Dowdell Middle Magnet School

2021-22 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: 7/29/2021

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* 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%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	[Lucinda Thompson](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

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)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	90%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	83%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	D

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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Von Ancken, Johan	Principal	Instructional leader on campus
Belin, Glynis	Instructional Coach	Provide reading strategies/content and pedagogy support for teachers.
McNair, Pamela	Assistant Principal	Instructional Leader on campus
Sturrup, Nakia	Other	To provide differentiated instructional strategies support for teachers
Fabian, Tashika	Magnet Coordinator	Provide professional development opportunities to strengthen classroom practice and magnet theme integration within our school. Serve as a liaison between staff, administration, families,, the community, and professional organizations that partner with the magnet program. Collaborate with on-site staff on the use of available school technology and resources to increase student achievement,

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/29/2021, 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.*
1

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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

33

Total number of students enrolled at the school

561

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

5

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

4

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	195	159	210	0	0	0	0	564
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	63	73	0	0	0	0	186
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	64	91	0	0	0	0	217
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	80	100	0	0	0	0	253
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	2	13	20	0	0	0	0	35

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	4	1	5	0	0	0	0	10
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

Monday 8/30/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	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		
Course failure in Math	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	

2020-21 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	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	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				29%	51%	54%	25%	52%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				40%	52%	54%	32%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				40%	47%	47%	29%	48%	47%
Math Achievement				36%	55%	58%	25%	56%	58%
Math Learning Gains				48%	57%	57%	43%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				46%	52%	51%	47%	52%	51%
Science Achievement				20%	47%	51%	18%	47%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				44%	67%	72%	41%	66%	72%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	33%	53%	-20%	54%	-21%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	25%	54%	-29%	52%	-27%
Cohort Comparison		-33%				
08	2021					
	2019	25%	53%	-28%	56%	-31%
Cohort Comparison		-25%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	31%	49%	-18%	55%	-24%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	47%	62%	-15%	54%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-31%				
08	2021					
	2019	16%	31%	-15%	46%	-30%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	19%	47%	-28%	48%	-29%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	42%	67%	-25%	71%	-29%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	83%	63%	20%	61%	22%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

The progress monitoring tools used by grade levels to compile data is Achieve 3000 for English Language Arts in grade levels 6-8. District Baseline Assessments in the Fall for Mathematics grades 6-8, Civics grade 7, and Science grade 8. District Mid-Year Assessments in the Winter for Mathematics grades 6-8, Civics grade 7, and Science grade 8.

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	11	13	12
	Economically Disadvantaged	9	10	10
	Students With Disabilities	10	15	14
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	30	37	
	Economically Disadvantaged	30	37	
	Students With Disabilities	29	36	
	English Language Learners	25	29	

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	7	9	11
	Economically Disadvantaged	7	9	11
	Students With Disabilities	7	10	14
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	28	40	
	Economically Disadvantaged	28	39	
	Students With Disabilities	27	36	
	English Language Learners	23	38	
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	31	43	
	Economically Disadvantaged	31	43	
	Students With Disabilities	32	40	
	English Language Learners	30	38	

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	13	18	19
	Economically Disadvantaged	13	18	19
	Students With Disabilities	21	28	26
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	30	45	
	Economically Disadvantaged	30	45	
	Students With Disabilities	29	42	
	English Language Learners	23	38	
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	47	47	
	Economically Disadvantaged	46	46	
	Students With Disabilities	45	46	
	English Language Learners	32	29	

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	13	30	23	9	28	30	19	31			
ELL	19	31	31	15	28	45	3	33			
BLK	27	35	34	18	27	23	14	37			
HSP	29	36	33	25	29	38	26	39	71		
MUL	50	29		42	28		60				
WHT	38	34	37	26	27	29	52	41	81		
FRL	29	35	35	23	29	30	27	39	77		
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		

ESSA Data Review

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	35
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	21
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	349
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	93%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	23
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	25
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	27
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	35
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	42
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	41
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	34
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

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

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

Based on 2021's testing data, the lowest performing content area was Math with an Achievement level of 24% of students scoring proficiency (level 3 and above). This represents a twelve percent decrease based on the 2019 school data. Proficiency trends indicate that scores have been
lower than most content areas over the last five years, even through ELA has made inconsistent gains within that time frame. Science was the second content area of the lowest performing achievement with 28% proficiency. This indicates an eight percent increase from 2019. One of the contributing factor's to
to the lower proficiency level in Science is the level of proficient Reading/ELA scores of students. 69% of current 8th graders are level 1 and level 2
ELA/Reading.

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

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.

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

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. New actions taken to address this improvement are teachers focusing on standards-based lesson planning, preparing engaging lessons, implementing rigorous informational texts within the science curriculum, and progress monitoring students' mastery of standards with differentiated instructional activities.

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

2019's data showed 7th grade math showed the greatest vertical improvement with 31% more students scoring proficiency (level 3 and higher).

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

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.

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

Using baseline and mid-year data to determine students' mastery of standards and pinpoint areas of focus to implement in small group instruction and differentiated instruction. Implementing standard-based assessments (formatives) to assess students focus areas and accelerating those areas as needed within the every content area.

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

Teacher and school leaders will be engaged in monthly professional development that focuses on cooperative learning strategies, standards- based lesson planning, instructional frameworks, and professional learning communities in every content area that focuses on analyzing student assessment data and student work samples, unit planning, planning for small group instruction, designing formative assessments, and goal setting.

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

Teachers will receive support from school leaders, subject area leaders (SALs), and on-site and district instructional coaches.

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 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 2022, FSA and SSA achievement will increase 3% in ELA/Reading, Math, Science and Civics.
Monitoring:	Professional Learning Communities Learning Walks Professional Development Coaching Cycles
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 planningweekly and grade level biweekly PLCs (Focus on data to align content and strategies).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Professional learning communities focus upon peer exchange of ideas and fosters teachers to push their learning each time they attend their professional learning communities. This will allow teachers the forum to plan for implementation of standard based instruction as well. Learning walks will be the leadership team's way of inspecting the expectation and providing continuous feedback upon what is going well and specifically where teachers need more support to inform meaningful professional development. Teacher participation in professional development trainings on their campus allows them to see their peers in action for the purpose of reflecting upon standard target task alignment to support their own reflection and implementation. Coaching cycles allow the academic coaches to specifically support the needs of teachers and participate in the "I do", "we do", "you do" modeling approach.

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 engaging 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, and small group instruction
6. Professional development on literacy strategies and resources

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This area of focus was identified as a critical need based on the Math FSA 2021 data results. A. Grade 6 indicated 11% proficiency B. Grade 7 indicated 14% proficiency C. Grade 8 showed 16% proficiency D. Math bottom quarter from grades 6-8 showed 31% proficiency.
Measurable Outcome:	Learning gains in the area of Math will increase from 31% to 34%.
Monitoring:	Professional Learning Communities Learning Walks Professional Development Coaching Cycles
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Johan Von Ancken (johan.vonancken@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Differentiated instruction that focuses Tier 2/3 students and students in the bottom quartile. Instructional Frameworks and lunch and learn for small group instructional practices that focuses on remediation and acceleration strategies for mastery of grade level standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Data analysis of student improvement showed growth when these strategies are incorporated in Math instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Unpack the standard to set objectives/lesson goals
2. Use data to determine appropriate acceleration strategies and small group instruction
3. Develop instructional activities/lessons/ assessments 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 related so content area strategies and resources

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

#3. 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 2021-2022.
Measurable Outcome:	By 2021, FSA and SSA achievement will increase 3% in Mathematics, ELA/Reading, Science and Civics.
Monitoring:	PLCs and data chats to support academic data based decision making/problem solving process with common planning weekly. Analyzing and dissaggregating grade level data (biweekly). Feedback trends from walkthroughs and observations.
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, Student Engagement PD Series)

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

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

NA

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.

Our school culture extends beyond the confines of our school building and encompasses the surrounding neighborhood. In addition to building positive alliances with the Tampa Bay Civic Association, as well as many community churches, we have also taken a grassroots approach to building a strong foundation of trust and support at Dowdell. By focusing on the cornerstone tenet of trust this year during preplanning, we truly engaged in the work needed to develop meaningful and sustainable relationships. We discussed the areas of contention, as well as strengths that need to be recognized and celebrated, so we could come together as a faculty. We have also leveraged our resources to provide ongoing support to teachers and staff, as well as opened the door to parent communication by establishing a Charter PTSA at Dowdell. This tremendous organization helps support the work that is vital to helping all our students succeed and we are partners to help our parents understand how to support their students and each other.

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

Dowdell Middle School will continue to build and maintain a positive school culture and environment through various methods. All community stakeholders are invited to collaborate with faculty and staff through the school PTSA and SAC. Families and community members will be invited to attend monthly SAC meetings to monitor and assess the effectiveness of the School Improvement Plan. These meetings will be utilized to strengthen the relationship between our school and the community in which it serves. Dowdell has just incorporated an active PTSA where we will be holding monthly meetings educating our parents through curriculum and informational sessions throughout the school year. Vinik Boys and Girls Club has been in integral part of our school community by offering grant funded after-care and tutoring to all students who attend Dowdell Middle School. Our school
communicates with families and the community through Edsby, Canvas, various district approved social media platforms, and the parent link telephone service to disseminate information to students' homes.

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

| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement | $0.00 |
| | | Total: | $0.00 |