

Brevard Public Schools

Rockledge Senior High School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	0

Rockledge Senior High School

220 RAIDER RD, Rockledge, FL 32955

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

Demographics

Principal: Buster Clark B

Start Date for this Principal: 10/30/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
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)	46%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: B (54%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

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

Guided by input from students, staff, parents, and community, Rockledge High School aspires to provide a safe, inclusive, and student-centered learning environment which thrives on the free interchange of ideas.

Provide the school's vision statement

Contributing Educational Excellence to our Community

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
Clark, Buster	Principal	Responsible for leading the school's staff and students with a clear vision. Collaborates with stakeholders to establish a positive and safe environment for all. Provides instructional data to school leaders to provide focus for student success. Promotes a school climate to provide high expectations and student engagement for all students. Manages the operation and organization of the school. Communicate with all stakeholders.
Zeiler, Mark	Assistant Principal	Monitors student attendance to provide purposeful conversations with families. Reviews disciplinary action to provide support for student behavior. Communicates with families to ensure student safety and promote student academic success. Evaluates teacher instruction to provide meaningful feedback to enhance student achievement. Participates in the development and implementation of school goals.
Keehn, Aaron	Teacher, K-12	Serves as SAC Chairperson to ensure communication between all stakeholders. Provides pertinent data to review for data-driven conversations that influence school-based decisions.
Cross, Ashley	Assistant Principal	Monitors student attendance to provide purposeful conversations with families. Reviews disciplinary action to provide support for student behavior. Communicates with families to ensure student safety and promote student academic success. Evaluates teacher instruction to provide meaningful feedback to enhance student achievement. Participates in the development and implementation of school goals.
Smith, Christina	Instructional Coach	Provides teachers with instructional strategies to promote student academic success through modeling research-based literacy instruction. Coaches and mentors teachers to review reading data to make instructional decisions throughout all disciplines. Coordinates and assist with administration and analysis of district-required reading assessments.
Joca, Deborah	Teacher, ESE	Manages ESE caseload to provide instructional decisions to provide academic plan for students. Supports teachers and students through dialogue to ensure students services are accurately met. Advocates for ESE students and teachers during I.E.P. meetings.
Feronti, Lauren	Assistant Principal	Responsible for supporting principal in leading the school's staff and students with a clear vision. Communicates achievement data to promote academic success with all stakeholders . Supervises instruction and evaluates staff to provide support for student achievement. Creates master schedule for all students and staff to

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
------	-------	---------------------------------

provide the best opportunities for academic success. Reviews academic information with guidance and families to support the graduation plan.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 10/30/2019, Buster Clark B

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.*

1

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.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

85

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
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)	46%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: B (54%)

	2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: B (54%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	401	414	379	323	1517
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	86	89	60	284
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	75	49	21	182
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	1	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	2	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86	73	56	41	256
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77	44	41	40	202

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77	79	53	38	247

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	0	8	35	0	0	43
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	7	7	1	30

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	0	0	393	418	383	317	1511
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	140	146	144	481
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111	78	42	18	249
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	47	32	27	146
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	64	96	80	304

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	176	202	193	158	729

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	0	0	16	28	54	98
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	1	6

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	0	0	393	418	383	317	1511
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	140	146	144	481
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111	78	42	18	249
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	47	32	27	146
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	64	96	80	304

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	176	202	193	158	729

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	0	0	16	28	54	98
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	1	6

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	58%	59%	56%	56%	58%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	51%	52%	51%	54%	53%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	36%	40%	42%	43%	44%	44%
Math Achievement	41%	48%	51%	37%	50%	51%
Math Learning Gains	42%	49%	48%	31%	46%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	45%	45%	36%	43%	45%
Science Achievement	56%	66%	68%	64%	67%	67%
Social Studies Achievement	64%	70%	73%	61%	70%	71%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey					
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
	(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
09	2019	60%	62%	-2%	55%	5%
	2018	60%	60%	0%	53%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	56%	59%	-3%	53%	3%
	2018	50%	61%	-11%	53%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	54%	66%	-12%	67%	-13%
2018	62%	67%	-5%	65%	-3%
Compare		-8%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	61%	71%	-10%	70%	-9%
2018	58%	70%	-12%	68%	-10%
Compare		3%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	32%	61%	-29%	61%	-29%
2018	22%	62%	-40%	62%	-40%
Compare		10%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	42%	60%	-18%	57%	-15%
2018	43%	60%	-17%	56%	-13%
Compare		-1%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	24	31	24	14	48	44	32	33		75	31
ELL	36	50					40			80	
BLK	35	40	31	24	36	40	34	48		79	41
HSP	64	60	44	41	47	62	55	62		92	72
MUL	68	52	20	56	35		62	70		83	55
WHT	68	54	44	52	45	59	71	74		94	74
FRL	46	44	33	33	40	45	47	53		81	48

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	15	33	37	22	33	30	19	37		74	19
ELL	27	45		30	27						
ASN	87	86					80				
BLK	31	44	42	24	22	27	40	43		83	46
HSP	56	48	19	30	29	53	59	70		89	59
MUL	64	60	50	39	31		65	50		71	76
WHT	70	61	54	47	38	43	83	73		91	78
FRL	43	50	42	28	27	34	49	50		82	49

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	87
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	635
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	59
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	41
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	62
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	56
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	64
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	50
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

ELA Lowest 25th percentile produced the lowest proficiency percentage at 36%. Large class sizes, weak implementation of the support facilitation service model for ESE students, lack of rigor. While the proficiency rate for all students on the ELA FSA has stayed relatively consistent the proficiency rate for the lowest 25th percentile has steadily decreased, 7% from 18-19 to 19-20.

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

Science proficiency showed the greatest decline from the prior year, dropping 8%, from 64% proficient to 56%. Contributing factors could have been, change in science sequencing that added a new group of students to Biology and the addition of several new, inexperienced Biology teachers.

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

Again, science achievement had the largest gap compared to the state average. In 2019, Rockledge High School's science achievement was 56%, compared to the state average of 68%. In 2018, RHS science proficiency was 64%, compared to the state's 67%. Possible contributing factors as stated above, could have been the change in science sequencing and an inexperienced Biology team.

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

Math LG and Math Lowest 25th percentile showed the greatest improvement with an 11% increase respectively. A two-year comparison shows Rockledge High School's LG's increase from 17% below the state average in 2018 to just 6% below in 2019. Overall, math proficiency has increased from 37% in 2018 to 41% in 2019. RHS implemented a targeted intervention and tutoring plan for bottom quartile math students.

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

Rockledge High School's greatest areas of concern remain, ELA Lowest 25th percentile (36%) and science proficiency (56%). Targeted efforts were taken last school year to address these gaps, but the cancellation of testing did not allow for quantitative analysis of any potential impacts.

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

1. ELA Lowest 25th Percentile and 10th Grade ELA Proficiency
2. Science Achievement
3. Students with Attendance <90%
4. Discipline disproportionality of African-American Males (ISS and OSS)
5. Math and ELA LG and Proficiency for African-American Subgroup

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The ELA proficiency rate of our lowest 25th percentile dropped 7% in 2019, from 43% down to 36%.

Measurable Outcome: With the goal being sustained gradual improvement in the proficiency of our lowest 25th percentile in ELA, RHS will improve the proficiency rate of the ELA bottom quartile by 4%, from 36% to 40% and sustain or improved that over subsequent years.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Christina Smith (smith.christinae@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: School wide implementation of standard-based instruction, tasks, and assessments that align with the standard and the grade level complexity of the standard, which includes requiring students to utilize the text to support their ideas and responses with evidence from the text.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Based on the analysis of the available data, as well as classroom observations, it is believed that the downward trend of the ELA proficiency of our lowest 25th percentile could be tied to issues regarding rigor, depth of the standard, task complexity, and quality standard based assessments. Focusing on rigor for all students, instruction to the full depth of the standards and grade-level text complexity will positively impact the learning of our lowest 25th percentile in ELA.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide teachers with the planning time to collaborate and build common lessons, tasks and assessments that reflect the standards and the grade level complexity.

Person Responsible Buster Clark (clark.buster@brevardschools.org)

Deliver targeted PD for text complexity, writing in response to text and supporting claims with evidence through the PEEL structure.

Person Responsible Christina Smith (smith.christinae@brevardschools.org)

Continuous monitoring to identify current at risk students through early warning indicators as well as appropriate placement of students in Intensive Language Arts classes.

Person Responsible Ashley Cross (cross.ashley@brevardschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Science achievement suffered the largest drop from 2018 to 2019. An 8% decrease, going from 64% down to 56%. This was also, well below the district and state averages.

Measureable Outcome: RHS will improve science achievement by 6% and bring the proficiency rate up to 62%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Buster Clark (clark.buster@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: To address the science achievement decline RHS will implement common unit assessments, common planning and pacing guides and small group skills days with a focus on argument driven inquiry.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Argument driven inquiry helps students develop deep concrete understanding and facilitates the problem solving process. The skills days provide hands-on opportunities for students and in-time formative feedback for the teachers to allow for adjustments in instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

Part-time science instructional coach built into the PAR and master schedule.

Person Responsible Buster Clark (clark.buster@brevardschools.org)

Development and implementation of common unit assessments, pacing and planning time.

Person Responsible Buster Clark (clark.buster@brevardschools.org)

Utilization of a Biology Skills Day after each unit to address the lowest standard comprehension as determined by the common unit assessment.

Person Responsible Buster Clark (clark.buster@brevardschools.org)

Implementation of Argument Driven Inquiry through Biology classrooms. (May need to be slightly modified due to social distancing expectations because of COVID-19)

Person Responsible Buster Clark (clark.buster@brevardschools.org)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity

Area of Focus	
Description and Rationale:	ISS and OSS disproportionality for Black Male ESE students.
Measureable Outcome:	RHS will lower the risk-ratio for ISS and OSS for Black Male ESE students to no greater than 2.00.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Mark Zeiler (zeiler.mark@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Increased Tier II and Tier III supports, including PBIS implementation and an improved MTSS process.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Problem solving and matching the student needs with supports can break the cycle change student behaviors and increase educational outcomes.

Action Steps to Implement

MTSS Coach to join the school based MTSS team to model initial problem-solving process conversation for identified students to build site-based capacity.

Person Responsible Ashley Cross (cross.ashley@brevardschools.org)

Focused, school-based PD will be provided based on a root-cause analysis discovered through the problem-solving process

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

PBIS School-wide implementation. Tier I training for PBIS Team.

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

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

RHS is in the process of incorporating student voice into school decision making. RHS used Youth Truth survey data to adjust some school-based policies and procedures. Next step is to begin to utilize student voice to impact instructional practices.

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.

Rockledge High School utilizes multiple sets of stakeholder survey data to include parent feedback survey, Youth Truth student voice survey, teacher insight survey, and frequent communication with Rockledge community members and the School Advisory Council. Based on data pulled from the 2019-2020 parent survey 88% of parents prefer email communication. Due to this, the principal will continue emailing out his weekly newsletter and emails will accompany all Blackboard Connect automated phone messages. 68% of parents also stated that text messages were also a welcomed for of communication and very helpful for short quick reminders for important dates and events. Blackboard Connect will be used to send out text messages to stakeholders to keep them up-to-date on important dates and events. One area of desired growth in our communication efforts is FOCUS. Only 62% of our parents frequently use FOCUS to monitor grades and communicate with teachers. We would like to see that number increase. An effort was made to increase the number of parents with active accounts during registration and admin and counselors always discuss FOCUS with parents when phone calls are made or meetings are held and will support parents/guardians with accessing their account if needed. Ensuring that all stakeholders have a voice in the collaborative decision making process builds a positive and nurturing school culture. Proactive two-way communication provides transparency and builds trust between school leadership and school stakeholders. RHS continues to improve stakeholder communication through social media platforms and a weekly newsletter sent out by the principal. that informs, asks for feedback and shares accomplishments of students and staff.

After examining data from both our teacher Insight survey and the Youth Truth student voice survey it is evident that students treating adults with respect is a growth opportunity for our school. Only 60% of teachers who responded to the survey indicated that students treat adults with respect on campus. Surprisingly, those numbers were substantiated in the student voice survey as well. We scored a 2.64 for this element, which was well below the 25th percentile, and was even lower based on the answers from our juniors and seniors, who felt students did not regularly treat adults with respect. Based on this data RHS will implement Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS). With careful attention to requirements set forth by Comprehensive Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CCEIS), and in close collaboration with Rockledge High School's Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) program, the purpose of PBIS will be to garner and maximize site-level and district-wide resources in the intentional pursuit of cultivating an increasingly positive school-wide instructional climate. PBIS will pave the way for more favorable mental health conditions, as well as more equitable academic, behavioral, and social outcomes for all students.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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