

Brevard Public Schools

# Cocoa Beach Junior/Senior High School



## 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# 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

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	High School 7-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	31%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (67%) 2017-18: A (68%) 2016-17: A (64%) 2015-16: A (65%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	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](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.

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

## 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)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 7-12	No	33%
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	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Rendell, Mark	Principal	Responsible for the overall operation of a Junior-Senior High School with 975 students, 55 instructional faculty, and approximately 50 other staff members. Oversee all areas of operation, including curriculum and instruction, facilities, and staff and student safety. Sets the instructional priorities of the school and monitors progress toward completion. Point person for community relations and all stakeholder relations. Oversight of all employee performance evaluations and hiring decisions.
Rhyne, Kevin	Assistant Principal	Responsible for oversight of Curriculum & Instruction, Guidance Services, and assigned employee performance evaluations. Supports the Academic Priorities by driving curriculum decisions, builds the Master Schedule, and coordinates all support services for students.
Link, Stephen	Assistant Principal	Responsible for oversight of Operations, the Physical Plant, and assigned employee performance evaluations. Manages the facility needs for the entire campus, all property inventory, and building level security needs. Serves as the liaison with outside agencies for facilities use and partner opportunities.
Galanopoulos, MaryEllen	Dean	Responsible for the administration of Student Discipline policies, matters of Safety and Security, and assigned employee performance evaluations.

## Demographic Information

### Principal start date

Monday 6/3/2019, Timothy Powers G

**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.*

3

**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.*

8

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

56

### Demographic Data

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	High School 7-12



<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	31%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (67%) 2017-18: A (68%) 2016-17: A (64%) 2015-16: A (65%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## 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	163	175	179	150	169	131	967	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	21	22	23	21	20	124	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	18	7	18	7	68	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	4	3	10	13	39	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	7	13	23	4	55	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	10	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	11	5	22	
	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	13	41	39	35	54	44	226

#### 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	5	2	11	12	3	33	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	

#### 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	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	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

**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	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	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

**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	
	(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	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			
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%	0
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%	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
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	61
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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	68
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	56
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.

Because of COVID and the lack of testing for 2020 our data did not change. For 2019 both of our lowest quartile learning gain components were our lowest-performing indicators. There was a concerted effort in 2018 SY 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. We have seen improvement in this indicator over this last year showing significant improvements in students testing and passing industry certification tests we are working to continue this growth.

#### 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 in 2019 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 skill acquisition from pre-alg. This caused 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 in 2019 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 outperform, 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?**

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.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	For the last two years, Cocoa Beach has been working to increase the use and focus of literacy standards across the curriculum. In 17/18-18/19 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. We also believe that because of our move to virtual learning all students are in need of additional supports in ELA. We also believe that because of this move to virtual learning our subgroup performance and students with other EWI might be at a disadvantage and need additional supports to be successful.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	Cocoa Beach is not only looking to return to the previous proficiency rate of 78 percent for 10th grade ELA but is also expecting to see growth. Our previous goal was to see a nearly eight percent increase. However, taking into consideration the changes to the learning environment we are adjusting our goals. Cocoa Beach for the 2021 SY has a goal of seeing improvement from 73 percent to at least 78 percent. We also expect to see continued growth in our learning gains and bottom quartile because of this continued focus. We also want to see increases in individual subgroup proficiency, not just growth.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Kevin Rhyne (rhyne.kevin@brevardschools.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	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 and evidence based writing. Focus on data chats to increase student-teacher communication and to develop strategies for improvement and growth. We also plan to continue our CMA10 groups where we combine data chats with one on one coaching to help those students who are close to making a learning gain but might need additional support and one on one mentoring
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	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. Specifically the use of data chats and one on one relationships has proven to be successful for us as evidenced as a high yield strategy by Hattie. Our CMA10 students our performed their cohort in every category proving and validating our approach.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Share with all stakeholders the data that we have collected and use that data to paint a picture of our future goals and direction.
2. Spend pre-planning working with departments to find things that work and things that didn't work in previous year's implementation and work to develop a redesigned or more finely tuned plan.
3. Utilize previously identified PD to remind/reinforce/support teachers in this strategy.
4. 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.
5. Utilize ASP and PSR funds to support remediation and tutoring time. Provide teachers and counselors additional opportunities to reach out to students who are identified as slipping.
6. Provide additional opportunities to get test help and prep after school and on weekends and offer similar opportunities to eLearners.

**Person Responsible** Kevin Rhyne (rhyne.kevin@brevardschools.org)

## Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Over the course of the last few years CBHS has worked to improve its overall math scores. It has been identified that improper placement of students starting in the 7th grade had resulted in the declining test scores for Algebra 1. We also identified that because of these improper placements students were failing future math courses at a higher rate simply due to placement and perceived need for acceleration in the IB Program. CBHS does not believe it has an issue within its math instruction or the level of proficiency of its students but rather low performing scores because students were not placed in courses that would lead them to success.

CBHS believes a more data-based approach to course placement is what is best for students. Further, by identifying and promoting an alternative math pathway for IB students more students will be able to find success within the program. The previous practice created an environment where only the top math students could be successful, while many students struggled.

Further, data provided to CBHS by the district identifies that students that are accurately placed and positively encouraged to perform score better on state tests. Additionally, students who do complete Algebra 1 in Middle School are more likely to accelerate in math later in high school. To address these issues, the APC will bring the math department together to discuss math course offerings and course sequences. We will investigate the courses we offer, when we offering them, and look at the requirement used to select the course recommendation for the next level course. Math Department will discuss specific promotion criteria for all levels of math courses, but specifically, the IB Math Course Sequence. We will also look at better defining an alternative path for students who are not as math savvy.

We will use the district placement tool to make better placement decisions, spend more time talking with parents about the course sequence in the middle school years, and better prepare students and parents for Algebra 1.

## 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.

Our overall culture and climate numbers are strong. For example, on our Parent Climate Survey 90% of our families state that they “feel welcome at our school.” Parents also indicated a strong sense of satisfaction with safety and security protocols in place at the school. This was reflected in the comment section of the survey with numerous positive statements from parents about the enhanced safety measures. Our student’s also indicate a strong feeling of physical and emotional and safety. On the Youth Truth Survey administered last school year 65% of the students believed that “Most students at this school are friendly to me.” Which is

well above the county and national average. Also, 64% indicated they “felt safe from harm in our school” and 70% felt “safe from harm while in classes.” All of these ratings were also well above the county and national averages.

However, both of the surveys indicated also revealed an area of weakness.

On the Youth Truth Survey, 84% of our students indicated that they “want to go to college,” which was right on target with the county average and above the national average. However, the same students stated that we had failed to help them understand the steps needed to prepare for college. Only 28% of our students stated that “My school has helped me understand the steps I need to take in order to apply for college.” This is well below the county and national average.

This same need was also reflected on the on the Parent Climate Survey. The top three responses for additional information from parents were: SAT/ACT prep, planning for college and career, and financial aid. So both our students, and parents, indicated a weakness in college preparation activities.

We began attacking this area of weakness last school year. Working with representatives from Eastern Florida State College (EFSC), Florida Bright Futures, and officials from the district office, we held two parent academy type workshops, called “Counselor Connect.” The topics included: the college application process, college entrance tests, financial aid, and also a session on resume writing. The workshops were well attended (between 50 -75 families each night). Our efforts paid off. Our Guidance Department received recognition for the largest increase in percent of completed FAFSA applications. Our completed FAFSA applications rose 14% while the county average increase for all other schools was only 1%. We also had the highest number of graduates with a Gold Seal of Biliteracy, and the highest increase in Academic Scholar Designations.

We have already repeated this process this year. We have held two Counselor Connect workshops - virtually through Zoom. EFSC and other local agencies were involved again this year. Attendance at both of these was over 100 families. We believe that our students, and parents are more prepared for the college application process than ever before, but we will continue to work in this area.

#### **Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link**

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