

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Dowdell Middle Magnet School



2022-23 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 | 14 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

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: 6/7/2022

| | |
|--|---|
| 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 |
| 2021-22 Title I School | Yes |
| 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| 2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2021-22: C (48%) 2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: D (36%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Central |
| Regional Executive Director | Lucinda Thompson |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | TSI |
| * 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 | 14 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

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) | 2021-22 Title I School | 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Middle School 6-8 | Yes | 100% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 88% |

School Grades History

| Year | 2021-22 | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | C | | C | 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

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Schlarbaum, Stacey | Principal | Instructional Leader on Campus |
| McNair, Pamela | Assistant Principal | Instructional Leader on campus |
| Mitchell, Tarsha | Instructional Coach | SAC Chair |
| Fox, Crystal | Instructional Coach | |
| Sabina, Kristin | Other | RTI Coordinator |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 6/7/2022, Stacey Schlarbaum

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

2

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

33

Total number of students enrolled at the school

520

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

12

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

9

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|---|----|----|----|-----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | | |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 171 | 180 | 169 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 520 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 67 | 88 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 193 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | |
| 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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55 | 51 | 84 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 190 | |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63 | 68 | 91 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 222 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|----|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | | 12 |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/30/2022

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

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

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 | 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 | |

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**School Data Review**

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

| School Grade Component | 2022 | | | 2021 | | | 2019 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 36% | 50% | 50% | | | | 29% | 51% | 54% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 44% | | | | | | 40% | 52% | 54% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 39% | | | | | | 40% | 47% | 47% |
| Math Achievement | 31% | 36% | 36% | | | | 36% | 55% | 58% |
| Math Learning Gains | 49% | | | | | | 48% | 57% | 57% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 61% | | | | | | 46% | 52% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 27% | 52% | 53% | | | | 20% | 47% | 51% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 66% | 58% | 58% | | | | 44% | 67% | 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 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 33% | 53% | -20% | 54% | -21% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 25% | 54% | -29% | 52% | -27% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -33% | | | | |
| 08 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 25% | 53% | -28% | 56% | -31% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -25% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 31% | 49% | -18% | 55% | -24% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 47% | 62% | -15% | 54% | -7% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -31% | | | | |
| 08 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 16% | 31% | -15% | 46% | -30% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -47% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 08 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 19% | 47% | -28% | 48% | -29% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 42% | 67% | -25% | 71% | -29% |
| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |

| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 83% | 63% | 20% | 61% | 22% |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |

Subgroup Data Review

| 2022 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2020-21 | C & C Accel 2020-21 |
| SWD | 17 | 31 | 27 | 17 | 46 | 57 | 8 | | | | |
| ELL | 28 | 43 | 47 | 28 | 49 | 49 | 22 | 58 | 69 | | |
| BLK | 31 | 47 | 38 | 22 | 42 | 65 | 22 | 57 | 71 | | |
| HSP | 38 | 45 | 42 | 35 | 54 | 59 | 27 | 67 | 76 | | |
| MUL | 40 | 38 | | 20 | 43 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 35 | 39 | 33 | 33 | 45 | 60 | 36 | 71 | | | |
| FRL | 35 | 44 | 39 | 30 | 49 | 60 | 26 | 65 | 76 | | |
| 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 | | |
| 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 | | |

ESSA Data Review

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

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|-----|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | TSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 47 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 45 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 473 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 98% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 29 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 3 |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 44 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Native American Students | |
| Federal Index - Native American Students | |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Asian Students | |
| Federal Index - Asian Students | |
| 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 | 44 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| Hispanic Students | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 49 |
| 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 | 35 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| 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 | 44 |
| 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 | 47 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis

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

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

Based on 2022's testing data, Civics (66%) had the highest increase in proficiency. This was a 26 point increase from 2021 and 22 points from 2019. ELA (36%) was slightly higher than Math (31%) in proficiency of students scoring level 3 and above. They both represent an increase from 2021's proficiency data. ELA trends indicate a consistent increase over the last three years in proficiency and in learning gains. Math trends indicate a significant increase in overall student learning gains and bottom quartile gains. Science proficiency decrease by only 1 percentage point from 2021 but showed an increase of 7 percentage points from 2019. Proficiency trends indicate that scores have been lower than most content areas over the last 5 years, even though Civics and ELA have made consistent gains within the same timeframe.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Based on 2022's assessment data, the lowest performing content area was Science with an achievement level of 27% of students scoring proficient. This represents a 1% decrease based on 2021 school data. Though this represents an overall increase of 7% since 2019, scores have been lower than other content areas the past four testing years. Math was the second content area of the lowest performance with 31% proficient. This indicates a 7% increase from 2021. One of the contributing factors to the lower proficiency level in Math is the level of proficiency at the 7th grade level. Only 7% of 7th graders were proficient at math.

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 is the lower level of proficient Math and Reading/ELA scores of students as they enter middle school. 70% of our 8th graders did not show proficiency in ELA. 78% of our 8th graders did not show proficiency in Math. New actions that will be taken to address this improvement would be teachers focusing on standards based lesson planning, preparing collaborative lessons, implementing rigorous informational texts with science curriculum, and progress monitoring students' mastery of standards.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

2022's data showed the bottom quartile in math had the greatest improvement of 30%. In 2021 the data showed 31% of the bottom quartile made gains in math and in 2022, the data showed 61% of the bottom quartile made gains.

2022 data also showed Civics achievement levels improve by 26%.

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

Actions which impacted this increase in math were focused lunch and learns and pull outs for our bottom quartile students. The bottom quartile gains were also impacted by the deepened focus on standards based instruction which used data from the progress monitoring common assessments, reteaching, and extension activities. The students were also impacted by using acceleration strategies with small groups within their normal classroom setting.

Actions which impacted this increase in Civics was an accelerated focus to improving the students mastery of ELA standards. Students who were not proficient in ELA at the 7th grade level participated in target small group lunch and learn sessions to improve the mastery of ELA standards which we feel impacted the improvement of Civics proficiency levels.

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

Implement benchmark based assessments to assess student focus areas and accelerate those areas as needed within every content area.

Use PM1 and PM2 data combined with common unit assessments to determine the level of mastery of benchmarks and pinpoint areas of focus to implement small group and differentiated instruction.

Give Tier 2 students interventions within their core content classes to accelerate the benchmark mastery as needed.

Place Tier 3 and level 1 students in intensive classes to improve understanding and assist in mastery of the grade level benchmarks.

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.

School leaders and teachers will be engaged in professional development throughout the year that focuses on cooperative learning strategies, benchmark/standard based lesson planning, instructional frameworks, and professional learning communities in all content areas that focus on analyzing student assessment data and student work samples, unit planning, 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, and on-site and district level instructional coaches.

Areas of Focus

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

:

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

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

This area of focus was identified as a critical need based on the FSA Math 2022 data results.

A. Grade 6 indicated 35% proficient.

B. Grade 7 indicated 7% proficient.

C. Grade 8 indicated 22% proficient.

D. Math Bottom Quartile from grade 6-8 indicated 61% made learning gains.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Learning gains in the area of Math will increase from 49% to 52%. Grade 6 proficiency will increase from 35% to 38%. Grade 7 proficiency will increase of 7% to 10%. Grade 8 proficiency will increase from 22% to 25%.

Monitoring:

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

Professional Learning Communities
Data Chats
Coaching Cycles
Professional Development
Common Assessments

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stacey Schlarbaum (stacey.schlarbaum@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Differentiated instruction that focuses on Tier 2, Tier 3, and bottom quartile students.
Instructional Frameworks and lunch and learns will be implemented for small group instructional practices that focuses on remediation and acceleration for mastery of grade level standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Data analysis of student improvement showed growth when these strategies are/were incorporated into the math instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

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

Use common assessment data to determine appropriate acceleration strategies and small group instruction.

Person Responsible

Stacey Schlarbaum (stacey.schlarbaum@hcps.net)

Use informal individually based data to determine appropriate instructional framework delivery method.

Person Responsible

Stacey Schlarbaum (stacey.schlarbaum@hcps.net)

Develop instructional activities/lessons/assessments relevant to the benchmark.

Person Responsible

Stacey Schlarbaum (stacey.schlarbaum@hcps.net)

Use ongoing progress monitoring to determine effectiveness of strategies and student progress.

Person Responsible

Stacey Schlarbaum (stacey.schlarbaum@hcps.net)

Enrich and remediate benchmarks with support of instructional coach, resource staff, and instructional leadership team.

Person Responsible Stacey Schlarbaum (stacey.schlarbaum@hcps.net)

Professional Development will be related to content area collaboration techniques, acceleration strategies, and resources.

Person Responsible Stacey Schlarbaum (stacey.schlarbaum@hcps.net)

The objectives and lesson goals will reflect the purpose of instruction identified within the benchmarks.

Person Responsible Stacey Schlarbaum (stacey.schlarbaum@hcps.net)

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

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

This area of focus was identified as a critical need based on the FSA ELA 2022 data results.

A. Grade 6 indicated 43% proficient.

B. Grade 7 indicated 30% proficient.

C. Grade 8 indicated 30% proficient.

D. ELA Bottom Quartile from grade 6-8 indicated 39% made learning gains.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Learning gains in the area of ELA 44% to 47%. Grade 6 proficiency will increase from 43% to 46%. Grade 7 proficiency will increase of 30% to 33%. Grade 8 proficiency will increase from 30% to 33%.

Monitoring:

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

Professional Learning Communities
Data Chats
Coaching Cycles
Professional Development
Common Assessments

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stacey Schlarbaum (stacey.schlarbaum@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Differentiated instruction that focuses on Tier 2, Tier 3, and bottom quartile students.
Instructional Frameworks and lunch and learns will be implemented for small group instructional practices that focuses on remediation and acceleration for mastery of grade level standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Data analysis of student improvement showed growth when these strategies are/were incorporated into the math instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

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

Use common assessment data to determine appropriate small group instruction and acceleration strategies.

Person Responsible

Stacey Schlarbaum (stacey.schlarbaum@hcps.net)

Use informal individually based data to determine appropriate instructional framework delivery method.

Person Responsible

Stacey Schlarbaum (stacey.schlarbaum@hcps.net)

Develop instructional activities/lessons/assessments relevant to the benchmark.

Person Responsible

Stacey Schlarbaum (stacey.schlarbaum@hcps.net)

Use ongoing progress monitoring to determine effectiveness of strategies and student progress.

Person Responsible

Stacey Schlarbaum (stacey.schlarbaum@hcps.net)

Enrich and remediate benchmarks with support of instructional coach, resource staff, and instructional leadership team.

Person Responsible

Stacey Schlarbaum (stacey.schlarbaum@hcps.net)

Professional Development will be related to content area, collaboration techniques, acceleration strategies and resources.

Person Responsible

Stacey Schlarbaum (stacey.schlarbaum@hcps.net)

The objectives and lesson goals will reflect the purpose of instruction identified within the benchmarks.

Person Responsible

Stacey Schlarbaum (stacey.schlarbaum@hcps.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement**Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Increase student performance, enrichment, and acceleration using collaboration strategies. Evidence of academic vocabulary is expected. Clear communication of learning objectives and outcomes should be shared between students within each lesson. Continue the effectiveness of collaborative learning in the classroom to increase student self-esteem and attitude toward learning due to being at home during COVID.

Measurable**Outcome:**

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

Student achievement in ELA, Math, Science, and Civics will increase proficiency by 3% according to the 2023 Florida Assessment Data.

Monitoring:

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

Observations
Learning Walks
Coaching Cycles
Analyzing and disaggregating data at grade level and subject area meetings each month.

Person

responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Collaboration of students is evidenced by ensuring students are engaged in discussions using academic vocabulary that is aligned to the expected complexity of the lesson. Ensuring students can articulate what they are learning and why it is important. Students will be engaged in the tasks to the complexity level of the standard through communication with each other. Students will be collaborating to achieve greater understanding of the material, higher order thinking, and acceleration of benchmarks.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

In collaborative learning, students use their different experiences, backgrounds, and perspectives, to collaborate and gain a greater understanding of the material. Benefits to students learning from group activities include but are not limited to promoting a higher level of thinking, improving communication and leadership skills, providing exposure to different learning styles, and increases students' understanding of diverse perspectives.

Action Steps to Implement

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

Use data to determine appropriate text/strategies to embed in activities.

Person Responsible Stacey Schlarbaum (stacey.schlarbaum@hcps.net)

Develop collaborative lessons relevant to the benchmarks.

Person Responsible Stacey Schlarbaum (stacey.schlarbaum@hcps.net)

Use ongoing progress monitoring to determine effectiveness of collaboration strategies and student progress.

Person Responsible Stacey Schlarbaum (stacey.schlarbaum@hcps.net)

Professional Development on collaboration strategies and resources.

Person Responsible Stacey Schlarbaum (stacey.schlarbaum@hcps.net)

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

N/A

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

N/A

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

N/A

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

N/A

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

N/A

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

N/A

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

N/A

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step**Person Responsible for Monitoring**

N/A

Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students and families of students, volunteers and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services and business partners.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

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 through this year's theme of TEAM: Trust-Equity-Accountability-Maximize. By focusing on these attributes of TEAM during preplanning, we truly engaged in the work needed to develop meaningful and sustainable relationships while working together as one TEAM. We discussed the areas of contention, as well as individual strengths through a strength finders survey 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 school culture and environment.

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 an 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 Canvas, Various district approved social media platforms, and the parent link telephone service to disseminate information to students' homes.