	550

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	37	86	112	87	45	16	383

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	0	30	69	37	3	148
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	13	21	22	5	5	77

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	311	258	329	281	212	208	1599
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	29	47	26	38	27	200
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	106	113	86	30	21	398
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	60	98	73	34	8	295
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115	103	114	116	64	38	550

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	37	86	112	87	45	16	383

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	0	30	69	37	3	148
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	13	21	22	5	5	77

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	39%	59%	56%	44%	58%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	43%	52%	51%	47%	53%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	40%	42%	40%	44%	44%
Math Achievement	43%	48%	51%	37%	50%	51%
Math Learning Gains	51%	49%	48%	37%	46%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	45%	45%	34%	43%	45%
Science Achievement	42%	66%	68%	43%	67%	67%
Social Studies Achievement	53%	70%	73%	50%	70%	71%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	7	8	9	10	11	12	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2019	31%	58%	-27%	52%	-21%
	2018	38%	56%	-18%	51%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	40%	63%	-23%	56%	-16%
	2018	45%	65%	-20%	58%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
09	2019	40%	62%	-22%	55%	-15%
	2018	40%	60%	-20%	53%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
10	2019	35%	59%	-24%	53%	-18%
	2018	45%	61%	-16%	53%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2019	44%	62%	-18%	54%	-10%
	2018	39%	62%	-23%	54%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	36%	43%	-7%	46%	-10%
	2018	19%	41%	-22%	45%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		17%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	31%	53%	-22%	48%	-17%
	2018	29%	55%	-26%	50%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	46%	66%	-20%	67%	-21%
2018	53%	67%	-14%	65%	-12%
Compare		-7%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	45%	74%	-29%	71%	-26%
2018	48%	73%	-25%	71%	-23%
Compare		-3%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	61%	71%	-10%	70%	-9%
2018	49%	70%	-21%	68%	-19%
Compare		12%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	45%	61%	-16%	61%	-16%
2018	42%	62%	-20%	62%	-20%
Compare		3%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	43%	60%	-17%	57%	-14%
2018	37%	60%	-23%	56%	-19%
Compare		6%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
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

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	51
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	615
Total Components for the Federal Index	12
Percent Tested	96%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	34
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	40
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	51
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	51
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	
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	58
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	48
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends

In SY2019, the data component with the lowest performance was overall Learning Gains in ELA for our lowest 25%. The lowest 25% is comprised largely by our most at risk ESSA subgroups -- SWD (21% of total student population) and ELL (8% of overall student population). Based on administrative classroom observations where lecture predominated, and follow-up discussions with PLC teams, it was determined that more independent student reading for the purpose of building content knowledge needed to occur across all content areas throughout the school day. A three year comparison of ELA assessment performance (2017-2019) shows that Cocoa High School students have an average learning gains increase of 41% in ELA. Additionally, our overall proficiency average in ELA was 39% in 2019, 20% lower than the district average and 17% lower than the state average. This data supports the need for students to be reading more often, more widely, and more critically across the school day. It also demands a closer look at what is happening instructionally related to critical reading strategies in ELA and ILA classes. There are serious concerns about the impact of COVID-19 and the distance and eLearning challenges that our particular student population faces due to socio-economic realities in this academic school year on a student population that already tested low in ELA proficiency. We are basing our PD off the research of John Hattie, Doug Fisher, and Nancy Frey and their "Visible Learning for Literacy" texts.

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

The SY2019 data component with the greatest decline from 2018 was the overall ELA achievement score (44% in 2018 to 39% in 2019). All tested grades, with the exception

of Cohort 2024, showed a decline in ELA achievement scores. Based on classroom walk through data, students were not reading independently often enough throughout the school day, and were also not working with grade level text consistently. In walk throughs, it was noted that most content classroom instruction relied on lecture with little student heavy lifting of learning. As a result, we implemented professional development for teachers to help them understand how to incorporate reading into instruction along with the strategies for those students who are below grade-level readers. Additionally we incorporated school-wide Reading Plus benchmark testing to progress monitor individual student reading skills development and to provide specific intervention efforts for small group intervention by the literacy coaches. Surveys of teachers during Professional Development on the topic of choosing complex, content-rich text for the purpose of knowledge building showed that the biggest reason teachers do not assign independent reading and prefer lecture is because of how much most students struggle to stay engaged in independent reading. Therefore, we brought Kagan to our campus during pre-planning in August 2019 for full faculty training in student engagement strategies, and sent almost 30 teachers to AVID Summer Institute in July 2019. PLC work requires teachers to reflect and collaborate on changes in literacy instruction practices.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends

Our SY2019 science achievement scores had a 26% gap between school score (42%) and state average score (68%). Though the gap between school performance and state performance was significant, school trend data showed only a 1% decrease in our overall science achievement score. In 2019, a new science sequence was implemented district wide changing the background knowledge students brought with them into Biology courses. Low performance in ELA could also be a contributing factor, due to the complexity of science texts included in science testing. In science instruction, there was a need to better align instruction to the standards and across classrooms. In SY2020, the science coach and science PLC, worked to standardize content delivery across all teachers who taught the same course, created common assessments based on test item specs for state tests, and progressed monitored students for the purpose of reteach, review, or remediation as needed. The assistance of the Science Resource Teacher was sought for the purpose of implementing Biology Skills Days lessons to help target specific content and science literacy skills based on common assessment data and test item specs. The data from the Skills Days in SY2020 was showing that students were improving in both content knowledge and literacy skills that were specifically targeted. Due to COVID-19 and the closing of school, we do not have state assessment data to support the effectiveness of the science instructional shifts, but local assessment data and classroom observation showed a positive growth trend.

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

The data component from SY2019 with the greatest learning gains was our Lowest 25% Math performance (25% increase), although our overall Math Learning gains was also significant (14% increase). The increase in performance in our math scores can be attributed to common assessment planning by math PLC teams, to include analysis and instructional planning adjustments based on student performance. These practices were implemented with consistency and fidelity by the majority of the math team. Our math coach modeled, mentored, and lead the math team towards meaningful PLC work that focused on identifying students who needed remediation, review, or reteaching in order to make gains. Progress monitoring and student feedback was also a part of this process.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

The EWS data comparison of SY2019 to SY2020 shows a significant increase in the number of students identified with two or more at risk factors (23% in SY2019, 32% in SY2020). However, it is important to note the impact that COVID19 and the school building closure had on Cocoa HS students. As a Title I community, moving learning to completely online created a disadvantage for many of our families who could not afford technology to meet learning needs. This contributed to the increase in students with attendance <90% (12% in SY2019 to 30% in SY2020), because students had to log into

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

1. Increasing subgroup performance for AA, SWD, and ELL students to bring us into compliance (minimum score of 41% required) and improve overall proficiency scores for these students.
2. Increase overall FSA ELA assessment performance which will help every student not only with test performance, but also with general academic success and life-long learning skills.
3. Increase overall Science assessment performance. Adding to section C above, the common planning, progress monitoring and data analysis process from SY2020 has continued into SY2021. The lowest performing groups in science were SWD and ELL, which correlates with the ESSA subgroup focus, and our FSA ELA performance.
4. Decrease the overall number of students with Attendance <90%, because there is a direct correlation to student academic performance, skills proficiency, and graduation rates associated with positive attendance rates for students. Students cannot learn course skills if they are not in the classroom.
5. Continue our overall increases in Math assessment performance so that we can continue to close the gap between school, district, and state proficiency averages, which translates into developing students who are mathematically literate and better prepared for a wider variety of post-secondary options for college and career.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increasing ELA Learning Gains and Achievement scores is a critical step in improving all content area performance. The complex texts found in high stakes tests, like FSA, SAT, ACT, etc., require students to be able to read and decode text proficiently. Passing the Reading FSA, or a concordant score on SAT or ACT, is a graduation requirement, and performing well on standardized tests opens up post-secondary opportunities for students in a wider array of College and Career options. We are working to increase the amount of student independent reading, per the research of Nancy Frey "Reading 20 minutes a day = 1,800,000 words per year & 90th percentile on standardized tests. Reading 5 minutes a day = 282,000 words per year & 50th percentile on standardized tests. Finally, a student who reads only 1 minute a day = 8,000 words per year & 10th percentile on standardized tests. Assumptions that all kids have access and time at home to read will not increase reading volume; instead, make time for students to read in your classroom." Teachers are encouraged to provide students a minimum of 15 minutes of independent reading, each class period of our 4-block school day. This instructional practice, when done with fidelity, gives students the potential for 60 minutes of independent reading each school day. We place a great emphasis on school-wide training in and implementation of Kagan strategies for student engagement, and AVID for the WICOR (Writing, Inquiry, Collaboration, Organization, and Reading) strategies. Teachers will increase student engagement in classroom learning activities by using Kagan strategies. They will plan their instruction following the WICOR lesson planning model to ensure that students are given multiple opportunities for direct literacy instruction and accountability of practice. (T)
Measureable Outcome:	Cocoa HS will see an overall 3% minimum increase in ELA proficiency scores on state standardized tests, including FSA retake data. There will also be a minimum 3% increase in individual student scores for Reading Plus and Lexia benchmark testing data from one testing session to the next (tested three times in the year -- Fall, Winter, and Spring). All eligible Cohort 2021 seniors who require ELA proficiency scores will meet this requirement in time for graduation in May, 2021.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Denise Stewart (stewart.catherine@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Cocoa HS English department will continue work with the TNTP training around using text sets of varying levels within text complexity bands by grade level. ESE students who struggle in reading and writing will be provided assistance through small group instruction by push-in ESE teachers and Instructional Assistants as well as support in Learning Strategies class as needed based on student IEPs. Additionally, as available, technology support and software will be used for those students who would benefit. ESOL students will work with ESOL Instructional Assistants as well as ESOL teachers for extra support. Additional learning tools, such as software,

support texts, and websites geared towards reading development will also be used to support all students below grade level.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

The work of John Hattie's "Visible Learning for Literacy" is the foundational research for our literacy instructional approach across grade levels. Additionally, as an AVID school, we also implement WICOR into lesson planning and instruction schoolwide. In SY2019, we also introduced the work of Dr. Spencer Kagan into our teacher instruction by having our entire teaching staff Kagan trained. Finally, admin attending the Standards Institute in January of 2020 provided extra training on standards-based instruction and planning in ELA. We will look to continue the work we started last school year with these four foundational research-based approaches to increasing and improving literacy instruction across all content areas.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will use Performance Matters data to identify which students are below proficiency in reading, and to also assess the overall proficiency average for their classes as a whole. This will assist in planning for individual, small group, and whole group differentiated instruction.Tier 1 interventions for all students within content classes will include specific "bite-sized" PD for reading strategies designated by the Curriculum AP, encouraging teachers to implement the strategies into their instruction, giving students multiple opportunities to practice and perfect the strategies. Teachers will then implement at least one reading assessment per unit that requires students to utilize the reading strategy. Teachers will hold data chats with at risk students, identified by course D or F grades, weekly or bi-weekly to determine instructional plans for reteaching, remediation, or review as needed. When necessary, teachers will recommend students for Tier 2 intervention through our MTSS process.

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

Literacy coaches, ESE teachers, and ESOL coordinator will each present PD to staff on how to best support students who are reading below grade level. The PD will focus on providing scaffolding techniques, differentiated instruction strategies, and multiple texts to build up background knowledge for students in ways that support unique learning challenges. Literacy coaches will provide specific small-group instruction based on Reading Plus and Lexia performance markers.

Person Responsible Tamara Hoffman (hoffman.tamara@brevardschools.org)

Literacy coaches, ESOL coordinator, and the reading teacher PLC team will analyze the Reading Plus benchmark data to determine which students need Tier 3 support. Those students most at risk of not passing FSA will be identified and monitored by the MTSS team, the team will include the Literacy Coaches, the ESOL teachers, our GSPs, admin, counselors, and classroom teachers.

Person Responsible Margaret Biery (biery.margaret@brevardschools.org)

Title I, ESOL, and ESE IAs will provide specific and targeted instructional support in core content classrooms to support those students who are in the bottom quartile of reading proficiency based on FSA test data, as well as Reading Plus and Lexia benchmark data. Teachers will identify which students need assistance and then provide specific mini-lessons for IAs to implement in small groups to meet students' needs. Intensive Language Arts teachers at the middle school level will work with Tier 2 and 3 students to provide intervention instruction and support.

| Person Responsible | Yolonda McGriff (mcgriff.yolonda@brevardschools.org) |

We will employee three reading intervention teachers, two reading/math intervention teachers, one GSP, one math intervention teacher, and one literacy coach to assist with instruction and RTI supports of lowest 25% and ESSA subgroup students using Title I funds. We will also employee 7 Title I Instructional Assistants for the purpose of providing reading support within core content classrooms for both individual and small groups of students.

| Person Responsible | Jennifer Rosado (rosado.jennifer@brevardschools.org) |

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	SY2019 test scores showed that Cocoa High School was below both state and district averages in overall science proficiency rates for both middle school and Biology EOC. Because our ELA proficiency ratings are also below average, it is suspected that the lack of literacy skills for many of our students impacts performance on tests that include a lot of science text reading. The science team will be focused on not only collaboratively planning for standards-based content, they will also work together to find grade-level science text and science appropriate reading skills to include in instructional activities to help increase student science literacy skills. (T)
Measureable Outcome:	Cocoa High School will see an overall minimum 3% increase in Science scores on state standardized tests.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Dennis Mattson (mattson.dennis@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The science department, lead by our science coach, will focus on monitoring student progress in PLC teams through both common formative and summative assessment. The team will meet to analyze the data of the teacher assessments to make plans for reteaching, review, or remediation of whole or small groups of students. The PLC team will also work together to find grade-appropriate text that supports the content standards as well as determining the best science appropriate reading skills to support struggling readers.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The work of DuFour and Hattie both support the positive impact on student learning when teachers collaborate for the purpose of data analysis and lesson planning. Visible Learning research states that "collective teacher efficacy" has one of the highest effect sizes on student learning (1.57%).

Action Steps to Implement

Science PLC lead by the science coach will create common summative and formative assessments based on standards. There will also be a plan for when to assess and the analysis/reflection process of the student data. Teachers will provide feedback from each common assessment to students, and when necessary, plan for small group instruction with the science coach to help with remediation, reteaching, or review of concepts missed.

Person Responsible	Dennis Mattson (mattson.dennis@brevardschools.org)

PLC teams will also create standards-based bellwork to be used daily for the purpose of review, remediation, and reteaching as needed based on student assessment data. Student performance will also inform instructional next steps.

Person Responsible	Dennis Mattson (mattson.dennis@brevardschools.org)

The science and literacy coaches will collaborate on best practice strategies for science appropriate reading strategies to share with the science teachers. PLC teams as well as individual teachers will identify grade-level, standards-reliable text to be used each day in class. Title I IAs will be used to assist with small group reading assignments, and ESOL IAs will assist specifically with ELL students utilizing ESOL strategies to help language learners access the science text.

Person Responsible   Dennis Mattson (mattson.dennis@brevardschools.org)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our SWD, ELL, & AA ESSA Subgroup Total Points will increase for every subgroup. Currently, based on SY2019 testing data due to COVID-19, the data shows that our SWD (33%), ELL (34%), and AA (40%) subgroups are below the minimum of 41% proficiency rates. This is year two of our three year time frame to increase performance by these subgroups. (T)
Measureable Outcome:	Our Federal Index Total Percent of Points for each subgroup will increase as follows: AA to 40% to 43%, SWD 33% to 36%, ELL 34% to 37%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Denise Stewart (stewart.catherine@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	In order to meet the unique needs of every learner, Cocoa High School will elevate the work of Carol Tomlinson and Differentiated Instruction into our instructional conversations and planning meetings. This is especially critical to our MTSS conversations on individual student progress, as the work of DI requires that teachers understand each student's academic skill level, interests, and social-emotional concerns. Differentiated Instruction also provides opportunities for teachers to improve the climate and culture of the classroom, which should have positive impacts on our Culture and Environment.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	When teachers differentiate the learning experience through content, process, and/or product, we meet each student where they currently are in skill level or content knowledge and help to increase their learning gains towards assessment proficiency.

Action Steps to Implement

Professional Development training will be provided to all teachers by our literacy coaches, ESOL Coordinator, and ESE team on best practice strategies for Differentiating Instruction for our most at risk subgroups. The trainers will then work with teams of teachers and/or individual teachers as needed to support implementation and practice of DI strategies and processes. PLC teams will collaborate on successes and challenges and will work together to find strategies that work within the confines of our school demographics, eLearning, COVID-19 quarantining, etc. Admin will provide teacher feedback on DI practices as part of the informal observation process, with recommendations for peer mentoring, PD, or other support assistance.

Person Responsible	Tamara Hoffman (hoffman.tamara@brevardschools.org)

Teachers will progress monitor and document the strategies being used to provide support to students who are identified as most at risk for failing and underperforming on state assessments. This information will be shared during PLC meetings in a 6 week cycle, and forwarded to the MTSS, ESE, and ESOL teams for Tier 2 or 3 intervention assistance.

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

Progress monitoring benchmark data taken from Reading Plus, Lexia, and MAPS will be used by MTSS and PLC teams to assist with identifying those students who will need extra support through tutoring, small group instruction, or assistive technologies as appropriate.

**Person
Responsible**   Yolonda McGriff (mcgriff.yolonda@brevardschools.org)

To meet specific needs of students academically and emotionally, tutoring and after hours counseling will be made available through Cares Act funds and Title I funding. Teachers will be available for one-on-one tutoring in each of the four core subject areas, and counselors will be available to assist with social-emotional issues that impact student attendance rates. Specific family outreach efforts by our counselors and social workers, as well as our GSP and Reading and Math Interventionist, will seek to help and educate our parents on how to best support their students academic performance through homework help, or community resource assistance to ensure basic needs for food and shelter are being met.

**Person
Responsible**   Yolonda McGriff (mcgriff.yolonda@brevardschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The two remaining priorities for Cocoa High School are increasing student attendance rates and maintaining our math assessment improvement rate from SY2019.

Our admin overseeing student attendance is working with our Students at Risk Coordinator, our counselors, and our social workers to reduce the absenteeism of our at risk students. Teachers are requested to make contact home with absent students to try to encourage them to come to school or assist with eLearning challenges. The eLearning absentee rate has already demonstrated a challenge given the circumstances of COVID-19, familial health concerns, and the socio-economic status of many of our most at risk students. Through Title I funding, we have attempted to purchase technology to assist students learning at home by providing school issued laptops. There is a significant negative impact of supporting eLearners with technology as well as tech needed for state testing on the instructional opportunities for our on campus learners due to their being less access to devices for teachers to use in classroom instruction. This is a challenge we are navigating by being strategic in the deployment of technology to classrooms as well as awaiting additional technology provided by the district and ordered by CHS through Title I funds.

Our math coach along with our math department has continued the work of their PLC team from SY2019 through last year and into this year. With the allowance of students to earn graduation math assessment requirements through either Algebra 1 EOC or Geometry EOC proficiency, we hope to increase student opportunities for demonstrating math proficiency. The instruction, assessment, data analysis, planning cycle used by our math PLC team has proven very effective and we will continue that solid work through this school year.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Cocoa High School receives feedback from school community stakeholders in a variety of ways, to include: BPS Annual Parent Survey, student Youth Truth survey, and the teacher Insight Survey. Additionally, as a Title I school, we send out several Parent Surveys throughout the year requesting feedback on instruction, services provided, information needed, community resource assistance, school climate, and more. Cocoa High School uses the information from the surveys to help leadership understand how we can improve and meet the needs of our stakeholders. The results of these surveys are shared with teachers during faculty meetings and there are opportunities for input from student and parent focus groups to assist with brainstorming ways to improve school culture.

Results from last year's surveys showed that one area of strength for Cocoa HS included a welcoming environment for families (BPS Parent Survey 70% of HS respondents), and that our students also felt that we had a positive school culture (3.17 in MS and 3.0 in HS on a 1-5 scale on the Youth Truth survey). Though we are pleased to know that our school climate is a positive experience for many, we also know that there is always more work to do be done to provide an all inclusive positive environment. As a leadership team, we have determined based on feedback and observation that we can do better in providing support and information to our Spanish speaking families. This is one area of improvement that we are seeking district and stakeholder assistance. We have requested assistance from the ESOL Content Specialist at the district, who has provided translation assistance once a week. One of our ESOL IAs has agreed to translate all school forms and documents that are generated in response to COVID-19 and eLearning so that our Spanish speaking families are able to understand the ever shifting challenges of instructing through a pandemic. We request translation assistance from our ESOL IAs for teacher/admin/counselor phone calls home, registration, and during Open House and Parent Conference events.

We will continue to find additional opportunities to meet with parents, families, students, and teachers to receive input in how to improve our school culture and environment for all.

In alignment with the BPS strategic plan, Goal 1, Obj 3 (Provide equitable supports in a safe learning environment for every student's social, emotional, and behavioral development.) the following will be implemented:

1. At risk students will be assigned a mentor, who will be a support staff or non-classroom teacher.
2. Students who exhibit attendance concerns will be monitored daily and receive phone calls and well-being home visits by the GSP, social workers, counselors and/or administration.

3. Title I Parent and Family Engagement events will be scheduled several times throughout the year, as well as taking advantage of the large community presence at home athletic events by providing a parent outreach table for information sharing at some events.
4. Community Food Giveaways every week, to include fresh produce as well as non-perishable items.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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