

Orange County Public Schools

Dream Lake Elementary



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	8
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	20
Budget to Support Goals	0

Dream Lake Elementary

800 N WELLS ST, Apopka, FL 32712

<https://dreamlakees.ocps.net/>

Demographics

Principal: Carol Ann Clenton Martin

Start Date for this Principal: 7/30/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	95%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (61%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: C (48%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
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 Orange 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	8
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	20
Budget to Support Goals	0

Dream Lake Elementary

800 N WELLS ST, Apopka, FL 32712

<https://dreamlakees.ocps.net/>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served
(per MSID File)

Elementary School
PK-5

2018-19 Title I School

No

2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate
(as reported on Survey 3)

95%

Primary Service Type
(per MSID File)

K-12 General Education

Charter School

No

2018-19 Minority Rate
(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)

75%

School Grades History

Year Grade	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
	B	B	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Orange 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 lead our students to success with the support and involvement of families and their community.

Provide the school's vision statement

To be the top producer of successful students in the nation.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Clenton-Martin, Carol-Ann	Principal	Administrator - serves as an instructional leader. Creates the vision for the staff and all stakeholders. Assists and observes teachers with data based decision making skills to ensure all students are meeting or exceeding expectations. Meets with teachers to discuss progress monitoring of students in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III. Also supports teachers with changing/ enhancing instructional strategies based on data to meet the needs of each student.
Biaggi, Kelli	Teacher, ESE	Ms. Biaggi works alongside the MTSS Coach and the ESOL Compliance Specialist to identify and analyze existing literature on scientifically based curriculum and intervention programs and then systematically match these programs and instructional strategies to the individual needs of the students. They support the teachers' implementation of these resources and intervention materials in small, intensive and/or specialized group instruction through modeling, coaching and feedback. They monitor student progress and in response, may pull small groups or individual students to ensure each student gets what they need.
Craft, Cynthia	Instructional Coach	As an instructional coach, Ms. Craft collaborates with the other instructional coaches to facilitate and evaluate content standards and instruction by providing guidance on the K-12 reading and math plan components. They support classroom teachers by coaching them on best practices and leading common planning in the areas of expertise. Additionally, they facilitate whole school screening programs that provide intervention services for those considered to be "at risk" while implementing progress monitoring through the systematic collection and analysis of data, ensuring the implementation of the MTSS Intervention plan. In response, as the needs of the students and teachers are identified, professional development is designed, presented, and supported.
Farran, Angel	Instructional Media	Our Media Specialist supports District and school wide initiatives implemented by the leadership and instructional staff. As a leader in the use of technology, she is the contact person for the DCTL, and coordinator for all digital media. She provides professional development on the use of digital devices for teachers, students and parents. In addition to supporting digital learning throughout the school, she facilitates several reading programs including Sunshine State Reader, Accelerated Reading, and Battle of the Books.
O'Dell, Leslie	Instructional Coach	As an instructional coach, Ms. O'Dell collaborates with the other instructional coaches to facilitate and evaluate content standards and instruction by providing guidance on the K-12

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<p>reading and math plan components. They support classroom teachers by coaching them on best practices and leading common planning in the areas of expertise. Additionally, they facilitate whole school screening programs that provide intervention services for those considered to be “at risk” while implementing progress monitoring through the systematic collection and analysis of data, ensuring the implementation of the MTSS Intervention plan. In response, as the needs of the students and teachers are identified, professional development is designed, presented, and supported need.</p>
Pruitt, Amy	Other	<p>As the Staffing Specialist, Ms. Pruitt ensures that Dream Lake is compliant in meeting the needs as identified by Quality IEPs and EPs by providing professional development for ESE and Gifted teachers in writing IEPs and EPs that are compliant with current district rules and procedures. She also participates in the decision making for intervention/enrichment, collaborating with the MTSS coach and 504 Coordinator at Problem Solving, eligibility and IEP meetings to ensure that all struggling students have plans in place.</p>
Pinchevsky, Terri	Assistant Principal	<p>Administrator - serves as an instructional leader. Assists and observes teachers with data based decision making skills to ensure all students are meeting or exceeding expectations. Meets with teachers to discuss progress monitoring of students in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III. Also supports teachers with changing/enhancing instructional strategies based on data to meet the needs of each student.</p>
Powell, Jessica	Instructional Coach	<p>As an instructional coach, Ms. Powell collaborates with the other instructional coaches to facilitate and evaluate content standards and instruction by providing guidance on the K-12 reading and math plan components. They support classroom teachers by coaching them on best practices and leading common planning in the areas of expertise. Additionally, they facilitate whole school screening programs that provide intervention services for those considered to be “at risk” while implementing progress monitoring through the systematic collection and analysis of data, ensuring the implementation of the MTSS Intervention plan. In response, as the needs of the students and teachers are identified, professional development is designed, presented, and supported need.</p>

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	130	116	117	149	129	142	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	783
Attendance below 90 percent	26	20	15	16	11	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103
One or more suspensions	0	4	3	4	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Course failure in ELA or Math	6	9	10	22	5	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	44	28	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111

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	2	3	4	21	11	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66

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	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

57

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/30/2019

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
Attendance below 90 percent	24	18	16	13	15	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	10	3	7	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	33	32	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104

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	7	2	7	12	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36

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
Attendance below 90 percent	24	18	16	13	15	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	10	3	7	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	33	32	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104

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	7	2	7	12	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36

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	60%	57%	57%	53%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	60%	58%	58%	50%	55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	52%	53%	38%	48%	48%
Math Achievement	71%	63%	63%	68%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains	68%	61%	62%	72%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	48%	51%	55%	46%	47%
Science Achievement	65%	56%	53%	53%	55%	55%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	130 (0)	116 (0)	117 (0)	149 (0)	129 (0)	142 (0)	783 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	26 (24)	20 (18)	15 (16)	16 (13)	11 (15)	15 (9)	103 (95)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	4 (0)	3 (0)	4 (1)	10 (0)	12 (1)	33 (2)
Course failure in ELA or Math	6 (0)	9 (10)	10 (3)	22 (7)	5 (1)	26 (7)	78 (28)

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	44 (33)	28 (32)	39 (39)	111 (104)

Grade Level Data

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

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	58%	55%	3%	58%	0%
	2018	51%	55%	-4%	57%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	53%	57%	-4%	58%	-5%
	2018	59%	54%	5%	56%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	59%	54%	5%	56%	3%
	2018	44%	55%	-11%	55%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	64%	62%	2%	62%	2%
	2018	64%	61%	3%	62%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	72%	63%	9%	64%	8%
	2018	76%	62%	14%	62%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
05	2019	65%	57%	8%	60%	5%
	2018	58%	59%	-1%	61%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	64%	54%	10%	53%	11%
	2018	50%	53%	-3%	55%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison						

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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	38	55	40	44	45	23	36				
ELL	55	53	62	72	76	62	50				
BLK	56	57	53	70	71	50	48				
HSP	58	62	53	71	72	67	67				
WHT	68	65	54	71	63	33	79				
FRL	55	58	54	68	71	59	61				

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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	31	35	24	38	30	15	43				
ELL	39	49	50	58	71	67	43				
BLK	47	51	41	63	75	56	46				
HSP	53	52	44	68	71	67	58				
WHT	59	46	19	71	71	35	52				
FRL	50	48	36	65	70	52	51				

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	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	59
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	488
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	61
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners 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	58
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	64
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students 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
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

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	62
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	60
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

The data component that showed the lowest performance was both in the English Language Arts and Math Learning Gains for the Lowest 25%. It should be noted that the ELA component of the Lowest 25% did increase by 14% (to 52%); however, the Math component declined by 2% (to 53%). Factors that may contribute to the lower performance is diversity of our student population who require highly specialized and differentiated instruction. 75% of our student are minorities (47% are ELL), and 95% of our students are Free/Reduced Lunch eligible.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline was the Mathematics Learning Gains which declined from 72% to 68%. Factors that contributed to this decline were twofold. First, the 5th grade teachers embedded STO PowerPoint during instruction. This was adjusted, but only after the first 9 weeks. Second, Interventions for our lowest 30% in Math did not begin until 2nd Semester.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends

The data component that had the only negative gap when compared to the state average was English Language Arts Learning Gains for the Lowest 25% by 1% (52% compared to 53%). Factors that contributed to this gap was the need for a highly structured Tier 3 support process for our Students With Disabilities during Interventions.

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

The data component showing the most improvement was English Language Arts Learning Gains of the Lowest 25% (+14 percentage points). Dream Lake attributes the increase in academic achievement to the implementation of a systematic approach of responsive progress monitoring and targeted push-in and pull-out instruction with struggling learners by school instructional and classified staff.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

An area of concern would be 103 students (13%) whose attendance was below 90%, and the 111 students that scored a level 1 on the FSA in ELA or math.

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

1. Increase Math proficiency by 5 percentage points to 76%
2. Increase ELA proficiency by 5 percentage points to 65%
3. Increase students with disabilities ELA proficiency by 5 percentage points to 42%
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Increase Learning Gains for the lowest Quartile in Math
Rationale	The Mathematics Learning Gains declined from 72% to 68% while the Math Learning Gains of the lowest 25% declined by two percent to 53%. This decline was especially noted in 5th grade as well as in the Students with Disabilities subgroup performed significantly lower than the average scores of the five other subgroups (23 percentage points compared to an average of 54 percentage points).
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	There will be a 5 percentage point increase in Math performance of the Lowest 25th percentile resulting in 58% learning gains.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jessica Powell (jessica.powell@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers will implement effective instructional strategies and purposeful progress monitoring of student achievement throughout the school year based on the Florida math standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Data analysis will provide a snapshot of what student know, what they should know, and what they need. With appropriate analysis and interpretation of data that is responsive to students' academic needs, teachers will make informed decision as to instructional strategies that will have a positive impact on student outcomes.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Instructional Coaches will plan and deliver professional development on effective/purposeful progress monitoring strategies including the use of Unify for Summative Assessments, iReady and ST Math reports. 2. Teachers will utilize common planning time to create lessons that build upon effective progress monitoring strategies with the support of the Instructional Coaches. 3. Teachers will implement planned lessons based on clearly defined learning goals and use systematic, explicit and well-paced instruction and use common assessments to progress monitor student mastery of the standards addressed throughout the instruction. 4. Teachers will frequently monitor their students' progress and adjust instruction accordingly with the support from the Instructional Coaches. 5. Teachers will provide remediation and enrichment opportunities, ensuring that students have many opportunities to practice, respond and receive immediate corrective feedback as needed by teachers and peers. 6. ESE Resource Teachers and Paraprofessionals will push in to support and monitor progress of SWD throughout the day (BPIE)
Person Responsible	Jessica Powell (jessica.powell@ocps.net)

#2	
Title	Increase Learning Gains for the lowest Quartile in English Language Arts
Rationale	Although Learning Gains for the Lowest 25th Percentile increased by 14%, they were still one percentage point below state level. The Students with Disabilities subgroup (SWD) performed significantly lower than the average scores of the five other subgroups.(40 percentage points compared to an average of 55%).
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	There will be a 5 percentage point increase in English Language Arts performance of the Lowest 25th percentile in all subgroups resulting in 57% learning gains including SWD (from 40 to 45% proficient).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Leslie O'Dell (34688@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers will implement effective reading and writing strategies and systematically monitor student achievement throughout the school year using various instructional and intervention materials/resources to support student needs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	With appropriate analysis and interpretation of data that is reflective of and responsive to students' academic needs, teachers can make informed decisions as to which instructional strategies will have a positive impact on student outcomes.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Instructional Coaches will plan and deliver professional development on effective/purposeful progress monitoring strategies including the use of Unify for Summative Assessments, iReady and various intervention resources including Fountas and Pinnell's Leveled Literacy intervention and Reading Plus (SWD). 2. The DPLC team members will support an increased focus on writing instruction and strategies (in response to Text Dependent questions) based on the District Professional Learning Community sessions as well as provide PD support for the implementation of Core Connections in grades 4-5. 3. Teachers will frequently monitoring their students' progress and adjust instruction accordingly with the support of the Instructional Coaches. 4. Teachers will provide remediation and enrichment opportunities ensuring that students have many opportunities to practice, respond and receive immediate corrective feedback as needed by teachers and peers. 5.ESE Resource Teachers and Paraprofessionals will push in to support and monitor progress of SWD throughout the day (BPIE).
Person Responsible	Leslie O'Dell (34688@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information)

Dream Lake Elementary School will provide opportunities where teachers, administrators and students can safely communicate and address their own personal implicit and explicit biases. All subgroups demonstrate achievement below the White subgroup. The use of CHAMPs a positive behavioral management system from Randy Sprick's Safe and Civil Schools will be implemented school-wide to help ensure consistency of behavioral expectations, increase communication and problem solving, as well as de-escalate situations in a safe learning environment.

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students

Dream Lake takes pride in building positive relationships with all stakeholders who play a vital role in the success of our students. We provide both internal and external activities and events that strengthen these relationships throughout the school year. Some of these activities include Title 1 Annual Parent Meeting, Quarterly Curriculum Night, Report Card Conferences and monthly parent workshops conducted by our Parent Engagement Liaison (PEL). Our PEL is our main point of contact for parents to receive resources, support and information about activities that engage parents and families. Our doors are open to the community through the implementation of activities during and after school that community members and organizations can volunteer to support as a Partner in Education as well as an ADDitions Volunteer.

PFEP Link

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

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services

Dream Lake's goal is to work collaboratively with staff, parents, and the community by creating a learning environment that fosters the academic and social needs of all students as we prepare them be successful. This is achieved through a multifaceted approach facilitated by the school's guidance counselor and behavior specialist.

The use of Sanford Harmo's Social Emotional Learning used within various classroom contexts and Class Dojo (Growth Mindset) is focused on:

Goal 1: Developing self-awareness and self-management skills to achieve school and life success.

Goal 2: Using social-awareness and interpersonal skills to establish and maintain positive relationships.

Goal 3: Demonstrating decision-making skills/responsible behaviors in personal, school, and community contexts.

In addition to Social Emotional Lessons (Tier 1), classroom guidance lessons are focused on character education, as well as bullying prevention, safety, drug awareness and test taking strategies.

Referrals for mental health services, parenting services and community agencies are also made available as well as individual and group counseling based on identified need.

Mentoring by both faculty members as well as from the community often provide support for our struggling students who require additional positive adult interaction.

Other programs and schoolwide initiatives such as Red Ribbon week, PEACE week, Diversity Awareness and Growth Mindset are just a few that help and promote the social emotional well being of our students.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another

Currently Dream Lake runs two Voluntary Pre-Kindergarten (VPK) programs on our campus. DLE is a cluster site for students who are identified as being Developmentally Delayed (DD). Children as young as three years old can be serviced in our program both half and full day in our Exceptional Student Education (ESE) VPK program.

Our VPK classes are held in the morning and afternoon. Each session services up to 20 students, who do not always live in our attendance zone. In the spring, local VPK programs can visit our school with their children and tour the campus. We have done this for the last four years to prepare students for starting Kindergarten in the fall. Incoming Kindergartners are screened with the Florida Kindergarten Readiness Screener (FLKRS) / Early Child Hood Observation System (ECHOS) within the first 30 days of school.

In the spring current grade level instructors meet with upper grade level instructors to form tentative upper grade classrooms for the upcoming school year. Academic levels, behavior, ELL needs, ESE needs, gender, learning styles, personality, and race are considered when classroom rosters are being built. Each year the DLE principal communicates with the receiving middle school principal the needs of the rising sixth grade students. 5th grade students have an opportunity to visit the middle school and meet with counselors for information.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact

We have a school-based MTSS Leadership Team. This team consists of Principal, Assistant Principal, General Education Teachers, Exceptional Student Education Teachers, Instructional Coaches, Reading Instructional Specialist, School Psychologist, Speech Language Pathologist and Student Service Personnel.

The grade level PLCs meet weekly to review the data including Universal screening data linked to instructional decisions; ongoing data monitoring on grade and classroom level to

identify students who are meeting/exceeding academic goals; identifying those students who are at moderate or high risk for not meeting academic goals. Professional development is planned and resources assigned accordingly. The team will collaborate and share effective practices and practice new processes and skills. Each team systematically works towards common goals through coordination of the leadership team.

Title II funds provide professional development in i-Ready (math and reading). Data is monitored by teachers as students work throughout the year. Leadership reviews the data weekly; meeting with teachers to discuss their data monthly; the goal is to increase proficiency of students in both math and reading in every Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO) for all subgroups.

Professional development activities directly support our reading and math goals found in the SIP. Student skills are monitored on i-Ready and teachers use this data to assign coursework, plan small group instruction, and ensure individualized instruction to increase student achievement in math and reading focused on learning gains for the Lowest 25%, ELL and ESE Subgroup.

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Funds that are provided to Dream Lake Elementary are used to support a behavior specialist and four one-to-one paraprofessionals. With Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) Funds, Dream Lake Elementary provides an after school tutoring program in Reading and Math. Ten Reading teachers work three days a week for an hour after school with small groups of third, fourth and fifth graders.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations

Dream Lake actively seeks to secure Partners in Education that can contribute to the school with a focus on STEM. In addition, most of our Partners in Education support Dream Lakes in the promotion of instruction aligned with the Florida Standards, for example, Curriculum Nights which are designed to strengthen and extend what is being taught in the classroom.