

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Dowdell Middle Magnet School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 20 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 20 |

Dowdell Middle Magnet School

1208 WISHING WELL WAY, Tampa, FL 33619

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Stacey Schlarbaum

Start Date for this Principal: 7/2/2020

| | |
|--|---|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Middle School 6-8 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2019-20 Title I School | Yes |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| 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* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: D (36%) 2016-17: C (42%) 2015-16: C (44%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Central |
| Regional Executive Director | Lucinda Thompson |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | TS&I |

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 20 |

Dowdell Middle Magnet School

1208 WISHING WELL WAY, Tampa, FL 33619

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | 2019-20 Title I School | 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Middle School 6-8 | Yes | 95% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 82% |

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To provide a secure, diverse, and accountable learning community where all students achieve academically while focusing on global sustainability.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Dowdell Middle Magnet will foster an environment that encourages students to reach their maximum potential while remaining environmentally conscious.

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 |
|-------------------|---------------------|--|
| Von Ancken, Johan | Principal | Instructional leader on campus |
| Warren, Margret | Instructional Coach | Provide mathematics content and pedagogy support for teachers. |
| Belin, Glynis | Instructional Coach | Provide reading strategies/content and pedagogy support for teachers. |
| McNair, Pamela | Assistant Principal | Instructional Leader on campus |
| Reeves, Yolanda | Teacher, K-12 | Provide ELA/literacy strategies/content and pedagogy support for teachers. |
| Sturup, Nakia | SAC Member | SAC Chair |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/2/2020, Stacey Schlarbaum

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.*

0

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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

45

Demographic Data

| | |
|--|---|
| 2020-21 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Middle School 6-8 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2019-20 Title I School | Yes |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| 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* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: D (36%) 2016-17: C (42%) 2015-16: C (44%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Central |
| Regional Executive Director | Lucinda Thompson |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | TS&I |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here . | |

Early Warning Systems**Current Year**

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 174 | 189 | 199 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 562 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 | 48 | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 147 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| 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 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 49 | 73 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 172 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 | 66 | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 198 |

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 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |

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 | 41 | 7 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 68 |
| 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 | 217 | 194 | 209 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 620 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 40 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 117 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 34 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 113 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 30 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 94 |
| 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 | 21 | 20 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 67 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| 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 | 217 | 194 | 209 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 620 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 40 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 117 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 34 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 113 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 30 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 94 |
| 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 | 21 | 20 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 67 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| 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 | 29% | 51% | 54% | 27% | 50% | 52% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 40% | 52% | 54% | 40% | 53% | 54% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 40% | 47% | 47% | 32% | 45% | 44% |
| Math Achievement | 36% | 55% | 58% | 33% | 54% | 56% |
| Math Learning Gains | 48% | 57% | 57% | 44% | 59% | 57% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 46% | 52% | 51% | 40% | 51% | 50% |
| Science Achievement | 20% | 47% | 51% | 35% | 47% | 50% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 44% | 67% | 72% | 45% | 66% | 70% |

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | Total |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----|-----|-------|
| | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| | (0) | (0) | (0) | 0 (0) |

Grade Level Data

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

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2019 | 33% | 53% | -20% | 54% | -21% |
| | 2018 | 28% | 52% | -24% | 52% | -24% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 25% | 54% | -29% | 52% | -27% |
| | 2018 | 21% | 52% | -31% | 51% | -30% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 4% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -3% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 25% | 53% | -28% | 56% | -31% |
| | 2018 | 20% | 54% | -34% | 58% | -38% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 4% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2019 | 31% | 49% | -18% | 55% | -24% |
| | 2018 | 16% | 48% | -32% | 52% | -36% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 15% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 47% | 62% | -15% | 54% | -7% |
| | 2018 | 23% | 61% | -38% | 54% | -31% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 24% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 31% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 16% | 31% | -15% | 46% | -30% |
| | 2018 | 22% | 29% | -7% | 45% | -23% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -6% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -7% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2019 | 19% | 47% | -28% | 48% | -29% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2018 | 18% | 48% | -30% | 50% | -32% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| 2018 | | | | | |
| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 42% | 67% | -25% | 71% | -29% |
| 2018 | 37% | 65% | -28% | 71% | -34% |
| Compare | | 5% | | | |
| 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 | 83% | 63% | 20% | 61% | 22% |
| 2018 | 70% | 63% | 7% | 62% | 8% |
| Compare | | 13% | | | |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| 2018 | | | | | |

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 | 8 | 26 | 24 | 9 | 28 | 45 | 7 | 9 | | | |
| ELL | 10 | 36 | 41 | 20 | 47 | 45 | 7 | 29 | | | |
| BLK | 22 | 34 | 39 | 29 | 41 | 49 | 9 | 37 | 75 | | |

| 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 |
| HSP | 29 | 43 | 41 | 37 | 51 | 46 | 23 | 44 | 84 | | |
| MUL | 53 | 53 | | 42 | 42 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 38 | 41 | 45 | 46 | 50 | 33 | 28 | 53 | | | |
| FRL | 28 | 40 | 39 | 35 | 48 | 47 | 18 | 45 | 83 | | |
| 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 | 8 | 25 | 20 | 7 | 37 | 38 | | 19 | | | |
| ELL | 10 | 34 | 36 | 16 | 39 | 51 | 6 | 37 | | | |
| BLK | 14 | 28 | 27 | 19 | 47 | 49 | 12 | 30 | | | |
| HSP | 26 | 36 | 31 | 24 | 42 | 47 | 15 | 43 | 66 | | |
| MUL | 31 | 31 | | 40 | 53 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 34 | 30 | 21 | 35 | 37 | 41 | 37 | 50 | 92 | | |
| FRL | 23 | 32 | 29 | 24 | 41 | 45 | 17 | 39 | 61 | | |
| 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 | 2 | 23 | 24 | 5 | 26 | 24 | 3 | 17 | | | |
| ELL | 8 | 26 | 31 | 16 | 39 | 43 | 13 | 19 | | | |
| BLK | 20 | 35 | 33 | 31 | 35 | 23 | 20 | 43 | 83 | | |
| HSP | 28 | 39 | 35 | 32 | 45 | 45 | 38 | 44 | 77 | | |
| MUL | 18 | 55 | | 36 | 45 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 39 | 45 | 14 | 34 | 48 | 45 | 44 | 53 | 83 | | |
| FRL | 26 | 39 | 32 | 32 | 44 | 39 | 35 | 45 | 77 | | |

ESSA Data

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

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|------|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | TS&I |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 44 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 3 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 57 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 444 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |
| Subgroup Data | |

| Students With Disabilities | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 24 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 2 |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 32 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Native American Students | |
| Federal Index - Native American Students | |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Asian Students | |
| Federal Index - Asian Students | |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 37 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 46 |
| 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 | 48 |
| 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 | 42 |
| 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 | 44 |
| 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.

Based on 2019's testing data, the lowest performing content area was Science with an Achievement level of 20% of students scoring proficiency (level 3 and above). Though this represents a two percent increase over the previous school year, scores have been lower than other content areas the past four testing years. A possible factor contributing to the lower proficiency level is the lower level of proficient Reading/ELA scores of students as they enter middle school. 70% of current 8th graders are level 1 and level 2 ELA/Reading.

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

2019's data showed 8th grade math showed the greatest decline from the previous year with 7%. The previous year included students who scored levels 3, 4, and 5 on the Math FSA. 2018-2019, students performing in the higher levels from the previous year were enrolled in Algebra resulting in a data shift of their scores. This area causes concern due to teacher attrition in 7th grade math last year (current 8th graders).

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.

2019's data showed, 8th grade ELA showed the greatest gap with 31% below state average. Though teachers focused on planning based on standards and preparing students with in class and supplemental instructional activities, the turnover of ELA teachers impacted consistent focus on instruction within their core content classrooms. This may have also been a factor in subgroup performance of SWD, ELL and BLK in ELA.

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

2019's data showed 7th grade math showed the greatest vertical improvement with 31% more students scoring proficiency (level 3 and higher). Actions which impacted the increase were deepened focus on standards based teaching which also included plans for targeted progress

monitoring, reteaching, and extension activities. Combined with a focus on increasing student engagement are actions which contributed to the increase in this area.

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

ELA Level 1 on statewide assessment all grades

Math Level 1 8th grade

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

1. Literacy across the subject areas
2. Engagement
3. PLC
4. CHAMPS/PBIS Model School
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Use of standard aligned lessons with a focus on increasing the use of informational texts across content areas with a focus on analysis of text, text complexity and active reading and literacy strategies. Focus on progress of Subgroups SWD, ELL, and BLK as well as 3-5. Areas identified based on 2019 test performance and current performance data comparison (Achieve 3000 baseline).
 Lessons should include:
 -well written and meaningful objectives that are aligned to the standards' complexity
 -evidence of academic vocabulary expected to be used in the lesson
 -clear communication of what students are learning at the complexity level indicated in the standard
 -prepared literacy based HOT questions/prompts to support students in understanding the objective and complexity of the lesson

Measurable Outcome:

By 2021, FSA and SSA achievement will increase 5% in ELA/Reading, Science and Civics.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Johan Von Ancken (johan.vonancken@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Standards based lesson plans to include active reading and literacy strategies (Clear lesson goals). Progress monitoring using Achieve 3000 and Common assessments (Feedback and plenty of practice). Common planning weekly and grade level biweekly PLCs (Focus on data to align content and strategies).

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Achieve 3000 weekly in ELA, monthly in Science and Social Studies, use of PATHS and A3000 in Reading. Computer based progress monitoring, Common Assessments, PLC logs. Students learn best when learning is "visible". Having instruction that is based on standards planning and articulates to students clearly what they are expected to learn. Research supports a 32% increase of achievement when lesson goals are clear. This extends to affording students the opportunity to tackle text, practice with tasks and texts that focus on achieving standard mastery. Receiving feedback and acting on the feedback also contributes to increase understanding. In order to accomplish the aforementioned, teachers meeting for common planning will assist in being prepared for strategies, practice, and feedback related to the content area and support for ELL, SWD, and BLK students.
 Resources: Teaching Literacy;
 Teacher Clarity Playbook; Killian, 2014

Action Steps to Implement

1. Unpack the standard to set objectives/lesson goals
2. Use data to determine appropriate text and/or strategies
3. Develop activities/lessons relevant to the standard
4. Use ongoing progress monitoring to determine effectiveness of strategies and student progress (See Resource Map)
5. Enrich and remediate standards with support of resource staff, ILT
6. Professional development on discipline specific literacy strategies and resources (CHAMPS, Effective Teacher, Teaching Literacy, Teacher Clarity Playbook, Student Engagement PD Series).

Person Responsible

Johan Von Ancken (johan.vonancken@hcps.net)

PLCs and data chats to support academic data based decision making/problem solving process. Common planning weekly. Grade Level Data biweekly.

Person Responsible Johan Von Ancken (johan.vonancken@hcps.net)

Content area and Resource teachers will work with teachers with individual coaching cycles, professional development, and planning sessions to assist in developing differentiated instruction support that is data driven.

Person Responsible Johan Von Ancken (johan.vonancken@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Increase student performance, enrichment, and reteaching of standards using engagement strategies. Identified barrier of addressing subgroup and mastery data related to engagement of students since returning for 2020-2021.

Measurable Outcome: By 2021, FSA and SSA achievement will increase 5% in Mathematics, ELA/Reading, Science and Civics.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Johan Von Ancken (johan.vonancken@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Engagement of students is evidenced by ensuring students:
 -are engaged in discussions using academic vocabulary that is aligned to the expected complexity of the lesson
 -can articulate what they're learning and why (active & cognitive engagement)
 -are engaged in tasks that are aligned to the complexity level of the standard
 - participating in assessment and/or checks for understanding throughout the lesson

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Engagement refers to attention, curiosity, optimism and passion students have when they are learning. In order to make connections, the information they are taught has to be meaningful and address different methods of engagement (behavioral, intellectual etc).

Action Steps to Implement

1. Unpack the standard to set objectives/lesson goals
2. Use data to determine appropriate engagement focus (see Resource Map)
3. Develop activities/lessons relevant to the standard
4. Use ongoing progress monitoring to determine effectiveness of strategies and student progress
5. Enrich and remediate standards with support of resource staff, ILT
6. Professional development on discipline specific strategies and resources to support ELL, BLK, and SWD students(CHAMPS, Effective Teacher, Student Engagement PD Series).

Person Responsible Johan Von Ancken (johan.vonancken@hcps.net)

PLCs and data chats to support academic data based decision making/problem solving process. Common planning weekly. Grade Level Data biweekly.

Person Responsible Johan Von Ancken (johan.vonancken@hcps.net)

Content area and Resource teachers will work with teachers with individual coaching cycles, professional development, and planning sessions to assist in developing differentiated instruction support that is data driven.

Person Responsible Johan Von Ancken (johan.vonancken@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

PLCs, PSLT, ILT to monitor data and support academic, behavioral, and attendance data based decision making/problem solving process.

Improve campus wide culture of learning as exemplified by the fidelity of usage of schoolwide systems, routines, and structures: Gradual release of responsibility models help to improve cultures of learning (Heick, 2014). This can be achieved through various school wide systems such as the use of CHAMPS routines and structures, PBIS supports, and specific classroom and content based area best practices for instruction. This is evidenced through positive classroom management that supports strong content delivery.

Goal is to: Increase Attendance by 5%

Decrease discipline by 10%

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.

SAC and PTSA groups to provide parent resources and activities. Magnet student and family activities. SEL activities through Electives. Student Services weekly Second Step and culture building SEL activities. School - based Food Pantry sponsored by Feeding Tampa Bay. PBIS and CHAMPS activities facilitated by Teachers and Students.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction | | | | \$225,500.00 |
|---|----------|---|--|-----------------|-----|--------------|
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21 |
| | | 100-Salaries | 0842 - Dowdell Middle Magnet School | Title, I Part A | | \$212,000.00 |
| | | | Notes: Academic Coach- Reading, Success Coach, RtI Resource, Assistant Teacher, Parent liaison | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|----------|---------------|---|---|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|
| | 7300 | 700-Other Expenses | 0842 - Dowdell Middle Magnet School | Title, I Part A | | \$500.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Printing Resources for Professional Development</i> | | | |
| | 5000 | 510-Supplies | 0842 - Dowdell Middle Magnet School | Title, I Part A | | \$4,000.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Student Supplies</i> | | | |
| | 6300 | 120-Classroom Teachers | 0842 - Dowdell Middle Magnet School | Title, I Part A | | \$2,000.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Professional development for Area of Focus</i> | | | |
| | | | 0842 - Dowdell Middle Magnet School | Title, I Part A | | \$6,000.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: STEAM/Saturday tutoring, ELP enrichment academy t payroll</i> | | | |
| | 5200 | 510-Supplies | 0842 - Dowdell Middle Magnet School | Title, I Part A | | \$500.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Supplies professional development</i> | | | |
| | 6150 | 510-Supplies | 0842 - Dowdell Middle Magnet School | Title, I Part A | | \$500.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Parent and student communication supplies</i> | | | |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement | | | | \$15,000.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21 |
| | 7300 | 692-Computer Software Non-Capitalized | 0842 - Dowdell Middle Magnet School | Title, I Part A | | \$3,500.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: software license, enrichment programs for content areas ie MobyMax, USA Test Prep</i> | | | |
| | 6300 | 120-Classroom Teachers | 0842 - Dowdell Middle Magnet School | Title, I Part A | | \$1,500.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Professional development and support for Area of Focus</i> | | | |
| | 6300 | 510-Supplies | 0842 - Dowdell Middle Magnet School | Title, I Part A | | \$10,000.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Classroom manipulatives</i> | | | |
| | | | | | Total: | \$240,500.00 |