Dowdell Middle Magnet School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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

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.
Sturrup, 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 consist focus on instruction within then 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 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
			Notes: Printing Resources for Professional Development			
	5000	510-Supplies	0842 - Dowdell Middle Magnet School	Title, I Part A		$4,000.00
			Notes: Student Supplies			
	6300	120-Classroom Teachers	0842 - Dowdell Middle Magnet School	Title, I Part A		$2,000.00
			Notes: Professional development for Area of Focus			
			0842 - Dowdell Middle Magnet School	Title, I Part A		$6,000.00
			Notes: STEAM/Saturday tutoring, ELP enrichment academy t payroll			
	5200	510-Supplies	0842 - Dowdell Middle Magnet School	Title, I Part A		$500.00
			Notes: Supplies professional development			
	6150	510-Supplies	0842 - Dowdell Middle Magnet School	Title, I Part A		$500.00
			Notes: Parent and student communication supplies			
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
			Notes: software license, enrichment programs for content areas ie MobyMax, USA Test Prep			
	6300	120-Classroom Teachers	0842 - Dowdell Middle Magnet School	Title, I Part A		$1,500.00
			Notes: Professional development and support for Area of Focus			
	6300	510-Supplies	0842 - Dowdell Middle Magnet School	Title, I Part A		$10,000.00
			Notes: Classroom manipulatives			
					Total:	**$240,500.00**