Roland Park K 8 Magnet School

2021-22 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: 7/29/2017

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
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	38%
2020-21 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%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

> * 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)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School KG-8	No	35%

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	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Weaver, Scott	Principal	Instructional Leader
VonAncken, Cara	Assistant Principal	Instructional Leader
Weber, Amy	Teacher, K-12	SAC chair

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Saturday 7/29/2017, 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.*
2

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.*
0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
100

Total number of students enrolled at the school
806

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
8

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
7

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	70	69	76	88	87	88	106	102	114	0	0	0	0	800
Attendance below 90 percent	7	4	6	6	5	7	9	7	14	0	0	0	0	65
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	4	0	0	0	0	14
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	8	6	7	7	9	0	0	0	0	40
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	9	10	8	1	1	0	0	0	0	32
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	1	0	5	4	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	17

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	1	0	1	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	7

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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
Wednesday 10/27/2021

2020-21 - 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	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	

2020-21 - 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	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	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				78%	57%	61%	77%	59%	60%
ELA Learning Gains				71%	56%	59%	65%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				52%	52%	54%	52%	49%	52%
Math Achievement				81%	55%	62%	79%	57%	61%
Math Learning Gains				75%	57%	59%	67%	53%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				55%	49%	52%	48%	47%	52%
Science Achievement				70%	50%	56%	73%	51%	57%
Social Studies Achievement				96%	77%	78%	86%	79%	77%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
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	2021					
	2019	84%	52%	32%	58%	26%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	78%	55%	23%	58%	20%
Cohort Comparison		-84%				
05	2021					
	2019	80%	54%	26%	56%	24%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				
06	2021					
	2019	79%	53%	26%	54%	25%
Cohort Comparison		-80%				
07	2021					
	2019	78%	54%	24%	52%	26%
Cohort Comparison		-79%				
08	2021					

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
	2019	72%	53%	19%	56%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2021					
	2019	88%	54%	34%	62%	26%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	82%	57%	25%	64%	18%
Cohort Comparison		-88%				
05	2021					
	2019	72%	54%	18%	60%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-82%				
06	2021					
	2019	71%	49%	22%	55%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				
07	2021					
	2019	88%	62%	26%	54%	34%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				
08	2021					
	2019	48%	31%	17%	46%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-88%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2021					
	2019	76%	51%	25%	53%	23%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	65%	47%	18%	48%	17%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2021					
2019					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	95%	67%	28%	71%	24%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	92%	63%	29%	61%	31%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	57%	43%	57%	43%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

Tools used for progress monitoring data include: Baseline assessments, Iready and Wonders in K, 1, 2.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	61	87	94
	Economically Disadvantaged	38	62	81
	Students With Disabilities	70	90	100
	English Language Learners	50	100	100
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	48	77	82
	Economically Disadvantaged	27	50	61
	Students With Disabilities	64	84	88
	English Language Learners	70	50	80

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	65	87	87
	Economically Disadvantaged	56	81	88
	Students With Disabilities	83	87	96
	English Language Learners	33	66	66
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	53	70	83
	Economically Disadvantaged	51	51	58
	Students With Disabilities	77	83	94
	English Language Learners	33	67	67

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	71	88	88
	Economically Disadvantaged	55	71	74
	Students With Disabilities	80	90	90
	English Language Learners	-	50	50
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	18	50	78
	Economically Disadvantaged	74	94	91
	Students With Disabilities	33	67	93
	English Language Learners	-	-	-

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	59	72	82
	Economically Disadvantaged	38	56	77
	Students With Disabilities	67	77	76
	English Language Learners	-	-	50
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	41	57	76
	Economically Disadvantaged	30	53	64
	Students With Disabilities	48	64	77
	English Language Learners	50	100	100

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	68	78	87
	Economically Disadvantaged	37	57	80
	Students With Disabilities	72	81	94
	English Language Learners	-	-	-
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	56	61	80
	Economically Disadvantaged	26	25	56
	Students With Disabilities	61	68	83
	English Language Learners	-	-	-
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Science	All Students	74	74	-
	Economically Disadvantaged	48	50	-
	Students With Disabilities	83	80	-
	English Language Learners	-	-	-

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	36	48	50
	Economically Disadvantaged	24	40	42
	Students With Disabilities	42	54	42
	English Language Learners	-	-	-
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	37	67	-
	Economically Disadvantaged	21	64	-
	Students With Disabilities	8	61	-
	English Language Learners	7	80	-

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	36	49	56
	Economically Disadvantaged	29	36	42
	Students With Disabilities	49	65	70
	English Language Learners	-	100	100
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	60	68	-
	Economically Disadvantaged	51	64	-
	Students With Disabilities	60	63	-
	English Language Learners	69	76	-
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	69	64	-
	Economically Disadvantaged	69	64	-
	Students With Disabilities	69	71	-
	English Language Learners	98	63	-

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	46	55	60
	Economically Disadvantaged	24	32	40
	Students With Disabilities	64	75	74
	English Language Learners	-	-	-
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	45	30	-
	Economically Disadvantaged	42	31	-
	Students With Disabilities	54	42	-
	English Language Learners	-	-	-
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	70	56	-
	Economically Disadvantaged	39	44	-
	Students With Disabilities	76	64	-
	English Language Learners	-	-	-

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	24	31	30	26	40	33	40	55			
ELL	55	63	55	58	53	33		80			
ASN	97	88		97	76		100				
BLK	55	48	34	50	34	31	41	74	79		
HSP	75	67	48	76	58	50	64	81	92		
MUL	81	73		79	77		81		80		
WHT	87	61	60	83	58	53	84	91	86		
FRL	57	55	41	57	40	35	44	79	73		
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						

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	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		

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	65
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	55
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	649
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	57
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	92
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	79
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	74
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	53
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

For the 2018 and 2019 School years, Roland Park Math and ELA achievement points either increased or stayed the same. This was also true for gains of the lowest 25% percentile. For the 2021 school year, achievement points decreased in both Math and ELA. This was also the case for gains made by the lowest 25%

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Math Achievement points and Math gains demonstrate the need for greatest improvement.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

The largest contributing factor would be the lack of in person instruction for all students due to global pandemic.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Based on 2019 data, Civics and Math showed the most gains. Civics went from 86 to 96 achievement points and Math went from 79 to 81 achievement points on 2019 FSA.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

In the 2018 and 2019 school years, we implemented curriculum based professional development and lateral articulation. The articulation helped teacher's direct instruction time to new curriculum and spending less time on curriculum that was covered in the past.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Strategies implemented will be before school tutoring ELP, Lunch and Learns for struggling students, small- group instructions and software support such as Algebra nation, PAPER tutoring, i-ready. Also the use of manipulatives in the classrooms to develop concepts.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

I-ready support trained all teachers in software, Grade-Level teams are participating in guided " Data Dives". Teachers also have the opportunity to observe peers. PLC's and ILT's are occurring monthly.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

District focus on acceleration over remediation.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Looking at FSA data from the 2018, 2019 and 2021 school years. The Math achievement points and the Learning Gains of our lower quartile dropped considerably.
Measurable Outcome:	Roland Park will raise the Math achievement score of the 2022 FSA to 78 points. This level is more in line with our averages for the past four years.
Monitoring:	Math achievement and growth will be monitored using standardized baseline, mid-year and FSA tests and i-Ready progress monitoring.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Scott Weaver (scott.weaver@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Data Dives were conducted at each level. i-Ready scores and FSA achievement scores from the prior year were used to identify strengths and weaknesses for each student.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Data Dives provide standards based outcomes that can be reproduced and standardized amongst our students and state standards.

Action Steps to Implement

Joe Costanzo will review with MYP teachers their growth from baseline, to mid-year and then on FSA. Cara vonAncken will conduct quarterly data reviews to monitor progress in PYP.

Person Responsible   Cara VonAncken (cara.vonancken@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Roland Park reported discipline rate is at 1.8 incidences per 100 students. This is just above the state average of 1.6 inc./100 stud. Roland park ranks 12th out of 31 district combination schools and #227 out of 313 combination schools in the state. Our number of out of school suspensions has decreased and the number of in-school suspensions is also decreasing from the '14,'15 school year. The primary area of concern that we will monitor is the number of out of school suspensions. This will be monitored through discipline data. The secondary area of concern will be students' perception of the overall school environment and this will be monitored through our Panorama survey results.

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.

Positive School Culture is the cornerstone of the IB Learner Profiles. Students explore the human role and influence in all curriculum settings and in all units. We have quarterly school- wide activities, and open up the school to quarterly community events to celebrate IB culture.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Administration, teachers, parents and students work together on different events and opportunities to foster our school community.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00