

Orange County Public Schools

Dream Lake Elementary



2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	3
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	10
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	13

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

2017-18
 B

2016-17
 C

2015-16
 C

2014-15
 B*

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 communities.

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
Clenton-Martin, Carol-Ann	Principal
Biaggi, Kelli	Teacher, ESE
Craft, Cynthia	Instructional Coach
Farran, Angel	Instructional Media
Murray, Maria	Assistant Principal
O'Dell, Leslie	Instructional Coach
Pruitt, Amy	Other
Powell, Jessica	Other

Duties

Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making

The leadership team at Dream Lake Elementary serves as instructional leaders with a common practice of shared decision making. Within the leadership team, there is a Principal, Assistant Principal, Curriculum Resource Teacher/Instructional Coach, MTSS Coach, Reading Coach, Staffing Specialist, ESE Resource Teacher and Media Specialist. Within the shared decision making process, the Principal and Assistant Principal provide a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing rigorous instruction, monitors instruction for rigor and high yield strategies, monitors implementation of intervention and enrichment support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support implementation of goals and strategies, and communicates with teachers, parents, and stakeholders the direction and purpose of the school.

As part of the team of Instructional Coaches, the (MTSS) Coach develops, leads and evaluates school core content standards/ programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches, identifies systematic patterns of student need to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies, assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervention services for children to be considered "at risk", assists in

the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection and data analysis, participates in the design and delivery of professional development; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring.

Within the school-based instructional leadership team, the Reading Coach provides guidance on the K-12 reading plan, facilitates and supports data collection activities, assists in data analysis, provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data-based instructional planning; supports the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention plan.

To address all needs of the student, the Staffing Specialist, and MTSS Coach participate in the collection, interpretation, and analysis of data within the MTSS model to determine the possible need for eligibility determination of ESE services, facilitates in the development of intervention plans, provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation, provides professional development and technical assistance for problem-solving activities including data collection, data analysis, intervention, planning and program evaluation, and facilitates data-based decision making activities.

To support the instructional leadership team and teachers, the Media Specialist collaborates with classroom teacher in designing, implementing and evaluating instruction, establishes a media program that encourages a variety of materials and activities to stimulate learning and to develop students' skills in reading, writing, listening, evaluating and communicating, promotes state and local reading contests to encourage reading such as Sunshine State Reader, Accelerated Reading, Battle of the Books, and promotes the use of technology for students and faculty.

Early Warning Systems

Year 2017-18

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 identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students exhibiting two or more indicators		0	7	2	7	12	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	36

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	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected
 Thursday 7/26/2018

Year 2016-17 - 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	15	21	12	20	19	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114
One or more suspensions	3	4	8	1	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in ELA or Math	8	11	1	16	4	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	26	43	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	2	4	2	16	11	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64

Year 2016-17 - 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	15	21	12	20	19	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114
One or more suspensions	3	4	8	1	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in ELA or Math	8	11	1	16	4	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	26	43	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	2	4	2	16	11	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

Assessment & Analysis

Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?

Our lowest performing category is ELA lowest 25%. Which is a three year trend. During this 3 year period the proficiency and learning gains have been on a decline followed by an increase this past year from 36% in 2017 to 38% in 2018.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

The greatest decline was in science. The science overall score declined from 57% to 53% (-4). These are comparisons from 2016-17 to 2017-18 school year.

Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?

The data component that had the biggest gap when compared to the state average was in Math Learning Gains, but in a positive way. All 3 of our math categories out performed the state average, with our biggest gap being in Math Learning Gains. A 13 point gap with the State 59% and School 72%.

Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?

The data component which showed the most improvement was the Math Lowest 25% data. Math Lowest 25% increased from 37% to 55% (+18). This is a comparison from 2016-17 to 2017-18 school year. This is not a trend as Math Lowest 25% has declined consistently from 2014-15 to the 2016-17 school year.

Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area

During the 2017-2018 school year one major change was that we monitored standards based assessments, math small groups, math interventions. With strategic planning during PLCs there was a focus on the understanding and implementation of the standards while ensure the assessments met the rigor of the standards as well. During data meetings the assessment results were analyzed to implement small groups.

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	2018			2017		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	53%	56%	56%	53%	54%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	50%	55%	55%	51%	58%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	48%	48%	36%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	68%	63%	62%	67%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	72%	57%	59%	58%	64%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	55%	46%	47%	37%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	53%	55%	55%	57%	50%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Attendance below 90 percent	24 (15)	18 (21)	16 (12)	13 (20)	15 (19)	9 (27)	95 (114)
One or more suspensions	0 (3)	0 (4)	0 (8)	1 (1)	0 (2)	1 (5)	2 (23)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (8)	10 (11)	3 (1)	7 (16)	1 (4)	7 (31)	28 (71)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	33 (26)	32 (43)	39 (46)	104 (115)

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	2018	51%	55%	-4%	57%	-6%
	2017	63%	57%	6%	58%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	59%	54%	5%	56%	3%
	2017	44%	57%	-13%	56%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2018	44%	55%	-11%	55%	-11%
	2017	48%	51%	-3%	53%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2018	64%	61%	3%	62%	2%
	2017	66%	63%	3%	62%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	76%	62%	14%	62%	14%
	2017	64%	64%	0%	64%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
05	2018	58%	59%	-1%	61%	-3%
	2017	62%	56%	6%	57%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2018	50%	53%	-3%	55%	-5%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	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				

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	5	21	26	17	33	32	12				
ELL	33	35	26	57	52	20	24				
BLK	57	54	30	67	57		61				
HSP	50	50	30	66	59	33	47				
MUL	40			60							
WHT	57	49	40	67	53	48	71				
FRL	47	48	33	62	59	38	50				

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

Areas of Focus:

Activity #1	
Title	Dream Lake Elementary will increase proficiency in all subgroups in ELA and Math.
Rationale	Overall score for ELA proficiency stayed the same from 2016-17 to 2017-18 at 53%. Overall Math proficiency went up 1% from 67% to 68% from the 2016-2017 to 2017-18 assessment.
Intended Outcome	By increasing the rigor of standards-based instruction in the core curriculum proficiency in ELA will increase from 53% to 59% and proficiency in Math will increase from 68% to 75%.
Point Person	Carol-Ann Clenton-Martin (carol-ann.clenton-martin@ocps.net)
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide teachers with common planning time facilitated by a leadership team member to build standards-based ELA lesson. (Craft, O'Dell, Powell) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Teachers will be provided with three additional common planning days designed and facilitated by the school-based leadership team. (Craft, O'Dell, Powell) - Teams will create an instructional focus calendar for ELA and Math in all grade levels. - PLCs will understand and implement standards based instruction and assessments. (Martin/Murray) 2. DPLC team members will facilitate the growth and development of teachers with understanding the close reading strategies will increase engagement of all students through rigorous discussion and responding to text dependent questions. (DPLC Team) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide teachers with professional development on close reads and responding to text dependent questions (DPLC Team) - DPLC will review professional learning from previous year to design a PD for all teachers (DPLC Team) 3. Instructional monitoring, feedback and coaching will occur based on student data trends and observational data. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Leadership will create a monitoring schedule to provide feedback regarding effective implementation of standards-based instruction. - Admin team will collaborate to analyze data and tier teachers for targeted coaching support. - Monitor students data weekly with a strategic focus on student subgroups. - Professional development opportunities will be offered to all staff member based on areas for growth. (Sample topics: academic notebooks, instructional best practices, Thinking Maps. etc.). 4. Implement a Culturally Responsive School Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Establish a House System for building diverse relationships within the school and the community. - Empower students to share thoughts, integrating diverse work and study practices, understanding student learning needs and styles, and emulating culturally-significant instruction styles.
Person Responsible	Leslie O'Dell (34688@ocps.net)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

Principal, AP and Instructional Coaches will attend grade-level common planning sessions weekly. During this time, lesson plan development will be monitored to ensure standards-based instruction is planned. Feedback will be provided to teachers in the moment as lessons are being planned and when final drafts are posted. Monitor assessment data with data matrices.

The leadership team will monitor the implementation of the lessons in the classroom by using a common walkthrough tool. The leadership team will calibrate scoring to ensure consistent high-expectations. This calibration will take place in leadership meetings (twice a month). Teachers will be provided with actionable feedback from the classroom walkthroughs that focus on the implementation of capacity and historical data. (Tier 1 - proficient teachers, Tier II - emerging teachers, Tier III - new to teaching, new to the school, teachers who need more support) Tier I teachers will receive at least 1 classroom walkthroughs a month with feedback. Tier II teachers will receive at least 3 classroom walkthroughs a month. Tier III teachers will receive at least 4 classroom walkthroughs a month with feedback.

Description

The principal will monitor the frequency of classroom walkthroughs to ensure the data being collected is a fair representation of classroom instruction in core subjects. The principal will also monitor the feedback being provided to teachers by the leadership team to ensure consistent expectations are being communicated in a specific and actionable format.

i-Ready diagnostic data will analyzed three times (BOY, MOY, EOY) throughout the school year. Teachers and members of the leadership team will analyze the data for predicted proficiency and students growth.

Agendas and sign-in sheets during professional development and PLCs.

Person Responsible

Maria Murray (maria.murray@ocps.net)

Activity #2

Title	Dream Lake Elementary will increase ELA learning gains and learning gains in the lowest 25%.
Rationale	Overall score for ELA learning gains had a 1% drop from 51% to 50% and ELA learning gains in the lowest 25% only had an increase of 2%, from 36% to 38%, from the 2016-17 to 2017-18 assessment.
Intended Outcome	By increasing student engagement learning gains in ELA will increase from 50% to 57% and our lowest 25% will increase from 38% to 45%.
Point Person	Carol-Ann Clenton-Martin (carol-ann.clenton-martin@ocps.net)

Action Step

Description	<p>Implement research based interventions with fidelity starting on the first day of school. (Classroom Teachers)</p> <p>Purchase additional Early Intervention in Reading (EIR) kits for grades 1, 2, and 3 and Level Literacy Intervention (LLI) kits for grades 4 and 5 to support intervention for selected students. (Martin)</p> <p>Incorporate writing to learn in grades K-5 utilizing Write Score for 4th grade specifically to monitor student growth. (Powell)</p> <p>Provide tutoring on Tuesdays and Thursdays for select students. (Ramirez)</p> <p>Create clubs to be a part of tutoring for students selected for tutoring. (Murray)</p> <p>Develop an incentive program to promote and encourage literacy. (Farran)</p> <p>Promote math and science clubs that provide enrichment opportunities for students.</p>
Person Responsible	Maria Murray (maria.murray@ocps.net)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

Description	<p>Using the MTSS process to ensure that students are making adequate growth and what adjustments will need to be made based on student outcomes. Student iReady minutes and pass rate will be monitored weekly by classroom teachers and school leadership.</p> <p>Student common assessment data will be monitored weekly by classroom teachers.</p> <p>Classroom teachers will update student data cards quarterly.</p> <p>Student diagnostic data will be monitored at BOY, MOY and EOY.</p> <p>Attendance of students selected for tutoring will be closely monitored to earn incentive. (Murray/Ramirez)</p>
Person Responsible	Jessica Powell (jessica.powell@ocps.net)

Part V: Budget

Total:	\$22,300.00
---------------	--------------------