Roland Park K 8 Magnet School

2022-23 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: 5/2/2016

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
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	38%
2021-22 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	2021-22: A (70%) 2018-19: A (74%) 2017-18: A (71%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* 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.](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)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School KG-8	No	38%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	66%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
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
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Cannaday, Maria	School Counselor	Insure socio-emotional support in school for all stakeholders.
VonAncken, Cara	Assistant Principal	Develop and maintain effective educational programs, promote the improvement of teaching and learning and ensuring school safety.
Weaver, Scott	Principal	Develop and maintain effective educational programs, promote the improvement of teaching and learning and ensuring school safety.
Weber, Amy	Teacher, Adult	Delivering daily IB instruction in a caring and collaborative setting.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 5/2/2016, Cara Vonancken

Number of teachers with a 2022 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 2022 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

52

Total number of students enrolled at the school

850

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

1

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

11

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	70	67	76	85	86	86	105	101	109	0	0	0	0	785
Attendance below 90 percent	5	6	7	6	6	7	8	12	4	0	0	0	0	61
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	2	10	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	11	21	0	0	0	0	58
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	8	5	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	5	8	9	13	19	0	0	0	0	59
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	5	9	17	9	9	8	0	0	0	0	57
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	3	2	2	5	3	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	20

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	1	2	1	0	1	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	10

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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

Friday 8/26/2022

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	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	

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	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	

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	75%	51%	55%				78%	57%	61%
ELA Learning Gains	63%						71%	56%	59%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	40%						52%	52%	54%
Math Achievement	77%	41%	42%				81%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains	70%						75%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	55%						55%	49%	52%
Science Achievement	69%	48%	54%				70%	50%	56%
Social Studies Achievement	91%	57%	59%				96%	77%	78%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	84%	52%	32%	58%	26%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	78%	55%	23%	58%	20%
Cohort Comparison		-84%				
05	2022					
	2019	80%	54%	26%	56%	24%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				
06	2022					
	2019	79%	53%	26%	54%	25%
Cohort Comparison		-80%				
07	2022					
	2019	78%	54%	24%	52%	26%
Cohort Comparison		-79%				
08	2022					
	2019	72%	53%	19%	56%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	88%	54%	34%	62%	26%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	82%	57%	25%	64%	18%
Cohort Comparison		-88%				
05	2022					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	72%	54%	18%	60%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-82%				
06	2022					
	2019	71%	49%	22%	55%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				
07	2022					
	2019	88%	62%	26%	54%	34%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				
08	2022					
	2019	48%	31%	17%	46%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-88%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	76%	51%	25%	53%	23%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-76%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	65%	47%	18%	48%	17%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	95%	67%	28%	71%	24%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	92%	63%	29%	61%	31%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	100%	57%	43%	57%	43%

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	21	28	17	26	43	34	23				
ELL	59	51	38	51	60	57	50	69			
ASN	93	71		93	76		92				
BLK	54	57	43	58	58	47	45	85	77		
HSP	72	61	38	71	71	55	68	91	83		
MUL	82	68		73	62	55	64				
WHT	86	66	39	90	77	69	83	97	94		
FRL	59	57	44	57	59	46	51	79	79		
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						
ASN	94	76		100	97		95	100	100		

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
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
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		

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	70
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	68
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	696
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	56
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	85
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	58
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	70
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	67
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	78
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	62
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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 2019 and 2020 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 2022 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 2022 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 as well as social and emotional concerns for all students due to global pandemic.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 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 accel

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

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.

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.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Looking at FSA data from the 2018, 2019 and 2020 school years. The Math achievement points and the Learning Gains of our lower quartile dropped considerably.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective 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: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Math achievement and growth will be monitored using standardized baseline, midyear and FAST/STAR tests and i-Ready progress monitoring.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Scott Weaver (scott.weaver@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Data Dives were conducted at each level. i-Ready scores and STAR/FAST achievement scores from the prior year were used to identify strengths and weaknesses for each student.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Data Dives provide standards based outcomes that can be reproduced and standardized amongst our students and state standards.

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

Continue Data Dives with all grade levels throughout school year. Monitoring the effectiveness of ELP tutoring support.

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

Collaborate with SWD case managers to create academic goals for students and monitor academic progression.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

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 school culture and environment.

Administration, teachers, parents and students work together on different events and opportunities to foster our school community. Administrators and teachers model a family culture within the school. Parents, students and teachers partake in different school cultural activities to expose our school family to different cultures. eg: Peace Day, International Bazaar, Black History Musical Showcase.