

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Roland Park K 8 Magnet School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	17
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	17

Roland Park K 8 Magnet School

1510 N MANHATTAN AVE, Tampa, FL 33607

[no web address on file]

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Weaver, Scott	Principal	Develop and maintain effective educational programs, promote the improvement of teaching and learning and ensuring school safety.
VonAncken, Cara	Assistant Principal	Develop and maintain effective educational programs, promote the improvement of teaching and learning and ensuring school safety.
Weber, Amy	Teacher, K-12	Develop and maintain effective educational programs, promote the improvement of teaching and learning and ensuring school safety.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

With a combination of the school leadership team, PYP & MYP teachers, student government and SAC, and came together to create these goals.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

To achieve these goals, we have created a community partnership to utilize the ELP program. Teachers and staff will also meet with these students daily in small group instruction and create differentiation lessons.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	66%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	38%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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		
Absent 10% or more days	5	6	7	6	6	7	8	12	4	61	
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	2	10	18	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	11	21	58	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	8	5	27	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	5	8	9	13	19	59	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	9	17	9	9	8	57	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	3	2	2	5	3	2	2	1	0	20	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	5	6	3	0	0	14

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	5	6	7	6	6	7	8	12	4	61	
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	2	10	18	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	11	21	58	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	8	5	27	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	5	8	9	13	19	59	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	9	17	9	9	8	57	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	3	2	2	5	3	2	2	1	0	20	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	5	6	7	6	6	7	8	12	4	61	
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	2	10	18	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	11	21	58	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	8	5	27	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	5	8	9	13	19	59	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	9	17	9	9	8	57	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	3	2	2	5	3	2	2	1	0	20	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review**ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	76	51	53	75	51	55	76		
ELA Learning Gains				63			62		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				40			45		
Math Achievement*	79	50	55	77	41	42	74		
Math Learning Gains				70			54		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				55			42		
Science Achievement*	72	48	52	69	48	54	69		
Social Studies Achievement*	86	65	68	91	57	59	85		
Middle School Acceleration	99	70	70	88	51	51	87		
Graduation Rate		83	74		44	50			
College and Career Acceleration		33	53		68	70			
ELP Progress	55	52	55	68	73	70	55		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	78
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	546
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	70

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	696
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	43			
ELL	59			
AMI				
ASN	92			
BLK	65			
HSP	74			
MUL	83			
PAC				
WHT	92			
FRL	68			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	27	Yes	1	1
ELL	56			
AMI				
ASN	85			
BLK	58			
HSP	70			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL	67			
PAC				
WHT	78			
FRL	62			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	76			79			72	86	99			55
SWD	34			36			35	67			4	
ELL	61			72			48	60			5	55
AMI												
ASN	88			93				94			3	
BLK	53			58			53	71	100		6	
HSP	71			76			67	79	97		7	50
MUL	87			92			75	83			5	
PAC												
WHT	88			88			83	100	100		6	
FRL	62			64			56	70	97		6	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	75	63	40	77	70	55	69	91	88			68
SWD	21	28	17	26	43	34	23					
ELL	59	51	38	51	60	57	50	69				68
AMI												
ASN	93	71		93	76		92					

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
BLK	54	57	43	58	58	47	45	85	77			
HSP	72	61	38	71	71	55	68	91	83			85
MUL	82	68		73	62	55	64					
PAC												
WHT	86	66	39	90	77	69	83	97	94			
FRL	59	57	44	57	59	46	51	79	79			86

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	76	62	45	74	54	42	69	85	87			55
SWD	24	31	30	26	40	33	40	55				
ELL	55	63	55	58	53	33		80				55
AMI												
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			
PAC												
WHT	87	61	60	83	58	53	84	91	86			
FRL	57	55	41	57	40	35	44	79	73			

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	74%	53%	21%	54%	20%
07	2023 - Spring	77%	47%	30%	47%	30%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	72%	44%	28%	47%	25%
04	2023 - Spring	85%	54%	31%	58%	27%
06	2023 - Spring	75%	47%	28%	47%	28%
03	2023 - Spring	78%	46%	32%	50%	28%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	81%	53%	28%	54%	27%
07	2023 - Spring	59%	36%	23%	48%	11%
03	2023 - Spring	79%	55%	24%	59%	20%
04	2023 - Spring	87%	59%	28%	61%	26%
08	2023 - Spring	79%	57%	22%	55%	24%
05	2023 - Spring	69%	53%	16%	55%	14%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	71%	41%	30%	44%	27%
05	2023 - Spring	72%	47%	25%	51%	21%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	99%	55%	44%	50%	49%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	49%	51%	48%	52%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	86%	64%	22%	66%	20%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Increase proficiency of literacy for all students with a focus on Students with Disabilities. The data for the 22-23 school year shows an 8% increase in growth as compared to the 10% increase at the district level for SWD.

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

Looking at previous data we see a trend with the group of students with disabilities and a lack of growth amongst this subgroup multiple years in a row.

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 largest factor with this gap is the overall instruction the students have been receiving, factors can be due to a lack of instructional support, which causes staff members to be pulled.

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

Based on the 22-23 State Assessment the most improved were Math. Math PM1 level 3+ was 22% to a 78% on the PM3.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Some areas of concern are students new to Roland Park have had varying experiences, such as, little or no instructional time with a teacher or social/emotional support.

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

Increase proficiency for all in literacy and continuing to have a positive school community.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Increase proficiency for all students with a focus on Students with Disabilities (SWD). The data for the 22-23 school year shows an 8% (site based) increase in growth as compared to the 10% increases at the district level for SWD. There has been a lack of growth amongst this subgroup multiple years in a row. There is need for more targeted equitable instruction and acceleration for all students.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

The percentage of students showing growth, among those scoring in the bottom quartile for ELA, show match or exceed the growth seen at the state level.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Students scoring levels 1 & 2 will be identified early in the year and monitored using a variety of assessments (fluency assessments, PM! & 2, unit assessments etc.) In addition, participation in the Extended Learning Program (ELP) will be monitored for these students. Walkthroughs will be used by the administration to ensure support for targeted students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cara VonAncken (cara.vonancken@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

We will also be focusing on small group instruction using standards-based materials. During small group instruction teachers will pull specific standard aligned text.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Our students with disabilities have continuously fallen below the district average.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Resource teachers working with students who scored a level 1 or 2, in the ESE program will provide consistent explicit and systematic instruction. Classroom teachers will work with students who scored a level 1 or 2, in small groups to address gaps in skills while using the accelerated model of on-grade level instruction. Looking towards our community partners to provide quality ELP tutoring,

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

By When: Quarterly academic reviews with admin. throughout the 23-24 school year.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

Yes