Rodgers Middle Magnet School

leadership

analysis

students

Florida

mission

college and career

ambitious

family and community involvement

school improvement

striving

teaching

achievement

relationships

success

learning

areas of focus

instruction

needs assessment

strategic planning

collaboration

vision

supportive environment

resources

growth

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Rodgers Middle Magnet School

11910 TUCKER RD, Riverview, FL 33569

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Adam Lane

Start Date for this Principal: 7/2/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	88%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (48%) 2015-16: C (51%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 Hillsborough County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Rodgers Middle Magnet School

11910 TUCKER RD, Riverview, FL 33569

[no web address on file]

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)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	69%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	65%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough 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.

Work collaboratively to empower students to become a community of problem solvers and lifelong learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To promote a learning environment that is warm, safe, and caring for all.

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
Basham, Gregory	Principal	
Scribner, Meredith	Assistant Principal	
Passalaris, Isidoros	Assistant Principal	
Benedix, Margaret	SAC Member	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/2/2020, Adam Lane

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
48

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	88%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (48%) 2015-16: C (51%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	[Lucinda Thompson](#)
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	349	233	395	0	0	0	0	977
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	93	63	67	0	0	0	0	223
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	27	42	0	0	0	0	116
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	27	27	0	0	0	0	57
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	35	61	0	0	0	0	124
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	62	65	0	0	0	0	200
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	88	87	71	0	0	0	0	246

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	7	62	60	0	0	0	0	129

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	3	8	6	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	5	0	0	0	0	11

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/9/2020

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	271	260	288	0	0	0	0	819
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	37	43	0	0	0	0	113
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	42	46	0	0	0	0	94
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	22	131	0	0	0	0	173
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	99	72	0	0	0	0	212

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	22	46	71	0	0	0	0	139

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	35	28	21	0	0	0	0	84
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	6	0	0	0	0	12

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	271	260	288	0	0	0	0	819
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	37	43	0	0	0	0	113
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	42	46	0	0	0	0	94
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	22	131	0	0	0	0	173
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	99	72	0	0	0	0	212

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	22	46	71	0	0	0	0	139

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	35	28	21	0	0	0	0	84
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	6	0	0	0	0	12

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	45%	51%	54%	39%	50%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	54%	52%	54%	46%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	47%	47%	33%	45%	44%
Math Achievement	56%	55%	58%	44%	54%	56%
Math Learning Gains	59%	57%	57%	50%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	52%	51%	39%	51%	50%
Science Achievement	43%	47%	51%	43%	47%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	61%	67%	72%	63%	66%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**			**Total**
	6	**7**	**8**	
	(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**
06	2019	48%	53%	-5%	54%	-6%
	2018	40%	52%	-12%	52%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	43%	54%	-11%	52%	-9%
	2018	34%	52%	-18%	51%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
08	2019	43%	53%	-10%	56%	-13%
	2018	42%	54%	-12%	58%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2019	45%	49%	-4%	55%	-10%
	2018	43%	48%	-5%	52%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	63%	62%	1%	54%	9%
	2018	50%	61%	-11%	54%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		20%				
08	2019	31%	31%	0%	46%	-15%
	2018	21%	29%	-8%	45%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		-19%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
08	2019	41%	47%	-6%	48%	-7%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	39%	48%	-9%	50%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						

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

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	61%	67%	-6%	71%	-10%
2018	47%	65%	-18%	71%	-24%
Compare		14%			

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

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	92%	63%	29%	61%	31%
2018	80%	63%	17%	62%	18%
Compare		12%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	57%	-57%	57%	-57%
2018	0%	56%	-56%	56%	-56%
Compare		0%			

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	11	45	38	18	53	59	14	31			
ELL	10	45	46	31	53	44	13	17			

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
ASN	50	71		67	53						
BLK	42	54	50	50	55	40	32	60	64		
HSP	36	51	48	51	61	52	33	52	74		
MUL	50	62			54	50		38	86		
WHT	54	55	51	63	61	70	59	68	83		
FRL	39	53	50	50	59	53	36	55	72		

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	13	30	26	14	39	38	10	16			
ELL	21	35	29	24	41	37	25	28			
BLK	33	37	36	38	46	48	27	53	83		
HSP	43	43	33	48	50	40	40	45	65		
MUL	29	29	36	37	47			14			
WHT	48	48	42	59	62	57	54	55	83		
FRL	36	42	37	43	53	49	38	42	70		

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	4	27	26	5	30	30		19			
ELL	19	39	37	28	46	43	14	50			
ASN	58	50		58	50						
BLK	24	36	23	31	38	29	25	51	80		
HSP	44	48	37	47	50	43	44	64	74		
MUL	34	37	46	32	53	75	54				
WHT	45	53	35	51	57	33	55	69	83		
FRL	35	43	34	39	46	38	38	58	73		

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	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	46
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	544
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	34
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	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	60
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	50
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	51
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	57
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	63
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	51
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.

ELL student ELA Achievement has lowest performance at 11%. Contributing factors would be lack of reading skills,low reading levels, and development of reading strategies. Both ELA and Science showed decreases in the number of students meeting the benchmark , while Math showed an increase over the previous year.

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

Analyzing subgroups our biggest decrease was in ELL, a decrease of 11% in ELA Achievement, a decrease of 12% in Science, and decrease by 11% in Social Studies from the previous year. Contributing factors would be lack of reading skills, low reading levels, and development of reading strategies.

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 greatest gap between schools performance and state average overall is ELA Achievement, with differences ranging between 6% for 6th grade, 9% for 7th grade and 13% for 8th grade. These gaps are decreased over the previous year. A gap of 15% remains in 8th grade math, but this is also a decrease over the previous year. So student achievement in these areas is on the increase. We continue to increase achievement by closing gaps in the students reading or writing skills and content knowledge.

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

Social Studies was our greatest increase by 12%. A contributing factor to this increase was the implementation of social studies boot camp on Saturdays, to build knowledge and bolster comprehension . These sessions were well attended by our students.

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

One of the concerns at Rodgers is poor attendance among some students. We would like to increase attendance rate to at least 98% by monitoring those at risk. Sending letters home to parents, making phone calls and intervention of teachers, social worker, and psychologist. We are also implementing strategies in the classroom to make our lessons more engaging and helping the student's connect their learning to their goals.

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

1. Implement reading and writing strategies across all content areas
2. Increase student agency to create greater ownership over their learning and connections to their goals through active learning
3. Increase parent involvement in SAC, PTSA, and AVID

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ELA Achievement continues to be an area where students need to improve their performance. Implementing reading and writing strategies in all subject areas will help increase reading comprehension and improve communication skills which will help improve all other subject areas.
Measurable Outcome:	An increase of at least 5% in ELA Achievement at every grade level. 6th grade will achieve 53%, 7th grade will have 48%, and 8th grade will increase to 48% of students meeting the benchmark.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Gregory Basham (gregory.basham@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Coaching cycles focusing on best practices and reading strategies will be offered by reading coach based on the students performance on formative assessments and the content standards.Reading coach will have data chats with all content area PLCs. All content area teachers will implement reading and writing strategies in their classrooms based on their content.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students continue to need improvement in ELA Achievement. Research has shown reading and writing are keys to comprehending, analyzing and synthesizing the information. These skills are transferrable to other content areas and will not only help improve the students performance in ELA, but the other content areas as well.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Professional Development to build knowledge and skill s of faculty in teaching reading and writing, during pre-planning.
2. Baseline testing for students in Achieve 3000.
3. Regularly scheduled PLC's to analyze student data and determine lessons based on student needs for development.
4. Continued professional development based on student needs, and teacher developmental needs to maximize instructional focus for student improvement
5. Schedule formative assessments, then plan for learning based on those assessments

Person Responsible	Gregory Basham (gregory.basham@hcps.net)

#2. Leadership specifically relating to Leadership Development

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	By increasing student agency, their ownership over their learning and their understanding of how it connects to their future plans we can engage the students in the process. Research has shown involving students in the learning process by eliciting their thinking, listening, and providing them choice that they are engaged and retain more.
Measurable Outcome:	Improved attendance across all grade levels and a reduction in the number of tardies school wide. This will also help increase student achievement across all content areas and across demographics by engaging students in the learning process.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Gregory Basham (gregory.basham@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Students have been given a "Cumulative Summary" that provides an opportunity for them to record their formative data throughout the school year. This is one tool to arm students with the information they need to make specific choices about where they need to focus to improve learning, but also provide a vehicle for teacher and students to discuss the student's progress in the short term, and make connections about how what they are doing impacts to their future goals.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research on "student voice" and student agency. This has shown to increase student engagement and provide authentic learning opportunities for students. This can help increase student achievement across content areas.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Implement the 5 Learner Attributes associated with being a Cambridge International School and integrate them into the processes and procedures to change the school culture.
2. Distribute the Cumulative Summary and help students understands its use and have them complete their Goals
3. Complete baseline testing in all content areas
4. Have students set their achievement goals in each content area based on baseline testing data (discussed with teacher and coaches).

Person Responsible	Gregory Basham (gregory.basham@hcps.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Parent Involvement	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increasing parent involvement will be valuable as we build student ownership and promote engagement of all stakeholders for improved outcomes for our students. This should help reduce the number of tardies and help improve attendance as well. According to survey data few parents responded to survey. The school has had difficulty in the past in getting parents involved. We as a school need to do a better job of communicating with parents about how they can be involved at Rodgers. 69% of parents reported they are "treated as a partner" on the district survey for Key Performance Indicators. We would like to raise this to 80%. Partnering with parents to improve student engagement and learning has been shown to be an effective strategy for raising achievement levels.
Measurable Outcome:	The number of parents indicating they are "treated as a partner" on the district's ASQI Survey will increase to 80%. The number of parents indicating "I would recommend this school to others" will increase to 80% as well.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Gregory Basham (gregory.basham@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Through programs such as PTSA, SAC and AVID the school has implemented activities to increase parent involvement. We will help the parents understand the learning the students are doing so they can help their student navigate their lessons and meet the expectations for their course work.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research has shown increased parent involvement and partnering with parents to help students learn has been successful in a variety of school contexts. Parents are an integral part of helping young people maintain their focus and navigate their learning.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Send communications to parents to make connections and help them understand expectations for student scholarship at Rodgers.
2. Communicate the individuals parents can contact for assistance
3. Meet with School Advisory Council to begin dialogue and schedule opportunities to engage parents and community members
4. Meet with PTSA to schedule opportunities to engage parents and increase their level of involvement on our campus
5. Utilize AVID to offer clinics for parents to give them techniques and strategies for helping thier students stay focused and be successful.

Person Responsible	Meredith Scribner (meredith.scribner@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

English Language Learner achievement in ELA will be improved by differentiating the instruction for these students in smaller classes. Teachers will be able to focus on the needs of the individual learners. We will use MTSS/Rti to monitor the students progress and address their specific needs. We will partner with the students parents, increase time on task and provide more opportunities for the students to receive individualized instruction designed to address their specific needs. By utilizing regular formative assessments and increased opportunities to demonstrate skill acquisition, we can improve outcomes. Involving the student's in the process and connecting their learning or the need for the learning to their wants and desires for their life should also help increase student ownership over their learning.

The Students with Disabilities achievement will increase by differentiating the instruction for these students and working with them in smaller groups. Teachers will be able to focus on the needs of the individual learners. We will use MTSS/Rti to monitor the students progress and address their specific needs. We will partner with the students parents, increase time on task and provide more opportunities for the students to receive individualized instruction designed to address their specific needs. By utilizing regular formative assessments and increased opportunities to demonstrate skill acquisition, we can improve outcomes.

Improved attendance and decreased tardies will increase instructional time which translates to improved achievement for students. The Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports system we put in place should help improve student engagement and decrease absences. We are working to help students understand the connections between their learning now and their own goals/aspirations in life through PBIS and our Cambridge program. These are school wide strategies we employ to increase student agency which research shows leads to improved outcomes.

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.

We have a SAC committee that meets once a month which includes parents, students, teachers, administrators, community leaders, and business leaders. We also have a strong PTSA which meets once a month and holds regular events and activities for the school and community to promote parent involvement. We have an AVID program which meets once a month which has four Family Nights a year to increase parent involvement. We recently began anew program to promote greater involvement by our students in the decisions that affect their education, and

help build connections between their learning and their lives.

In addition, our Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports, and Cambridge program promote student input, engagement and ownership of their learning/choices to build better relationships between faculty, staff and students.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Leadership Development	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Parent Involvement	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00