

Brevard Public Schools

Cocoa Beach Junior/Senior High School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	22
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Cocoa Beach Junior/Senior High School

1500 MINUTEMEN CSWY, Cocoa Beach, FL 32931

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Every student, every day.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Equipping students with skills to navigate the future.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Powers, Timothy	Principal	As principal, Mr. Powers leads all school initiatives. Mr. Powers directly supervises the electives, ESE, CTE departments.
Zeiler, Mark	Assistant Principal	As our assistant principal of curriculum, Dr. Zeiler is leading the way to keep faculty informed of new instructional approaches and how we will achieve the best results. He is instrumental in our MTSS process and course placements. Dr. Zeiler directly supervises the English and foreign language departments.
Mannes, Cole	Assistant Principal	As our assistant principal of operations, Mr. Mannes leads all safety initiatives. He is also instrumental in our MTSS process and directly supervises the math and history departments.
Gahres, Cathy	Assistant Principal	As our assistant principal of discipline, Mrs. Gahres works directly with students to receive input that will affect the school's decision-making process. Mrs. Gahres directly supervises the science, the arts, and PE departments.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

We dedicated eight hours of our preplanning professional development time to involve our faculty in the SIP analysis and creation. We had data pulled and ready for them to disaggregate and discuss while we fleshed out our needs and potential action plans together as a team.

Part of the data we pulled and analyzed included the parent survey, the Youth Truth survey, and our

Insight survey. This allowed us to gain valuable perspective from our parents, students, and faculty. Our School Advisory Council also provides involvement on pertinent issues facing our school.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Through teacher interviews, our staff has overwhelmingly voiced the desire to involve more data in all school decisions and initiatives. We will add data analysis to our monthly department meetings, and CMA teams will hold each other accountable for collegial discussions. Administration will attend department meetings to offer support to the department heads during these meetings. Administration will also conduct classroom walkthroughs to ensure school initiatives are being followed.

Our two overarching action plans include monitoring and advancing our students with disabilities and to improve school culture. While the admin team will shoulder the burden on these initiatives, teachers will also assist in discussing data, devising plans to move students forward, and communicating their needs. In addition, we will continue making student, teacher, and parent survey data a priority. We will meet as an administrative team to disaggregate that data as it comes in.

In order to accurately monitor our SWD population's progress, we will track and use progress monitoring results in English and math. This data will be pulled by our curriculum assistant principal and analyzed discuss in both admin meetings and department meetings.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	24%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	31%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)

School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A
	2019-20: A
	2018-19: A
	2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	17	30	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	22	31	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	7	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	8	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	10	18	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	13	31	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	17	22	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	18	24

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	5

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	23	91	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	10	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	53	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	65	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	24	92	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	37	120	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	22	94	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	63

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	57
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	34

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	23	31	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	7	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	9	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	24	52	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	37	39	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	22	36	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	11

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	8

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review**ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	61	43	50	68	52	51	66		
ELA Learning Gains				54			46		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				45			31		
Math Achievement*	63	34	38	60	40	38	65		
Math Learning Gains				53			37		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				45			46		
Science Achievement*	69	59	64	67	37	40	70		
Social Studies Achievement*	68	63	66	69	44	48	70		
Middle School Acceleration	66			73	43	44	77		
Graduation Rate	92	87	89	91	63	61	93		
College and Career Acceleration	82	72	65	69	66	67	66		
ELP Progress		57	45	82			73		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	72
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	501
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	92

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	776
Total Components for the Federal Index	12
Percent Tested	96
Graduation Rate	91

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	51			
ELL	36	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	70			
BLK	48			
HSP	69			
MUL	68			
PAC				
WHT	72			

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	60			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	39	Yes	1	
ELL	49			
AMI				
ASN	74			
BLK	53			
HSP	61			
MUL	57			
PAC				
WHT	64			
FRL	53			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	61			63			69	68	66	92	82	
SWD	33			31			36	45		70	6	
ELL	27			45							2	
AMI												
ASN	70										1	
BLK	50			38			57				3	
HSP	53			53			55	63	64	96	7	
MUL	67			64			67	78	64		5	

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	62			65			71	69	65	78	7	
FRL	56			51			56	61	45	64	7	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	68	54	45	60	53	45	67	69	73	91	69	82
SWD	34	32	32	27	40	38	29	43	45	90	21	
ELL	50	50		39	38			36				82
AMI												
ASN	86	62										
BLK	47	50		60	46			60				
HSP	63	63	52	48	53	50	53	60	69	90	67	
MUL	66	50	45	65	61		42	63	64			
PAC												
WHT	69	53	42	62	52	47	72	70	73	92	69	
FRL	55	46	38	50	48	45	60	55	46	81	54	

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	66	46	31	65	37	46	70	70	77	93	66	73
SWD	24	14	13	28	32	36	41	52	36			
ELL	60	71		67	59							73
AMI												
ASN	60	75								100	71	
BLK	50	25		62	30							
HSP	66	60	47	51	43	53	68	67	73	89	50	
MUL	63	37		77	43		72	72	91	82		
PAC												
WHT	67	44	29	67	36	41	70	72	77	93	68	
FRL	58	38	27	57	38	40	62	58	66	77	50	

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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
10	2023 - Spring	69%	54%	15%	50%	19%
07	2023 - Spring	61%	53%	8%	47%	14%
08	2023 - Spring	63%	52%	11%	47%	16%
09	2023 - Spring	71%	56%	15%	48%	23%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	75%	58%	17%	48%	27%
08	2023 - Spring	52%	38%	14%	55%	-3%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	57%	48%	9%	44%	13%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	73%	51%	22%	50%	23%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	56%	50%	6%	48%	8%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	80%	61%	19%	63%	17%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	65%	69%	-4%	66%	-1%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	71%	62%	9%	63%	8%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

Historical Cocoa Beach Jr/Sr High School assessment data indicates that students with disabilities have achieved much lower levels of achievement compared to their General Education peers. For example, in 2021-2022, students with disabilities scored substantially lower in all state-tested content subject areas including: 34% lower proficiency in ELA, 33% lower proficiency in math, 38% lower proficiency in science, and 26% lower proficiency in social studies. This trend has shown no signs of improvement in comparison to 2020-2021 and 2018-2019 data in the same areas.

In reviewing results of the most recent statewide & progress monitoring assessment data, the lowest performance and most troubling data points continue to revolve around our students with disabilities population. In 2022-2023, students with disabilities achieved academic proficiency (Level 3 or higher) rates of just 44% (ELA/reading), 45% (Algebra 1 EOC), and 53% (Math/FAST). Statistically speaking, this means that more than 1 out of every 2 students with disabilities FAIL to achieve academic proficiency in these subject areas.

Another concern in reviewing data related to our students with disabilities population is found in what appears to be an alarming lack of access to or advocacy for College & Career-related opportunities at school. In 2018-2019, only 11% of SWD earned College & Career Acceleration points. While this statistic was unavailable in 2020-2021 due to COVID, 21% of SWD earned College & Career Acceleration points, which is nearly three and a half times LESS than their General Education peers. Statistically speaking, this means that just 2 out of 10 students with disabilities are likely to have access to Career and Technical Education coursework or experiences in leadership development programs such as JROTC.

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

In comparing the most recent statewide assessment data to results in prior years, our US History EOC scores have steadily declined over the course of the last three school years, gradually declining from a Mean Scale Score of 418 in 2020-2021 to 412 in 2021-2022 to 407 in 2022-2023. The most recent year-to-year decrease of 5% is the largest decrease of any state-wide testing data. While we are striving for positive gains and continue to plan strategically for improvements, the 5% decrease is not alarming in the sense that the district average on the US History EOC showed a 2% decrease and the state average showed a 1% decrease. Of the 17 other schools in the district with available data, only 3 schools achieved positive gains in 2022-2023 and 7 schools reported greater declines in US History EOC scores. Our Social Studies Department has recently faced some turnover, with two teachers new to Cocoa Beach, but we have strong leadership and the team is committed to driving improvements.

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.

In comparing statewide assessment averages, the greatest gaps noted were actually positive ones. Eighth (8th) grade math Mean Scale Score averages increased by more than six times the state average; more details of these positive results are provided in the following section. Additionally, eighth (8th) grade ELA student achievement enjoyed a 5% year-to-year increase, which was the largest increase among all other tested middle schools in the district. This is a tremendous accomplishment considering the district average for improvements in ELA results was 0% and the state results showed an overall 2% decrease in 8th grade ELA student achievement based on Mean Scale Scores. Many factors contributed to this outcome. Beyond outstanding teaching, the teacher also utilized ALEKS, and the math department provided ample tutoring sessions throughout the year. Administration also actively participated in data chats with the classes. This provided an expectation to both the department and students that we were committed to improving our scores, and it provided administrative perspective on the data.

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

Despite all the challenge educators and students have faced inside and outside of classrooms in recent years, our Math Department continues to work together to help students achieve at a high level. For example, our most recent 8th Grade Math state assessment scores showed exceptional improvements from last year. Students scoring a Level 1 on the assessment declined from 44% in 2021-2022 to 27% in 2022-2023; a 21% decrease. This exceeded both the district and state averages by THREE times based on average improvements. Cocoa Beach Jr/Sr's Mean Scale Score on this assessment showed a 13% overall increase, which exceeded the district average by SIX times based on average improvement. Our Math Department exhibited a high level of collaborative effort to help achieve these results, as well as demonstrated a willingness to go above and beyond with providing before-school tutoring opportunities for students in "The Math Lab."

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Cocoa Beach's Early Warning Systems (EWS) identified 88 students struggling with 2 or more early warning indicators. A couple of areas that pose great concern are: (1) 126 students scoring a Level 1 on ELA assessments; and (2) 117 students performing at a level that indicates a Substantial Reading Deficiency. As students' reading performance is widely regarded as a chief indicator of how much academic success they will experience across content areas, these EWS areas are especially important to address.

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

During the week of pre-planning and in the first weeks of school, Cocoa Beach Jr/Sr High School conducted a thorough process of analysis, collaboration, and ideation to engage a variety of stakeholders in identifying the most critical areas of school-wide improvement. Through the course of this process, as a team of educators committed to best serving the needs of our school, we honed in on two central areas of need: (1) Fostering higher levels of teacher morale to bolster teacher retention and job satisfaction; and (2) Supporting higher levels of student achievement among our Students with Disabilities (SWD) population.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

As our only ESSA Category, focusing on improving student achievement in our ESSA Subgroup (students with disabilities) stands out as a critical area. While our goal is to provide all students with opportunities to be successful, compared to our general education student population, our students with disabilities have traditionally performed lower and achieved less learning gains in tested core content areas than their general education peers. Building on our plans from the 2022-2023 School Improvement Plan, we are continuing our school-wide quest to identify and remove learning barriers that students with disabilities face. In doing so, we are focused on providing as many suitable interventions, resources, and supports as are necessary to position this very important subgroup of students to help them achieve academic success across content areas.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

We will increase the percentage of ESE students that are performing at or above academic proficiency by focusing on the following measurable outcomes:

- 1) Increasing SWD Subgroup Federal Index, from 41% to 45%.
- 2) ELA proficiency - we will increase from 44% to 54% level 3 and above proficiency.
- 3) Math achievement - we will increase from 53% to 63% level 3 and above proficiency.
- 4) College & Career Participation - we will increase the numbers of our SWD students earning College & Career Acceleration Points to at least 30%.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

In collaboration with the site-based Instructional Leadership Team, ESE Team, and district resource teachers, the assistant principal of curriculum will communicate available resources to all struggling students and their families, and progress monitor using data such as FAST progress monitoring to identify and support struggling students with targeted instructional interventions.

Administration will perform classroom walks to ensure teachers review data with their students.

Administration will also invite teachers who excel at data chats to share best practices with the faculty.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Mark Zeiler (zeiler.mark@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Cocoa Beach Jr./Sr. will utilize a Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) process to proactively identify students with one or more early warning system indicators and work to provide suitable supports and interventions to help students overcome struggles that could otherwise hold them back from achieving academic success.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By monitoring student progress within specific areas of need, incorporating this collaborative process with fidelity will help ensure that a foundation of basic instructional needs are being provided to students with disabilities, as well as go the extra step of providing more intensive supports to help these students

overcome potential barriers to achieving learning outcomes. The MTSS process will involve a multitude of instructional, support, and district personnel who will all share the same goal of helping our students with disabilities achieve their highest level of potential across content areas.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Identifying all SWD and disseminating that list to the math, English, science, and history teachers. Extra emphasis will be given to math and English teachers, and tracking those students will be the responsibility of the teachers/admin.

Person Responsible: Cole Mannes (mannes.cole@brevardschools.org)

By When: 1st quarter.

Running reports of PM results for comparison and analysis. We will look for trends and use that data for discussion of our SWD students and where they stand on their PM tests.

Person Responsible: Mark Zeiler (zeiler.mark@brevardschools.org)

By When: Approximately: 9/8, 1/12, 5/7 will be the windows of data availability.

Data Chats with our SWD students. This will be intentional and scheduled. We will assign a Data Chat date a week prior to department meetings so teachers can discuss that data during those meetings.

Person Responsible: Mark Zeiler (zeiler.mark@brevardschools.org)

By When: Throughout the year. These data chats will take place one week prior to the department meetings.

Administrative walkthroughs on designated data chat days to ensure implementation.

Person Responsible: Timothy Powers (powers.timothy@brevardschools.org)

By When: Quarterly.

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Our Insight data came back lower than both district and state outcomes in many categories. With the current retention rates in Florida, we must utilize the perspective of our teachers to identify our major weaknesses and adapt our practices. In addition to our Insight data, our principal also interviewed teachers individually to have candid conversations on where we are both lacking and excelling. We have also identified a teacher leader to create and disseminate a teacher survey designed to measure teacher morale at our school.

The measurable outcomes below are from our 2022-23 Insight Data.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

The person who evaluates my performance knows how much progress my students have made this year. We will improve from 58% to 72%.

My school has dedicated time for me to analyze student work and/or assessments and plan future instruction based on my students' performance. We will improve from 36% to 65%, 5% above the Brevard average.

I have the opportunity to provide input on key school decisions that affect me. We will improve from 48% to 61%.

Leaders at my school value my feedback. We will improve from 56% to 70%.

My school leaders model the behavior they hope to see across the school community. We will improve from 59% to 79%, 5% above Brevard average.

The time I spend collaborating with my colleagues is productive. We will improve from 46% to 80%, 5% above the Brevard average.

In the past six months, someone at my school or district has helped me develop new skills or content knowledge that I was able to apply in my own classroom. We will improve from 40% to 66%.

Professional development opportunities at my school help me improve my effectiveness as an educator. We will improve from 36% to 62%.

I get enough feedback about my teaching with an instructional leader at my school. We will improve from 50% to 60%.

Provided me with regular, positive feedback. We will improve from 38% to 54%.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Our primary monitoring tool for teacher morale will be our quarterly survey along with the Insight Survey. We will analyze that data as an admin team, and we will discuss the data during faculty meetings. As the year progresses, we will look for trends and respond accordingly.

Admin will run data reports for our respective departments to accurately monitor student progress. This will be a running list that can be referred to throughout the year to show student improvement and discussed at department meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Mark Zeiler (zeiler.mark@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

We have identified a teacher who will disseminate the teacher morale survey and collect the data. This data will be brought to admin. Admin will present to staff during faculty meeting.

Person Responsible: Mark Zeiler (zeiler.mark@brevardschools.org)

By When: Quarterly

We are combining small group meetings with department meetings now. These meetings will be structured around data.

Person Responsible: Mark Zeiler (zeiler.mark@brevardschools.org)

By When: Quarterly.

Faculty participation in creation of the School Improvement Plan. We want investment, collaboration, and engagement from all stakeholders. Therefore, we will present all relevant data to faculty and analyze SIP data as a team.

Person Responsible: Mark Zeiler (zeiler.mark@brevardschools.org)

By When: Prior to 8/31/23.

Create action plan with department heads. With the data analyzed and problem areas targeted, admin will set up a subsequent, voluntary meeting with department heads to guide the action plans.

Person Responsible: Cole Mannes (mannes.cole@brevardschools.org)

By When: Prior to 8/31/23.

Change the format of our meetings to include more faculty voice.

Person Responsible: Timothy Powers (powers.timothy@brevardschools.org)

By When: Quarterly.

Create a teacher-led PD schedule for peer-based PD.

Person Responsible: Cole Mannes (mannes.cole@brevardschools.org)

By When: Throughout school year.

Transparency on observation/evaluation approaches to improve the quality of feedback with faculty.

Person Responsible: Timothy Powers (powers.timothy@brevardschools.org)

By When: Second faculty meeting, which is in September.

#3. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Cocoa Beach's leadership team meets at the start of the school year to review faculty schedules, personnel allocations, instructional materials, and technology resources to ensure alignment with needs of our students with disabilities and Gen Ed Students. The admin team participates in PAR meetings to strategically build schedules in such a way that best serves the needs of our SWD student population.

We continue to strive for systematic improvements that will best meet the needs of ESE students. Among areas our team is focused on improving is ensuring that master scheduling is aligned and maximized to ensure students get the highest quality of support. This includes scheduling for collaborative planning, core instruction, Learning Strategies coursework, and any personalized interventions and/or time on technology with support programs notated in students' IEPs.

Our School Advisory Committee meets monthly to review school resources and potential revenue streams to support our students.

Additionally the following resources are also aligned to support all students.

PERSONNEL: In collaboration with our designated district ESE support facilitator, our site-based ESE support specialist, our school-based ESE and student services personnel, our collective team have reviewed ESE case load information, services required, and support systems currently in place to meet these requirements. Ongoing monitoring, re-evaluations, and other systems are in place to help keep service needs and delivery plans updated.

DISTRICT RESOURCE TEACHERS/CONTENT SPECIALIST – scheduled on campus multiple times a week to work with grade level teachers (including ESE teachers) to help maximize student service delivery.

MENTAL HEALTH RELATED PERSONNEL - Cocoa Beach Jr/Sr High School now has access to a social worker for our middle school students to help address a wide variety of social-emotional needs. These sessions include group work as well as individual counseling.