

Orange County Public Schools

Dream Lake Elementary



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	20

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: 6/4/2016

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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

Provide the school's vision statement

With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways that lead our students to success.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
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>

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 6/4/2016, Carol Ann Clenton Martin

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.*

2

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

69

Demographic Data

2020-21 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 .	

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	35	112	130	112	130	134	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	653
Attendance below 90 percent	2	16	27	24	20	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	13	15	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	13	17	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	11	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	10	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	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	12	18	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Saturday 6/27/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

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

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	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	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	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	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
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%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
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				

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
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	
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 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

Learning Gains for the Lowest 25% was the data component that showed the lowest performance in both in the English Language Arts and Math. Factors that may contribute to the lower performance is the diversity of our student population who require highly specialized and differentiated instruction. 75% of our students are minorities, 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

Learning Gains in Math (72% to 68%), was the data component that showed the greatest decline. Factors that may have contributed to this decline were twofold. First, the 5th grade teachers embedded STP PowerPoint 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

Learning Gains for the Lowest 25% in English Language Arts was the data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average (52% as compared to 53%). The key factor 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?

Learning Gains of the Lowest 25% in English Language Arts was the data component that showed the greatest improvement (+14 percentage points). This demonstration of improvement is attributed to the implementation of a systematic approach of responsive progress monitoring and targeted push-in and pull-out instruction with struggling learners by the school's instructional and classified staff.

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

Historically, our students with disabilities have performed lower than our other subgroups.

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%
2. Increase ELA proficiency of Students with Disabilities by 5 percentage points to 42%
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: At Dream Lake, we want to create a culture of continuous improvement by working together to meet the social and emotional needs of our children. The process of developing self-awareness, self-control, and interpersonal skills are vital for school, work, and life success. When social and emotional skills are taught and mastered using evidence-based approaches that connect cognitive and conative strategies our students will be able to demonstrate academic and personal success.

Measureable Outcome: Dream Lake ES will utilize social and emotional learning skills to support academics as demonstrated by an increase in learning proficiency of our students who tested in the Lowest Quartile in Math and ELA. (5 percentage point increase in performance).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Lucy Dorlus (lucy.dorlus@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: We will implement the Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning Core Competencies (CASEL) as the common language that supports a culture of social and emotional learning and continuous improvement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: CASEL’s mission is “to help make evidence-based social and emotional learning (SEL) an integral part of education by helping students "manage own emotions and recognize what is happening inside them and think about a situation before acting. SEL Core Competencies create the conditions for learning to happen. Establishing supportive environments and relationships enhance how students interact with one another and the content. When students participate in social emotional learning, there is an overall increase in students performance on standardized tests and a decrease in aggressive behaviors and emotional stress.

Action Steps to Implement

- We will begin the implementation of SEL by:
1. Identifying and providing professional development for the School-based Student Services Team who will be the first point of contact for teachers and students to offer support as we develop a school-wide SEL community. This team will include the School Counselor, Admin, and Behavior Specialist.
 2. Ensure staff participation in SEL professional development
 3. Collaboratively pan and implement lessons that incorporate social emotional learning.

Person Responsible Lucy Dorlus (lucy.dorlus@ocps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Although learning gains for the lowest quartile in English Language Arts increased by 14%, the score was still below state level. Additionally, the Students with Disabilities subgroup (SWD), performed significantly lower than the average scores of the other five subgroups (40 percentage points compared to an average of 55%).

Measureable Outcome: There will be a five percentage point increase in the learning gains of the Lowest 25th percentile in all subgroups (from 52 to 57%) including our Students with Disabilities (from 40 to 45% proficient).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jessica Powell (jessica.powell@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: The instructional strategy of differentiation as guided by a variety of purposeful and effective progress monitoring strategies including Unify for summative assessments, iReady, Fountas and Pinnell Leveled Literacy intervention (use of Literably as the assessment tool), and Reading Plus (reading fluency, vocabulary and comprehension intervention).

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: When teachers/coaches consistently monitor classroom progress they are able to analyze and interpret the data, resulting in the ability to be responsive to students needs by planning and adjusting their instruction based on those needs in a timely manner. Additionally, the consistent monitoring of students during intervention allows for timely adjustments to be made to their intervention program to meet their needs as indicated by progress or the lack of.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Progress monitoring data for each student will be housed in the Data Matrix on the grade levels Google Drive and individual student data cards will be maintained and updated in the teachers' area of instruction

Person Responsible Jessica Powell (jessica.powell@ocps.net)

2. Implementation of the Instructional Focus Calendar with committed dates for Standards based explicit and well-paced instruction, and progress monitoring through the use of common formative and summative assessment to monitor student proficiency.

Person Responsible Jessica Powell (jessica.powell@ocps.net)

3. Small group instruction that is differentiated based on identified needs for foundational skills, priority standards and prerequisite standards and supported by the coaches and resource teachers.

Person Responsible Jessica Powell (jessica.powell@ocps.net)

5. ESE Resource Teachers and Paraprofessionals will push in to support and monitor the progress of our SWD throughout the day.

Person Responsible Kelli Biaggi (kelli.biaggi@ocps.net)

Additional Information

Additional information regarding this instructional practice can be found in the Instructional Practice Guide (IPG) for this practice.

For more information on this instructional practice, please contact the Instructional Practice Guide (IPG) team at ipg@ocps.net.

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Learning gains in Math declined from 72% to 68%, while learning gains for the lowest quartile declined by two percent to 53%. This decline was especially noted in the 5th grade as well as by the performance of the Students with Disabilities subgroup (SWD), who performed significantly lower than the average scores of the other five subgroups (23 percentage points compared to an average of 54%).

Measurable Outcome: There will be a five percentage point increase in the learning gains of the Lowest 25th percentile resulting in 58% learning gains.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Leslie O'Dell (34688@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will implement effective instructional strategies and purposeful progress monitoring of student achievement throughout the school year. The instructional strategy of differentiation as guided by a variety of purposeful and effective progress monitoring strategies will include the use of Unify for summative assessments, iReady, ST Math, and District instructional math resources.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: When teachers/coaches consistently monitor classroom progress they are able to plan, adjust and differentiate their instruction based on demonstrated individual student needs in a time manner. Additionally, the consistent monitoring of students during intervention allows for timely adjustments to be made to their intervention program to meet their needs as indicated by progress or the lack of.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Progress monitoring data for each student will be housed in the Data Matrix on the grade levels Google Drive and individual student data cards will be maintained and updated in the teachers' area of instruction.

Person Responsible Leslie O'Dell (34688@ocps.net)

2. Implementation of the Instructional Focus Calendar with committed dates for Standards based explicit and well paced instruction, and progress monitoring through the use of common formative and summative assessment to monitor student proficiency.

Person Responsible Leslie O'Dell (34688@ocps.net)

3. Small group instruction that is differentiated based on identified needs for foundational skills, priority standards and prerequisite standards and supported by the coaches and resource teachers.

Person Responsible Leslie O'Dell (34688@ocps.net)

4. ESE Resource Teachers and Paraprofessionals will push in to support and monitor the progress of our SWD throughout the day.

Person Responsible Kelli Biaggi (kelli.biaggi@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Historically our students with disabilities have performed significantly lower than all other subgroups at our school.

Our ESSA data supports this trend, as the only subgroup who performed below the Federal Index of 41% in the 2018-2019 school year, were our students with disabilities (40%). Leadership will focus on these students increasing their ELA proficiency of Students with Disabilities by 5 percentage points to 42% This will be accomplished by direct involvement of leadership in ensuring differentiation of classroom instruction through ongoing progress monitoring and responsive and timely monitoring of Tier 3 intervention.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

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

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

In order to establish a positive school culture and climate, our school will engage in ongoing, district-wide professional learning on leveraging social and emotional learning as well as leadership for student success. Using a distributive leadership model, we will use social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise in all students. Dream Lake will implement the CASEL Framework, which is a "systemic approach to SEL intentionally cultivating a caring, participatory, and equitable learning environment and evidence-based practices that actively involve all students in their social, emotional, and academic growth. This approach infuses social and emotional learning into every part of students' daily lives—across all of their classrooms, during all times of the school day, and when they are in their homes and communities." (CASEL, 2017)

At Dream Lake, all stakeholders must work together to meet the social and emotional needs of our children. We will use the CASEL Core Competencies as a common language to support a positive culture of social and emotional learning. When social and emotional skills are taught and mastered using evidence-based approaches that connect cognitive and conative strategies to support student success, our students will be able to succeed not just in school, but in all avenues of life.

A core team of teachers and administrators from our school including our school counselor

(School based Student Services Team), will attend district-wide professional learning throughout the year. This core team will then work with a broader school team, personalizing and implementing professional learning for all school stakeholders, based on school and community needs. School leadership teams will collaborate with stakeholders, through processes such as the School Advisory Council, to reflect on implementation and determine next steps. Development of positive culture and environment is further enhanced through district programs such as the Parent Academy. Our school will utilize our staff, including the Parent Engagement Liaison to bridge the community and school culture.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget			
1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
			Total: \$0.00