Cocoa High School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Cocoa High School

2000 TIGER TRL, Cocoa, FL 32926

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

Demographics

Principal: Catherine Stewart D

Start Date for this Principal: 6/5/2019

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)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: C (45%) 2014-15: C (52%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	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.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Cocoa High School

2000 TIGER TRL, Cocoa, FL 32926

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2018-19 Title I School**	**2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 7-12	Yes	78%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	57%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	C	C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Brevard County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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 intheir 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 and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Wilson, Rachad	Principal	
Stewart, Denise	Assistant Principal	
Primus, Steve	Other	Title I Coordinator
Nickerson, Noelle	Other	Students At Risk Coordinator
Connor, Jannette	Other	Guidance Service Professional -- Testing Coordinator
Hoffman, Tamara	Instructional Coach	Literacy Coach
Biery, Margaret	Instructional Coach	Literacy Coach
Mattson, Dennis	Instructional Coach	Science Coach
McDonald, Jolette	Instructional Coach	Math Coach
Gondek, Ashley	Teacher, K-12	AVID Coordinator
Nauman, Justin	Teacher, Career/Technical	CTE Department Lead

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	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

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
111

Date this data was collected or last updated
Tuesday 8/27/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	39%	59%	56%	40%	57%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	43%	52%	51%	40%	51%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	40%	42%	31%	42%	41%
Math Achievement	43%	48%	51%	31%	48%	49%
Math Learning Gains	51%	49%	48%	31%	43%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	45%	45%	33%	35%	39%
Science Achievement	42%	66%	68%	43%	67%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	53%	70%	73%	56%	67%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	311 (0)	258 (0)	329 (0)	281 (0)	212 (0)	208 (0)	1599 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	33 ()	29 ()	47 ()	26 ()	38 ()	27 ()	200 (0)
One or more suspensions	42 (0)	106 (0)	113 (0)	86 (0)	30 (0)	21 (0)	398 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	22 (0)	60 (0)	98 (0)	73 (0)	34 (0)	8 (0)	295 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	115 (0)	103 (0)	114 (0)	116 (0)	64 (0)	38 (0)	550 (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.

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

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%				
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 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

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
WHT	52	50	42	45	39	34	56	59	55	81	66
FRL	41	46	39	35	36	34	41	48	49	76	40

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	7	28	27	10	27	28	22	26		69	10
ELL	11	28	27	20	34	29	13	21			
BLK	24	34	27	20	26	31	21	40	50	72	30
HSP	35	36	24	29	26	25	47	45	55	76	35
MUL	41	36	32	24	30	35	42	68	45	50	
WHT	48	45	41	38	36	40	52	68	61	81	60
FRL	34	37	30	29	29	31	37	52	51	72	41

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%	
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%	

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%	

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%	

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%	

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%	

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%	

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%	

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%	

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%	

Analysis

Data Reflection

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

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

The data component with the lowest performance was our overall learning gains (38%) in ELA for our lowest 25%. Based on classroom walk through data, there was a need to have students reading more often throughout the school day for the purpose of building content knowledge, and more of an emphasis on independent reading of grade level text by every student throughout the school day. In 2018, there was an overall learning gains increase from 40% in 2017 to 47% in 2018. The drop from 2018's 47% to 2019's 38% places ELA learning gains performance back in closer alignment to previous school performance in this component, though the 2018 score is the lowest score for this component than any other year in our three year comparison.

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

The data component with the greatest decline from 2018 was the overall ELA achievement score (44% 2018 to 39% 2019). In every grade level, except 9th grade, there was a decline in ELA achievement scores. Based on classroom walk through data, students were not reading often enough throughout the school day, and were not reading grade level text independently often enough.

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 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 is significant, our own trend data showed only a 1% overall decrease in our science achievement score. A change in science course sequencing from 2018 to 2019 had a great impact on the prior knowledge of students taking Biology in 2019. The impact of lower ELA achievement scores might also have had an impact on science achievement scores.

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

The data component with the greatest improvement was our math learning gains for overall (51%), our lowest 25% (59%), and within each subgroup performance as well. The reason for this increase was due to common assessment with analysis that lead to instructional planning adjustments. Our math coach was instrumental in assisting teachers by creating the common assessments and then providing the data collected from the common assessments. This data drove the work of the PLC teams and emphasized the need for remediation, review, and reteach practices. This work was applied to both overall classroom instruction as well as individual student progress monitoring.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Cohort 2023 has seen an increase in number of students exhibiting two or more indicators (76 in 2017-2018 to 112 in 2018-2019). Academically, Cohort 2022 saw an increase in students scoring Level 1 in ELA or Math FSA (91 in 2017-2018 to 114 in 2018-2019).

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

1. Our first priority is to increase the total percent of points achieved by our SWD, ELL, and African American students to bring us into compliance with ESSA subgroup requirements of a total points minimum score of 41% through MTSS and student mentoring of the individual students in these subgroups.

2. Our second priority is to increase the amount of access to independent reading of grade level text for every student specific to the purpose of building of content knowledge in every class so that our overall FSA ELA achievement scores can be raised 5%.

3. Our third priority is to increase overall student science proficiency scores 5% through common assessment and common lesson planning practices.

4. Our fourth priority is to increase our 7th grade Civics and 11th grade US History scores 5% through targeted remediation and specific content literacy Skills Days review sessions.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	ELA Learning Gains and Achievement Scores Increase 3% - 5%
Rationale	CHS ELA proficiency is at 39% average for all grades tested and is 12% lower than the state average and has been trending up over the last three years.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	For SY2019-2020, CHS has a goal of increasing ELA proficiency 5%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Steve Primus (primus.steve@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	For the past two years CHS's ELA department has worked with TNTP, part of the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, on the importance of using complex grade level text and various strategies to support comprehension. According to their research in The Opportunity Myth, "When students who started the year behind grade level had access to stronger instruction, for example, they closed gaps with their peers by six months; in classrooms with more grade-appropriate assignments, those gaps closed by more than seven months" (2018). As an entire school we have received professional development across all content areas highlighting the research of TNTP, with a focus on increasing student exposure to grade appropriate complex text and implementing text-dependent questioning. The implementation of and professional development opportunities for AVID and Kagan Structures are being infused in lessons to aid in the comprehension of complex text.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	According to research by John Hattie on Visible Learning, and research by Spencer Kagan on the effects of collaborative structures, implementing Hattie's instructional strategies such as classroom discussion (Kagan's Round Robin, Rally Robin), the Jigsaw method (Kagan's Numbered Heads Together, Traveling Heads Together), and Reciprocal Teaching (Kagan's Rally Coach) have effect sizes of 0.82, 1.20, and 0.74 respectively. This year, teachers are continuing to work in PLCs with a focus on literacy and developing lessons to meet the needs of all learners. Content area teachers will have planning days once per quarter to analyze literacy data and plan lessons using AVID strategies and Kagan Structures with grade level complex text.

Action Step	
Description	1. Provide all teachers current students' FSA literacy data, along with updates on current progress monitoring data as it becomes available. Also, Identifying and sharing with teachers, those students in the bottom quartile . 2. Provide school wide Literacy Coach support on literacy based goals. 3. Using the data from FSA analysis, implement quarterly planning days with ELA/ILA teachers to include data analysis and collaborative planning of lessons utilizing grade appropriate complex text and researched strategies from AVID and Kagan. 4.Identify highest need classes and, with literacy coach support, increase small group work with targeted instruction based on student need to include Kagan, AVID, and PBIS initiatives. Literacy coaches will also meet with the bottom quartile of students to conduct data chats and gain a better understanding of individual learning needs. 5. Provide school wide professional development on differentiated instruction, scaffolding,

vocabulary support, and the use of AVID Strategies and Kagan Structures. Monitored by administrative walkthroughs to include specific feedback.

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

#2	
Title	Science Achievement Scores Increase 3% - 5%
Rationale	During the 2018-19 school year, 31% of CHS 8th grade science students scored a Level 3 or above. This was 17% lower than the state average of 48%, as well as 22% lower than the district average. Simultaneously, 46% of students taking the Biology EOC scored a Level 3 or above in 2018-19. This was 21% below both the state and district averages.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	For SY2019-2020, the Cocoa High School science department has a goal of increasing SSA/EOC scores 5%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Denise Stewart (stewart.catherine@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Based on high-quality research findings, the science department will focus on creating a professional learning community that continually monitors student progress throughout the year using a variety of methods.These will include, but will not be limited to, the usage of common formative and summative assessments, shared bellwork and instructional practices that strengthen the reading ability of all students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	When looking at Visible Learning research, "collective teacher efficacy" continually has one of the highest effect sizes on student gains (1.39 - 1.57). Through a departmental belief that as a team our efforts can positively influence student learning, continued collaboration will occur throughout the year to build strong lessons, monitor their success, and help drive re-teaching, as needed. This approach is also one supported by Rick and Becky DuFour, pioneers in the development of Professional Learning Communities in schools.

Action Step	
Description	1. Full implementation of PLCs (Professional Learning Communities) department wide. 2. Provide support to teachers using an Academic Science Coach. 3. Common formative and summative assessments will be used to monitor student progress. The addition of Science Skills Days will provide the instructional response based on assessment data. 4. Standard based bellwork will be used daily to help review, strengthen and identify areas of instructional need. 5. Instructional focus in every science class will include strategies to strengthen reading practices.
Person Responsible	Dennis Mattson (mattson.dennis@brevardschools.org)

#3	
Title	Social Studies Achievement Scores Increase 3% - 5%
Rationale	From 2018 (49%) to 2019 (61%), CHS had a 12% increase in US History achievement scores, and a 3% decrease (48% to 45%) in 7th grade Civics achievement scores. In comparison to the 2019 district average scores, Civics is 29% below district average and US History is 10% below district average.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	For SY 2019-2020, the Cocoa High School social studies department has a goal of increasing Civics and US History scores 5% each from last year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Denise Stewart (stewart.catherine@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	The social studies EOC course teams will be implementing common assessments, common instructional pacing of course standards related to the items specifications of previous EOC tests, and Skills Day review sessions, which are based on literacy in social studies skills. According to John Hattie and Visible Learning research, when teachers work together towards a common goal with fidelity, there is a greater impact on student achievement than when they work in isolation of one another (Collective Efficacy, 1.57 effect size).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	US History and Civics teachers are working with District Resource Teacher Kimberly Garton to implement a Skills Day Review schedule throughout the school year. Additionally, the teachers are working in PLC teams to do common lesson planning using district pacing guides and resources, as well as to implement common assessments throughout the year. We started this work in SY 2018-2019 and saw a 3% gain in overall SS EOC scores. We are using our experiences from last year to inform our work this school year. We also know that the same work was done by other secondary schools in our district under the leadership of Kimberly Garton and those schools ultimately saw a significant increase in EOC test scores when implemented with fidelity.

Action Step	
Description	1. Meet in the start of the school year to set pacing expectations, review district materials, and schedule Skills Days with Kimberly Garton. 2. Implement standards-based instruction using district resources and other teacher created standards-aligned lesson tasks. 3. Implement common assessments tied to EOC prep, then analyze data to inform Skills Days Review sessions. 4. Stop a minimum of once each quarter to review EOC course content and work on test taking strategies related to literacy skills during Skills Day Review sessions. 5. Just prior to EOC test date, hold one final Skills Day Review session over several days to prepare students to take the exam.
Person Responsible	Denise Stewart (stewart.catherine@brevardschools.org)

#4	
Title	ESSA SWD, ELL, & AA Subgroup Total Points Increase to 41%
Rationale	Our ESSA subgroup data for our SWD (33%), ELL (34%), and AA (40%) students each fall below the minimum Federal Index total percent of points of 41%. Per ESSA, we must increase each subgroup to meet the minimum overall Federal Index Percent of Points within a three year window, with this school year being year 1.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Our Federal Index Total Percent of Points for each subgroup will increase in SY 2019-2020 as follows: AA 40% to 45%, SWD 33% to 38%, ELL 34% to 39%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Denise Stewart (stewart.catherine@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	We are focusing on the research by Carol Tomlinson on Differentiated Instruction to provide our teachers with the proper support to raise student achievement for students in these subgroups.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Differentiated Instruction requires teachers to know each student in terms of academic skill level, student interests, and social-emotional concerns. Using this information, teachers adjust instruction and assessment to meet the unique needs of every learner in the classroom. By differentiating the learning experience through content, process, and/or product, we have the opportunity to help students increase their learning gains towards state assessment proficiency.
Action Step	
Description	1. Provide support and training to teachers related to SWD and ELL students through professional development specific to ESE and ELL accommodations as well as Differentiated Instruction. 3. Conduct administrative learning walks for the purpose of determining how well and to what extent teachers are differentiating instruction to meet the needs of every student. Provide ongoing feedback and training to teachers throughout the year as needed.
Person Responsible	Denise Stewart (stewart.catherine@brevardschools.org)

#5	
Title	Mathematics Achievement Scores Increase 3% - 5%
Rationale	CHS Math proficiency is at 43% for all reporting categories: Grade 7, Grade 8, Algebra, and Geometry FSA/EOC. Math achievement scores are 5% points lower than the District average and 3% points lower than the state average.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	For SY2019-2020, the Cocoa High School mathematics department has a goal of increasing FSA/EOC scores 5%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Denise Stewart (stewart.catherine@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	The math department will focus on utilizing our Professional Learning Community's to monitor student growth and mastery of targeted standards-based weekly assessments. Cocoa High will also use data from MAP growth progress monitoring which has been implemented this school year.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Professional Learning Communities have a shared purpose, clear vision, values, and goals that are all focused on student learning. There is a collaborative culture with a focus on learning. DuFour et al. (2008) MAP growth through NWEA is a research-based, not-for-profit organization that supports students and educators worldwide by creating assessment solutions that precisely measure growth and proficiency—and provide insights to help tailor instruction. (Illustrations © 2017 Adam Simpson and Heart)

Action Step	
Description	1. Full implementation of PLCs (Professional Learning Communities) department wide. 2. Provide support to teachers using an Academic Math Coach. 3. Common standards-based weekly formative assessments. 4. Standard based bell work will be used daily to help review, strengthen and identify areas of instructional need. 5. Instructional focus in every math class will include strategies to strengthen reading practices. 6. MAP Growth progress monitoring that will be conducted three times during the school year.
Person Responsible	Jolette McDonald (mcdonald.jolette@brevardschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

1. Increase WICOR strategies used in every classroom as evidenced with WICOR Tracker and data collected by Ashley Gondek, AVID Coordinator and Denise Stewart, AVID Administrator.
2. Achieve AVID certification status this year through improvements in our school guidance department systems and procedures as related to student scheduling in CCR courses as evidenced by the number of students enrolled in CCR courses and tracked by cohort administrators.

3. By working with district CTE resource teachers, increase the number of industry certifications earned by our CTE students as evidenced by certification exam pass rates tracked by our CTE department chair Justin Nauman.

4. Implement Kagan strategies to increase student engagement of every student as evidenced by walk through observational tools and data collected by administration.

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

Parent involvement events include but are not limited to math night, literacy night, and social studies night hosted by each academic department. In addition, we host financial aid night, scholarship night, movie night, and game night. Snacks and take home resources related to academic courses, the college application process, scholarship writing, and how to pay for college are provided at all events. These resources are used to help the families and may be in the form of handouts and/ or books highlighting important information from the event.

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

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

The school addresses student's social-emotional needs by working closely with the student's cohort administrator, guidance counselors, social workers, teachers, parents and anyone involved with the student to create a plan of action to support the whole child (social-emotional and academics). This plan is reviewed on a regular schedule appropriate to the issues each child faces to ensure that they are being supported and the plan is adjusted as necessary. Our school social workers with our students on issues such as home/ family concerns, mental health counseling, peer relationships, peer mediation, and many other social-emotional concerns. We also use Instructional Assistants in our classrooms to help provide additional support to these students in the hope of helping them make better decisions.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

Incoming 9th and 7th graders and their families are all invited to an informational night in Spring of the year prior to entering those grades. We also host a senior night to share important information regarding graduation and meeting academic requirements to be able to graduate on time. Each cohort has an administrator assigned to monitor behavior, academics, and social emotional needs. This cohort admin works in close conjunction with the grade-level counselor and social workers to ensure students are supported during the year and through transitional periods.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

The principal meets with his administrative team and leadership team to analyze school grade data at the beginning of July. Using the data analysis, evidence from classroom walks, and survey data from parents and teachers, the administrative team determines what course of action must be taken the next school year to help support teachers in moving student achievement forward. All requests for funding are evaluated based on the school improvement goals that evolve from the admin team meetings prior to the start of pre-planning. The people involved in these conversations are Principal Rachad Wilson, Assistant Principal John Johnson, Assistant Principal Kim Stockton, Assistant Principal C. Denise Stewart, Assistant Principal Dr. Thomas Johnson, Assistant Principal Ivor Mitchell, Title I Coordinator Dr. Steve Primus, Instructional Coaches, and bookkeeper Tiffany Morgan. Administrative meetings occur weekly on Fridays.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

This year, CHS will be opening a College and Career Center in the media center. This center will be staffed by both Instructional Assistants and students Teacher Assistants and will serve the purpose of providing a place for students to get more information about college and career. The center will also have the support of our AVID team, lead by AVID coordinator Ashley Gondek. The AVID program emphasizes college and career readiness and encourages students as young as 7th grade to learn the college application process. We also work with several colleges, community programs, local businesses and mentors who come to our school to speak to our students about post-secondary options.