Roland Park K 8 Magnet School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Roland Park K 8 Magnet School

1510 N MANHATTAN AVE, Tampa, FL 33607

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Cara Vonancken

Start Date for this Principal: 6/2/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	38%
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: A (74%) 2017-18: A (71%) 2016-17: A (74%) 2015-16: A (66%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the 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

Roland Park K 8 Magnet School

1510 N MANHATTAN AVE, Tampa, FL 33607

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served
(per MSID File)

Combination School
KG-8

2019-20 Title I School

No

2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate
(as reported on Survey 3)

38%

Primary Service Type
(per MSID File)

K-12 General Education

Charter School

No

2018-19 Minority Rate
(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)

65%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	A	A

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the 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.

We strive to inspire young inquiring minds to become compassionate life-long learners who are internationally minded people.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We aim to develop caring, open-minded and independent thinkers who will help to create a better, more peaceful world.

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
Weaver, Scott		

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 6/2/2017, Cara Vonancken

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.*
5

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.*
11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
62

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education

2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	38%
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: A (74%) 2017-18: A (71%) 2016-17: A (74%) 2015-16: A (66%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

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	72	62	73	82	82	86	101	107	104	0	0	0	0	769
Attendance below 90 percent	7	3	1	0	3	1	5	6	9	0	0	0	0	35
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	6	7	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	13	10	0	0	0	0	40

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	1	0	0	0	0	1

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	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 10/29/2020

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	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	78%	57%	61%	75%	60%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	71%	56%	59%	66%	60%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	52%	54%	52%	53%	51%
Math Achievement	81%	55%	62%	79%	60%	58%
Math Learning Gains	75%	57%	59%	72%	60%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	55%	49%	52%	66%	54%	50%
Science Achievement	70%	50%	56%	75%	54%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	96%	77%	78%	91%	78%	75%

	EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey									
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**									**Total**
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	84%	52%	32%	58%	26%
	2018	72%	53%	19%	57%	15%
Same Grade Comparison	12%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	78%	55%	23%	58%	20%
	2018	82%	55%	27%	56%	26%
Same Grade Comparison	-4%					
Cohort Comparison	6%					
05	2019	80%	54%	26%	56%	24%
	2018	77%	51%	26%	55%	22%
Same Grade Comparison	3%					
Cohort Comparison	-2%					
06	2019	79%	53%	26%	54%	25%
	2018	83%	52%	31%	52%	31%
Same Grade Comparison	-4%					
Cohort Comparison	2%					
07	2019	78%	54%	24%	52%	26%
	2018	68%	52%	16%	51%	17%
Same Grade Comparison	10%					
Cohort Comparison	-5%					
08	2019	72%	53%	19%	56%	16%
	2018	79%	54%	25%	58%	21%
Same Grade Comparison	-7%					
Cohort Comparison	4%					

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	88%	54%	34%	62%	26%
	2018	83%	55%	28%	62%	21%
Same Grade Comparison	5%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	82%	57%	25%	64%	18%
	2018	72%	57%	15%	62%	10%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	72%	54%	18%	60%	12%
	2018	77%	54%	23%	61%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	71%	49%	22%	55%	16%
	2018	72%	48%	24%	52%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
07	2019	88%	62%	26%	54%	34%
	2018	83%	61%	22%	54%	29%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		16%				
08	2019	48%	31%	17%	46%	2%
	2018	30%	29%	1%	45%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison		-35%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	76%	51%	25%	53%	23%
	2018	70%	52%	18%	55%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	65%	47%	18%	48%	17%
	2018	75%	48%	27%	50%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

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	95%	67%	28%	71%	24%
2018	86%	65%	21%	71%	15%
Compare		9%			

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	93%	63%	30%	62%	31%
Compare		-1%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	57%	43%	57%	43%
2018	100%	56%	44%	56%	44%
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	38	44	27	46	53	43	38				
ELL	55	47		55	63						
ASN	94	76		100	97		95	100	100		
BLK	55	59	46	57	64	55	39	93	67		
HSP	74	66	55	77	70	45	65	92	71		
MUL	88	76		93	71						
WHT	91	79	73	92	81	59	90	100	95		
FRL	62	58	51	65	68	57	48	91	64		
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	37	35	30	37	44	32	22				
ELL	48	61	55	64	78						
ASN	93	76		100	78		93	100	100		
BLK	53	57	42	53	54	44	53	76	70		
HSP	70	61	56	77	65	46	71	79	83		
MUL	93	77		88	68		94				
WHT	90	69	71	90	75	50	79	100	94		
FRL	56	53	48	60	56	43	53	73	75		

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	42	63	52	45	63	70	45				
ELL	40	61	70	52	39						
ASN	93	74		98	85		96		100		
BLK	53	54	51	55	59	59	51	84	92		
HSP	63	62	56	74	71	63	63	88	77		
MUL	83	69		83	69		80				
WHT	92	75	50	94	80	89	93	95	100		
FRL	54	55	50	62	69	65	54	86	78		

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	74
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	663
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	55
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	95
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	59
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	68
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	82
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 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	84
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	63
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.

The lowest performance was in ELA with our lowest 25% students. This level has stayed constant the last few years and is partly due to students struggling to make gains even with intensified curriculum.

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

The greatest decline was in Science. We saw a decline in 8th grade Science. We believe this was partly due to Teacher's teaching different grade levels and varying curriculum throughout the day.

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.

There was a positive gap in our Math achievement scores. Math achievement was 19% above the state average which continues our trend upward. As an IB school we focus on real world application and students are placed into heterogeneous classrooms.

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

Math Learning gains showed an improvement of 8% above the prior year. Intensified Math staff development with use of manipulative contributed to our gains.

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

Two areas of concern with our EWS data was the attendance rate below of 90 percent and the number of students scoring a level 1 on statewide assessments.

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

1. Increase ELA Lowest 25th percentile
2. Increase ELA achievement
3. Increase ELA achievement in SWD subgroup
4.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Proficiency is directly correlated to students' comprehension and engagement. Through the use of Ib strategies such as making real world connections and fine tuning inquiry skills, students' newfound comprehension and engagement will increase their ELA proficiency as measured by I-Ready and Achieve 3000.
Measurable Outcome:	Student's proficiency (at level 3 or above) on: - Increase % of Kdg-2nd grade students scoring proficient on I-Ready Reading from Diagnostic 1-3 - Increase % of 3rd-8th grade students scoring proficient on Achieve 3000 Reading from Diagnostic 1-3
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Scott Weaver (scott.weaver@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Incorporate concepts connected curriculum tied to grade level standards. "Reflect and revise" during instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Integrating Inquiry, collaboration, and reflection during instruction increases students' engagement to authentic learning opportunities and help students' make connections to central ideas, transdisciplinary themes and real world applications.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

N/A

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.

N/A

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: Student Engagement	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00