Cocoa Beach Junior/Senior High School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Cocoa Beach Junior/Senior High School

1500 MINUTEMEN CSWY, Cocoa Beach, FL 32931

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

Demographics

Principal: Timothy Powers G

Start Date for this Principal: 6/3/2019

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	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	31%
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* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (67%) 2017-18: A (68%) 2016-17: A (64%) 2015-16: A (65%) 2014-15: A (74%)
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	N/A
* 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 Beach Junior/Senior High School

1500 MINUTEMEN CSWY, Cocoa Beach, FL 32931

http://www.cbhs.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	No	27%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	25%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our mission for Cocoa Beach Jr/Sr High School is to foster learning in all students by recognizing and addressing their individual strengths, needs, learning styles, cultures and goals. With respect and care, we will guide them to become independent, responsible, productive citizens in our changing and complex global society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our Vision:
1. Learning is the heart of our school.
2. All students can learn when they are actively engaged in a challenging learning environment with a variety of
instructional approaches.
3. All students are unique persons with various proficiencies, learning styles, and needs.
4. Students should be guided with care, compassion, and respect for their diverse learning styles by utilizing a variety of curriculum and instructional practices.
5. The school atmosphere should foster mutual respect, responsibility, tolerance, and independent thinking.
6. The continued success of our school's mission involves all stakeholders: students, parents, teachers, administrators, and community members.
7. The commitment to ongoing school improvement is vital to the success of our mission.

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
Rendell, Mark	Principal	
Rhyne, Kevin	Assistant Principal	
Johnson, Christina	Instructional Coach	
Link, Stephen	Assistant Principal	
Galanopoulos, MaryEllen	Dean	

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	162	175	149	189	164	166	1005
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	28	38	48	43	37	209
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	5	5	2	19
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	56	45	76	14	200
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	14	30	36	34	16	150

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	24	37	57	59	62	39	278

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	0	1	2	1	2	2	1	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	2

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
64

Date this data was collected or last updated
Wednesday 9/11/2019

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	26	11	17	11	19	20	104
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	11	11	8	7	49
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	31	32	32	28	5	141
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	5	12	12	37

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	6	9	18	14	29	19	95

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	75%	59%	56%	73%	57%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	66%	52%	51%	60%	51%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	40%	42%	41%	42%	41%
Math Achievement	67%	48%	51%	62%	48%	49%
Math Learning Gains	54%	49%	48%	50%	43%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	45%	45%	31%	35%	39%
Science Achievement	75%	66%	68%	75%	67%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	87%	70%	73%	82%	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	162 (0)	175 (0)	149 (0)	189 (0)	164 (0)	166 (0)	1005 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	15 ()	28 ()	38 ()	48 ()	43 ()	37 ()	209 (0)
One or more suspensions	2 (0)	3 (0)	2 (0)	5 (0)	5 (0)	2 (0)	19 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	2 (0)	7 (0)	56 (0)	45 (0)	76 (0)	14 (0)	200 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	20 (0)	14 (0)	30 (0)	36 (0)	34 (0)	16 (0)	150 (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	76%	58%	18%	52%	24%
	2018	67%	56%	11%	51%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	73%	63%	10%	56%	17%
	2018	73%	65%	8%	58%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
09	2019	73%	62%	11%	55%	18%
	2018	70%	60%	10%	53%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2019	73%	59%	14%	53%	20%
	2018	78%	61%	17%	53%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2019	63%	62%	1%	54%	9%
	2018	24%	62%	-38%	54%	-30%
Same Grade Comparison		39%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	75%	43%	32%	46%	29%
	2018	63%	41%	22%	45%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		51%				

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	65%	53%	12%	48%	17%
	2018	65%	55%	10%	50%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC

Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	81%	66%	15%	67%	14%
2018	68%	67%	1%	65%	3%
Compare		13%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	85%	74%	11%	71%	14%
2018	72%	73%	-1%	71%	1%
Compare		13%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	85%	71%	14%	70%	15%
2018	89%	70%	19%	68%	21%
Compare		-4%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	60%	61%	-1%	61%	-1%
2018	80%	62%	18%	62%	18%
Compare		-20%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	62%	60%	2%	57%	5%
2018	67%	60%	7%	56%	11%
Compare		-5%			

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	39	52	49	33	42	52	45	55	25	95	11
ELL	33	47	50	28	50	40					
ASN	91	90		75	67		67	92			
HSP	66	59	57	46	46	46	65	69	67	89	59
MUL	61	53	36	57	50		54	91		100	45
WHT	77	67	55	73	56	48	80	89	73	90	45
FRL	56	60	44	51	45	36	60	79	69	84	31
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	35	52	40	30	44	44	35	55		100	8
ELL	30	40		20	36						
ASN	87	74		89	81		85	90			
HSP	58	62	45	64	53	40	53	81	80	100	58
MUL	68	54	50	68	39		67	76			

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	75	60	45	67	60	52	73	82	76	93	64
FRL	54	52	44	47	48	38	49	64	62	90	41
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	23	33	29	29	34	20	44	52		79	16
ELL		67	60		45						
ASN	85	71		83	67		81	90			
HSP	64	50	36	59	48	50	56	92	79	82	56
MUL	68	61		60	49	46	61	85		90	
WHT	75	62	45	62	50	28	79	81	81	89	53
FRL	53	42	34	43	35	24	54	70	63	77	23

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	50
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	786
Total Components for the Federal Index	12
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	45
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	43
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	80
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	61
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	61
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	68
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	56
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.

Both of our lowest quartile learning gain components were our lowest performing indicators. There was a concerted effort last year to introduce high yield strategies to improve learning gains and we did in fact see an increase in this component however it is still our lowest performing. Another indicator that saw low performance was College and Career Readiness. While this is data that is a year behind the other data it is still a component we saw

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

The area that saw the greatest decline was Algebra 1. In this area we saw a drop of 20 percent. We believe the contributing factor to this drop is student placement. There was a move to place all 7th grade MYP students into pre-algebra a couple of years ago. This had the effect of causing a large number of 8th graders, who were not prepared for the acceleration to be forced to take Algebra 1 in 8th grade regardless of their of skill acquisition from pre-alg. This cause Cocoa Beach to see a sharp decline in this indicator.

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.

The component that showed the largest gap was 8th grade math. In this area we saw a 30 percent increase over last year. Again, the factors that can explain this all revolve around placement issues. Here, students that were in 7th grade math advanced took the 8th grade test. Those students are generally strong students who do not attempt Algebra 1. Those students, in the right class, taking the proper test, could have shown a larger increase in the Algebra 1 numbers rather than a decline.

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

The component that showed the greatest improvement was ELA proficiency and ELA learning gains. Actions taken to affect this change include a 2 year focus on ELA standards across the curriculum and a dedicated professional development plan that supported teachers growth in this area. Further, a focus on high effect size strategies identified the need to have all teacher engage students in data chats and push and encourage selected students to perform, or out perform, their previous years scores. A focus on students who were close to making a learning goal helped concentrate that effort.

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

Two areas of concern for Cocoa Beach is Attendance Rate and ELA and Math course failures. These two areas have traditionally been our areas of concern. It is also notable that only about 25 percent of those students who fall into the attendance rate indicator also show up in the course failure indicator. So while the two in combination might be contributing to each other, this data point would indicate something else is a factor.

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

1. Continuing the efforts made in cross curriculum ELA focus.
2. A deliberate focus on proper student placement.
3. A focused approach to ESE and ELL supports.
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	ELA Proficiency
Rationale	For the last two years, Cocoa Beach has been working to increase the use and focus of literacy standards across the curriculum. In 18/19 Cocoa Beach saw some significant increases in ELA however, we did see a drop in 10th grade ELA scores indicating continued focus in this area is still a need.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Cocoa Beach is not only looking to return to the previous year's proficiency rate of 78 percent for 10th grade ELA but is also expecting to see growth. Looking at other grade-level growth, Cocoa Beach is looking to show an additional 3 percent growth in 10th-grade scores. Because of this Cocoa Beach has a goal of seeing improvement from 73 percent to at least 80 percent. We also expect to see continued growth in our learning gains and bottom quartile because of this continued focus.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kevin Rhyne (rhyne.kevin@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	School-wide focus on ELA standards in each content area, specifically 10th-grade MESH courses. The use of curriculum teaming to discuss best practices and high yield instructional strategies. Focus on non-fiction reading in the content areas. Focus on data chats to increase student-teacher communication and to develop strategies for improvement and growth.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Over the course of the last two years, Cocoa Beach has been working to implement these strategies and has seen improvements in our ELA proficiency and learning gain components. We also have buy-in from our teachers that this focus on ELA standards works and has proven to be a high impact focus for us. Our greatest validation was the increase in ELA scores specifically in the learning gain category.
Action Step	
Description	1. Spend the summer and pre-planning diving into the data and combing through scores to find the best use of our resources 2. Share with all stakeholders the data that we collect and use that data to paint a picture of our future goals and direction. 3. Spend pre-planning working with departments to find things that work and things that didn't work in last year's implementation and work to develop a new plan based on current needs. 4. Develop a PD schedule along with our reading coach that will address further our growth in content area literacy. 5. Utilize an academic PLC model of both content area and grade level meetings to discuss high yield strategies and vertical and horizontal alignment of literacy standards in all classrooms. 6. Use ASP and PSR funds to extend the media center day.
Person Responsible	Kevin Rhyne (rhyne.kevin@brevardschools.org)

#2	
Title	Low performing sub groups
Rationale	According to our subgroup data we have two critical needs areas that need additional attention. This year Cocoa Beach does not have any monitored ESSA subgroups, however, last year we did and we are dangerously close to the 41 percent threshold in both ELL and ESE students. Because of this we are adding an additional focus on these groups. Specifically Math and English proficiency are our lowest components with learning gains not as bad.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Because of our detailed focus and approach to interventions with our subgroups we are expecting to see an additional 5 percent increase in ELA performance in the first year, with a quick balancing of scores with other subgroups in the following year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kevin Rhyne (rhyne.kevin@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	We are going to better utilize our MTSS system to bring a detailed focus and approach to interventions for our subgroups. We plan on deeply analyzing our ELL and ESE students across the school and see what tier two and tier three interventions we can provide. We also took a very deliberate approach to course placement this year during the summer to make sure hadn't inadvertently created any obstacles that would inadvertently stifle our subgroups.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	in order to fully understand the nature of the lower performance a deep dive is required. A thorough examination of course selection and placement and interventions will give us a better picture of what we need to do to enhance performance.

Action Step	
Description	1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

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).

PBIS

Our Positive Behavior and Intervention System (PBIS) for the last several years has focused on a token economy (Sand Dollars) to recognize individual student positive behaviors. This has not proven to be an effective way to improve the overall school climate and culture of the campus. There was not an

identified and well defined set of student expectations, behavior or academic, for the campus.

Our first step is to establish a school-wide set of expectations for behavior and conduct. We will launch a school-wide student competition to define "Beach Pride." This will enable us, with student voice, to identify a common set of expectations (behavior and academic) for students on our campus. Once defined we will honor students who exemplify these characteristics as "Student of the Month." Each teacher will select an individual student each month. These students will receive recognition, as well as prizes. With this protocol we will be able to emphasize, recognize, and reward the desired behaviors We will honor roughly 50 students per month, reaching almost half of our student population by the end of the school year.

The second step involves a competition between classrooms. We will choose a "Class of the Quarter" based on a set of measurable criteria. The class GPA, attendance rate, tardy rate, discipline referral rate, and participation in charitable activities (such as food drives), will alba factored together to select a wining class each quarter (grading period). The winning class will receive recognition and prizes. This protocol will also enable us to emphasize, recognize, and reward the desired behaviors, on a collective basis.

The prizes in each of these protocols will be purchased with funds generated through general donations to the school form area businesses and organizations.