2013-2014 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Dream Lake Elementary
500 N PARK AVE
Apopka, FL 32712
407-884-2227

School Demographics

School Type	Title I	Free and Reduced Lunch Rate
Elementary School	No	69%

Alternative/ESE Center	Charter School	Minority Rate
No	No	66%

School Grades History

2013-14	2012-13	2011-12	2010-11	2009-10
A	B	A	A	A

SIP Authority and Template

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district.

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, as marked by citations to the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or with a grade of F within the prior two years. For all other schools, the district may use a template of its choosing. All districts must submit annual assurances that their plans meet statutory requirements.

This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridacims.org. Sections marked "N/A" by the user and any performance data representing fewer than 10 students or educators have been excluded from this document.

Table of Contents

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. A corollary at the district level is the District Improvement and Assistance Plan (DIAP), designed to help district leadership make the necessary connections between school and district goals in order to align resources. 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: Current School Status

Part I summarizes school leadership, staff qualifications and strategies for recruiting, mentoring and retaining strong teachers. The school's Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) is described in detail to show how data is used by stakeholders to understand the needs of all students and allocate appropriate resources in proportion to those needs. The school also summarizes its efforts in a few specific areas, such as its use of increased learning time and strategies to support literacy, preschool transition and college and career readiness.

Part II: Expected Improvements

Part II outlines school performance data in the prior year and sets numeric targets for the coming year in ten areas:

1. Reading
2. Writing
3. Mathematics
4. Science
5. Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM)
6. Career and Technical Education (CTE)
7. Social Studies
8. Early Warning Systems (EWS)
9. Parental Involvement
10. Other areas of concern to the school

With this overview of the current state of the school in mind and the outcomes they hope to achieve, the planning team engages in an 8-Step Planning and Problem-Solving Process, through which they define and refine their goals (Step 1), identify and prioritize problems (barriers) keeping them from reaching those goals (Steps 2-3), design a plan to help them implement strategies to resolve those barriers (Steps 4-7), and determine how they will monitor progress toward each goal (Step 8).

Part III: Coordination and Integration

Part III is required for Title I schools and describes how federal, state and local funds are coordinated and integrated to ensure student needs are met.

Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support Goals

Appendix 1 is the professional development plan, which outlines any training or support needed for stakeholders to meet the goals.

Appendix 2: Budget to Support Goals

Appendix 2 is the budget needed to implement the strategies identified in the plan.

Differentiated Accountability

Florida's Differentiated Accountability (DA) system is a statewide network of strategic support, differentiated by need according to performance data, and provided to schools and districts in order to improve leadership capacity, teacher efficacy and student outcomes. DA field teams collaborate with district and school leadership to design, implement and refine school improvement plans, as well as provide instructional coaching, as needed.

DA Regions

Florida's DA network is divided into five geographical regions, each served by a field team led by a regional executive director (RED).

DA Categories

Traditional public schools are classified at the start of each school year, based upon the most recently released school grades (A-F), into one of the following categories:

- Not in DA – currently A or B with no F in prior two years; all charter schools; all ungraded schools
- Monitoring Only – currently A or B with at least one F in the prior two years
- Prevent – currently C
- Focus – currently D
  - Year 1 – declined to D, or first-time graded schools receiving a D
  - Year 2 – second consecutive D, or F followed by a D
  - Year 3 or more – third or more consecutive D, or F followed by second consecutive D
- Priority – currently F
  - Year 1 – declined to F, or first-time graded schools receiving an F
  - Year 2 or more – second or more consecutive F

DA Turnaround and Monitoring Statuses

Additionally, schools in DA are subject to one or more of the following Turnaround and Monitoring Statuses:

- Former F – currently A-D with at least one F in the prior two years. SIP is monitored by FDOE.
- Post-Priority Planning – currently A-D with an F in the prior year. District is planning for possible turnaround.
- Planning – Focus Year 2 and Priority Year 1. District is planning for possible turnaround.
- Implementing – Focus Year 3 or more and Priority Year 2 or more. District is implementing the Turnaround Option Plan (TOP).

2013-14 DA Category and Statuses

DA Category	Region	RED
Not in DA	N/A	N/A

Former F	Post-Priority Planning	Planning	Implementing TOP
No	No	No	No

Current School Status

School Information

School-Level Information

School
Dream Lake Elementary

Principal
Gary Schadow

School Advisory Council chair
Ben Ramos

Names and position titles of the School-Based Leadership Team (SBLT)

Name	Title
Shannon Blake	Assistant Principal
Jill Floyd	Curriculum Resource Teacher
Amy Holland-Pruitt	Staffing Specialist
Angel Farran	Media Specialist
Cindy Craft	Reading Coach
Kelli Biaggi	Inclusion Specialist

District-Level Information

District
Orange

Superintendent
Dr. Barbara M Jenkins

Date of school board approval of SIP
1/28/2014

School Advisory Council (SAC)

This section meets the requirements of Section 1114(b)(1), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Membership of the SAC

The elected positions on Dream Lake's SAC include two co-chairs and a recording secretary. The co-chairs consist of one parent and one Dream Lake staff member, which has been filled by the principal for the last 8 years. Typically, our SAC has more than 20 members. More than 50% of the SAC members are parents representing our diverse student population at Dream Lake.

Involvement of the SAC in the development of the SIP

In the spring, a survey is done of our students, parents, and staff members on school effectiveness and climate conditions. The SAC reviews the results and makes recommendations that are put into the next year's School Improvement Plan, to increase student, parent, and staff satisfaction with the school. In the fall, all SAC members receive copies of the School Improvement Plan and the plan is discussed at

one or more of our sessions. As the school year continues, results of benchmark testing and other progress monitoring data is shared, questions answered, and suggestions for improvement sought.

Activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year

A. Go over the school's grade from the State and determine what factors contributed to our school grade dropping from an A to B.
B. Reviewing and approving the SAC By-Laws.
C. Making sure that our SAC membership reflects the make-up of our school demographics.
D. Determine in part the agenda for the next SAC meeting based on interest, current changes in education, and pressing school needs.
E. Elect co-chairs and a recording secretary for our new SAC year.
F. Having a SAC parent representative participate in the interview process for administrative openings.
G. Review and analyze progress monitoring data and make recommendations for change.
H. Investigate and discuss current changes in education such as Common Core, teacher evaluation, and school grading processes.
I. Conduct and analyze the results from our yearly parent, staff, and student surveys.
J. Hold a joint SAC meeting of schools in the Apopka area to learn about proposed changes in education from our locally elected school board member, area superintendent, and elected state representative.

Projected use of school improvement funds, including the amount allocated to each project

The proposed use of school improvement funds will be to ear mark any funds that we receive for our summer tutoring program in the area of reading and math. This past summer our grade level PLC's in Kindergarten through fourth grade selected 12 students who were below grade level to come to school during summer break for 20 days (6 hours daily) to receive extra instruction in reading and math. Our hope was to move the students closer to being on grade level in the reading and math to prevent a summer slip. This intervention costs between $15,000 to $18,000 to do each summer.

Compliance with section 1001.452, F.S., regarding the establishment duties of the SAC
In Compliance

If not in compliance, describe the measures being taken to comply with SAC requirements

Highly Qualified Staff

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(C) and 1115(c)(1)(E), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Administrators

# of administrators
2

 # receiving effective rating or higher
(not entered because basis is < 10)

Administrator Information:

Gary Schadow		
Principal	Years as Administrator: 22	Years at Current School: 7

Credentials	Education: Bachelor of Science Curriculum and Instruction and Masters of Science Educational Leadership Certification: Biology 6-12, General Science 5-9, School Principal (All Levels), Middle Grades Endorsement
Performance Record	2006-7 Grade A /567 points/ AYP 100%/Reading 78%/Math 76%/Science 47%/Writing 72%/Reading Gains 73%/Math Gains 77%/Reading Bottom 25% 63%/Math Bottom 25% 82% 2007-08 Grade A /583 points/ AYP 98%/Reading 83%/Math 76%/Science 47%/Writing 77%/Reading Gains 73%/Math Gains 77%/Reading Bottom 25% 73%/Math Bottom 25% 77% 2008-09 Grade A /565 points/ AYP 92%/Reading 82%/Math 77%/Science 49%/Writing 90%/Reading Gains 75%/Math Gains 70%/Reading Bottom 25% 55%/Math Bottom 25% 67% 2009-10 Grade A /546 points/ AYP 67%/Reading 81%/Math 76%/Science 52%/Writing 81%/Reading Gains 63%/Math Gains 69%/Reading Bottom 25% 52%/Math Bottom 25% 72% 2010-11 Grade A /613 points/ AYP 85%/Reading 79%/Math 85%/Science 52%/Writing 94%/Reading Gains 64%/Math Gains 84%/Reading Bottom 25% 68%/Math Bottom 25% 87% 2011-12 Grade A /564 points/ Reading 60%/Math 67%/Science 49%/Writing 79%/Reading Gains 69%/Math Gains 77%/Reading Bottom 25% 79%/Math Bottom 25% 84% 2012-13 Grade B/505 points/Reading 60%/Math 67%/Science 45%/ Writing 73%/Reading Gains 63%/Math Gains 70%/Reading Bottom 25% 70%/Math Bottom 25% 57%

Shannon Blake		
Asst Principal	Years as Administrator: 1	Years at Current School: 7

Credentials	Education: Bachelor of Science in Elementary Education and Masters in Educational Leadership and Administration Certification: Elementary Education K-6, ESOL K-12, ESOL Endorsement, Educational Leadership (All Levels)
Performance Record	2006-7 Grade A /567 points/ AYP 100%/Reading 78%/Math 76%/Science 47%/Writing 72%/Reading Gains 73%/Math Gains 77%/Reading Bottom 25% 63%/Math Bottom 25% 82% 2007-08 Grade A /583 points/ AYP 98%/Reading 83%/Math 76%/Science 47%/Writing 77%/Reading Gains 73%/Math Gains 77%/Reading Bottom 25% 73%/Math Bottom 25% 77% 2008-09 Grade A /565 points/ AYP 92%/Reading 82%/Math 77%/Science 49%/Writing 90%/Reading Gains 75%/Math Gains 70%/Reading Bottom 25% 55%/Math Bottom 25% 67% 2009-10 Grade A /546 points/ AYP 67%/Reading 81%/Math 76%/Science 52%/Writing 81%/Reading Gains 63%/Math Gains 69%/Reading Bottom 25% 52%/Math Bottom 25% 72% 2010-11 Grade A /613 points/ AYP 85%/Reading 79%/Math 85%/Science 52%/Writing 94%/Reading Gains 64%/Math Gains 84%/Reading Bottom 25% 68%/Math Bottom 25% 87% 2011-12 Grade A /564 points/ Reading 60%/Math 67%/Science 49%/Writing 79%/Reading Gains 69%/Math Gains 77%/Reading Bottom 25% 79%/Math Bottom 25% 84% 2012-13 Grade B/505 points/Reading 60%/Math 67%/Science 45%/ Writing 73%/Reading Gains 63%/Math Gains 70%/Reading Bottom 25% 70%/Math Bottom 25% 57%

Instructional Coaches

# of instructional coaches
2

 # receiving effective rating or higher
(not entered because basis is < 10)

Instructional Coach Information:

Jill Floyd		
Full-time / School-based	Years as Coach: 3	Years at Current School: 13

Areas	RtI/MTSS, Other
Credentials	Education: Bachelor of Science in Mentally Handicapped Education and Masters in Specific Learning Disabilities Certification: Exceptional Student Education K-12
Performance Record	2006-7 Grade A /567 points/ AYP 100%/Reading 78%/Math 76%/Science 47%/Writing 72%/Reading Gains 73%/Math Gains 77%/Reading Bottom 25% 63%/Math Bottom 25% 82% 2007-08 Grade A /583 points/ AYP 98%/Reading 83%/Math 76%/Science 47%/Writing 77%/Reading Gains 73%/Math Gains 77%/Reading Bottom 25% 73%/Math Bottom 25% 77% 2008-09 Grade A /565 points/ AYP 92%/Reading 82%/Math 77%/Science 49%/Writing 90%/Reading Gains 75%/Math Gains 70%/Reading Bottom 25% 55%/Math Bottom 25% 67% 2009-10 Grade A /546 points/ AYP 67%/Reading 81%/Math 76%/Science 52%/Writing 81%/Reading Gains 63%/Math Gains 69%/Reading Bottom 25% 52%/Math Bottom 25% 72% 2010-11 Grade A /613 points/ AYP 85%/Reading 79%/Math 85%/Science 52%/Writing 94%/Reading Gains 64%/Math Gains 84%/Reading Bottom 25% 68%/Math Bottom 25% 87% 2011-12 Grade A /564 points/ Reading 60%/Math 67%/Science 49%/Writing 79%/Reading Gains 69%/Math Gains 77%/Reading Bottom 25% 79%/Math Bottom 25% 84% 2012-13 Grade B/505 points/Reading 60%/Math 67%/Science 45%/ Writing 73%/Reading Gains 63%/Math Gains 70%/Reading Bottom 25% 70%/Math Bottom 25% 57%

Cindy Craft		
Full-time / School-based	Years as Coach: 7	Years at Current School: 11

Areas	Reading/Literacy
Credentials	Education: Bachelor of Science in Elementary Education Certification: Early Childhood Education, Reading, and ESOL
Performance Record	2006-7 Grade A /567 points/ AYP 100%/Reading 78%/Math 76%/Science 47%/Writing 72%/Reading Gains 73%/Math Gains 77%/Reading Bottom 25% 63%/Math Bottom 25% 82% 2007-08 Grade A /583 points/ AYP 98%/Reading 83%/Math 76%/Science 47%/Writing 77%/Reading Gains 73%/Math Gains 77%/Reading Bottom 25% 73%/Math Bottom 25% 77% 2008-09 Grade A /565 points/ AYP 92%/Reading 82%/Math 77%/Science 49%/Writing 90%/Reading Gains 75%/Math Gains 70%/Reading Bottom 25% 55%/Math Bottom 25% 67% 2009-10 Grade A /546 points/ AYP 67%/Reading 81%/Math 76%/Science 52%/Writing 81%/Reading Gains 63%/Math Gains 69%/Reading Bottom 25% 52%/Math Bottom 25% 72% 2010-11 Grade A /613 points/ AYP 85%/Reading 79%/Math 85%/Science 52%/Writing 94%/Reading Gains 64%/Math Gains 84%/Reading Bottom 25% 68%/Math Bottom 25% 87% 2011-12 Grade A /564 points/ Reading 60%/Math 67%/Science 49%/Writing 79%/Reading Gains 69%/Math Gains 77%/Reading Bottom 25% 79%/Math Bottom 25% 84% 2012-13 Grade B/505 points/Reading 60%/Math 67%/Science 45%/ Writing 73%/Reading Gains 63%/Math Gains 70%/Reading Bottom 25% 70%/Math Bottom 25% 57%

Classroom Teachers

# of classroom teachers
59

 # receiving effective rating or higher
59, 100%

 # Highly Qualified Teachers
100%

 # certified in-field
59, 100%

 # ESOL endorsed
29, 49%

 # reading endorsed
8, 14%

 # with advanced degrees
26, 44%

 # National Board Certified

2, 3%

 # first-year teachers

1, 2%

 # with 1-5 years of experience

10, 17%

 # with 6-14 years of experience

24, 41%

 # with 15 or more years of experience

24, 41%

Education Paraprofessionals

# of paraprofessionals

24

 # Highly Qualified

24, 100%

Other Instructional Personnel

# of instructional personnel not captured in the sections above

0

 # receiving effective rating or higher

(not entered because basis is < 10)

Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategies

This section meets the requirements of Section 1114(b)(1)(E), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Strategies to recruit and retain highly qualified, certified-in-field, effective teachers to the school, including the person responsible

Dream Lake Elementary School attempts to retain teachers by providing support in all areas. Teachers are supported through the use of mentors, support instructional staff, and with PLC teams who work directly with teachers to enable them to rise to the standards expected of highly effective educators. The Dream Lake Leadership Team provides professional development opportunities based on the demonstrated need of the staff as defined in the annual School Improvement Plan. Dream Lake uses the Orange County Hiring System to recruit teachers. We post openings, screen, and hire from the pool provided by the District.

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(D) and 1115(c)(1)(F), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Teacher mentoring program/plan, including the rationale for pairings and the planned mentoring activities

Dream Lake Elementary School has a mentoring program both for beginning teachers and new teachers to Dream Lake for the current school year. Both sets of teachers are brought in a week before pre-planning to spend the day with their assigned mentor and and administrators. On this day the teachers learn about Dream Lake, take tours, are set up in their classrooms and can work with mentors on questions about the school and their grade level. Each new staff member is paired with a

mentor from their same grade level, that is both experienced with the grade and are considered a master teacher.

Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) / Response to Intervention (RtI)

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(B)(i)-(iv) and 1115(c)(1)(A)-(C), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Data-based problem-solving processes for the implementation and monitoring of MTSS and SIP structures to address effectiveness of core instruction, resource allocation (funding and staffing), teacher support systems, and small group and individual student needs

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 team meets as needed or at least two times per month to engage in the following activities: Review universal screening data and link it to instructional decisions; review progress monitoring data at the grade level and classroom level to identify students who are meeting/exceeding benchmarks and to identify those students who are at moderate risk or at high risk for not meeting benchmarks. Based on the above information, the team will identify professional development and assign resources. The team will also collaborate regularly, problem solve, share effective practices, evaluate implementation, make decisions, and practice new processes and skills. The team will also facilitate the process of building consensus, increasing infrastructure, and making decisions about implementation school-wide. Each team within the school systematically works towards the common goal stated above. All teams are coordinated through the central school leadership team, which works to integrate the work of each of the other teams. Dream Lake teams are: grade level team leaders, literacy team, ESE resource team and grade level PLC's.

Function and responsibility of each school-based leadership team member as related to MTSS and the SIP

Principal/Asst. Principal: Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing MTSS, conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based MTSS plans and activities.
General Education Teachers: Provides information about core instruction, participates in student data collection, delivers Tier 1 instruction/intervention, collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities.
Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Teachers: Participates in student data collection, integrates core instructional activities/materials into Tier 3 instruction, and collaborates with general education teachers through such activities as co-teaching.
Instructional Coach (es) CRT/MTSS: 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 intervening 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.
Reading Instructional Specialist: Provides guidance on 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 plans.

School Psychologist: Participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates 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; facilitates data-based decision making activities.

Speech Language Pathologist: Educates the team in the role language plays in curriculum, assessment, and instruction, as a basis for appropriate program design; assists in the selection of screening measures; and helps identify systemic patterns of student need with respect to language skills.

Student Services Personnel: provides interventions to link child-serving and community agencies to the schools and families to support the child's academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success.

Systems in place that the leadership team uses to monitor the fidelity of the school's MTSS and SIP

The leadership team monitors the fidelity of the school's MTSS and SIP through as series of meetings. These meetings begin in the summer with 2 full days and continue throughout the school year on a 6 week basis.

At our MTSS meeting every six weeks the team meets along with classroom teachers to progress monitor students through the tiers. When looking at students, we look at data and classroom observations to decide if the support should increase, continue, or decrease through the tiers. Along with making adjustments to interventions we offer teacher support at the MTSS meetings as well as through our PLC grade level meetings. Teacher support includes professional development in assessments, strategies, graphing student data, monitoring student progress.

Data source(s) and management system(s) used to access and analyze data to monitor the effectiveness of core, supplemental, and intensive supports in reading, mathematics, science, writing, and engagement

Reading
•Universal Screen FAIR/FLKRS
•Targeted Diagnostic FAIR
•Targeted Diagnostic FAIR
Math
•Go Math BOY
•OCPS Benchmark
•Go Math Targeted Diagnostic
Science
•OCPS Benchmark
•Topic Tests Pearson
Writing
•Write Score Writing
Behavior
•DLE Discipline Referral

Plan to support understanding of MTSS and build capacity in data-based problem solving for staff and parents

Dream Lake has designed its academic day to meet the needs of all students. Tier 1,2 and 3 lessons are scheduled and consistent. Each day begins with intervention or enrichment for every student. This framework allows for understanding and ease of use. When a student exhibits a need the team works quickly with the teachers to provide the intervention or enrichment called for. Our high percentage of learning gains especially in our struggling students provides us with the motivation to continue the process.

Training the staff begins with the MTSS Leadership Team meeting to help develop the goals and

professional development for student achievement on the SIP. The team provides data on: Tier 1, 2, and 3 targets; helps set clear expectations for instruction (Rigor, Relevance, Relationship); and aligns processes and procedures. Once those things have been accomplished, the MTSS Team meets with grade level PLC's to deliver the information listed above and to facilitate conversations and learning. The team will also work with the CRT and Reading Coach to facilitate building wide learning opportunities during learning celebrations(staff meetings).

Increased Learning Time/Extended Learning Opportunities

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(B)(ii)(II)-(III), 1114(b)(1)(I), and 1115(c)(1)(C)(i) and 1115(c)(2), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Research-based strategies the school uses to increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum:

Strategy: Before or After School Program

Minutes added to school year: 4,680

Dream Lake Elementary runs an after school tutoring program 3 days a week for an additional hour after school. Students in grades 3-5 participate who are identified by their teachers and testing scores as needing additional help in Reading. Our teachers run the program in their classrooms after school with small groups of 5 to 10 students on the same reading level. These students then participate in a guided reading group with non-fiction high interest leveled books. In addition to the reading groups we have 2 small groups who receive small group math tutoring.

Strategy Purpose(s)

- Instruction in core academic subjects

How is data collected and analyzed to determine the effectiveness of this strategy?

Each quarter all students are tested using the STAR program. Their small guided reading group is based on their lexile found after the STAR test is given. Each quarter students are rearranged in the small groups to get them on their instructional level. In addition students take an independent reading test each Friday consisting of a grade level passage and 5 comprehension questions. At the end of the test students then graph their percentage correct so we have data on a weekly basis to show student growth.

Who is responsible for monitoring implementation of this strategy?

The after school tutoring program is ran by our Reading Coach, Cindy Craft. Along with the Reading Coach, our MTSS team monitors student graphs from the program in our meetings.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

Names and position titles of the members of the school-based LLT

Name	Title
Gary Schadow	Principal
Shannon Blake	Assistant Principal
Cindy Craft	Reading Coach
Brittany Tindle	Reading Resource

Name	Title
Jill Floyd	CRT and RTI Coach

How the school-based LLT functions

This group is a subcommittee of the leadership team and meets on an as needed basis to research, recommend, and model best practices in the area of literacy. It also helps develop school based professional development for teachers and monitors the after school tutoring program.

Major initiatives of the LLT

The two major initiatives of the LLT this year is to implement the Common Core Standards in grades K-5 as well as supporting teachers in the use of the newly adopted reading series within the reading block.

Every Teacher Contributes to Reading Instruction

How the school ensures every teacher contributes to the reading improvement of every student

Coaching (Reading), Common Planning, PLC, Professional Development (District and School), Progress Monitoing and Assessment of:
Daily 90 minute ELA Block including whole group, small group, digital experiences/exposure and literacy centers
Daily Intervention and Enrichment
Daily use of reading resource Success Maker
Daily Tier 2 and 3 Interevention Time
Daily language arts, reading and writing times

Preschool Transition

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(G) and 1115(c)(1)(D), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Strategies for assisting preschool children in transition from early childhood programs to local elementary school programs

Currently Dream Lake runs 2 VPK programs on our campus. We are a center school for students who are identified as being developmentally delayed. Children as young as 3 years old can be serviced in our program. We have 5 students with us all day in our ESE VPK program.
Our VPK classes are held in the morning and afternoon. Each session services 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 three years to prepare students for starting Kindergarten in the fall. Incoming Kindergartners are screened with the FLKRS/ECHOS within the first 30 days of school.

College and Career Readiness

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(B)(iii)(I)(aa)-(cc), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

How the school incorporates applied and integrated courses to help students see the relationships between subjects and relevance to their future

N/A

How the school promotes academic and career planning, including advising on course selections, so that each student's course of study is personally meaningful

N/A

Strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level

N/A

Expected Improvements

Area 1: Reading

Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) - Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 3 on FCAT 2.0, or scoring at or above Level 4 on FAA

Group	2013 Target %	2013 Actual %	Target Met?	2014 Target %
All Students	63%	60%	No	66%
American Indian				
Asian				
Black/African American	59%	56%	No	63%
Hispanic	54%	52%	No	59%
White	69%	69%	Yes	72%
English language learners	48%	43%	No	54%
Students with disabilities	39%	38%	No	45%
Economically disadvantaged	57%	52%	No	61%

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	102	28%	33%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	118	27%	32%

Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6	*[data excluded for privacy reasons]*		43%
Students scoring at or above Level 7	*[data excluded for privacy reasons]*		39%

Learning Gains

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and FAA)	135	63%	68%
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0)	38	70%	75%

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking (students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students)	64	43%	48%
Students scoring proficient in reading (students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students)	43	29%	34%
Students scoring proficient in writing (students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students)	31	21%	26%

Postsecondary Readiness

	2012 Actual #	2012 Actual %	2014 Target %
On-time graduates scoring "college ready" on the Postsecondary Education Readiness Test (P.E.R.T.) or any college placement test authorized under Rule 6A-10.0315, F.A.C.			

Area 2: Writing

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0) Students scoring at or above 3.5	94	70%	75%
Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA) Students scoring at or above Level 4	*[data excluded for privacy reasons]*		100%

Area 3: Mathematics

Elementary and Middle School Mathematics

Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) - Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 3 on FCAT 2.0 and EOC assessments, or scoring at or above Level 4 on FAA

Group	2013 Target %	2013 Actual %	Target Met?	2014 Target %
All Students	69%	67%	No	72%
American Indian				
Asian				
Black/African American	65%	57%	No	69%
Hispanic	67%	69%	Yes	70%
White	73%	74%	Yes	75%
English language learners	63%	63%	Yes	67%
Students with disabilities	50%	43%	No	55%
Economically disadvantaged	68%	64%	No	71%

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	129	35%	40%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	119	30%	35%

Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6	*[data excluded for privacy reasons]*		67%
Students scoring at or above Level 7	*[data excluded for privacy reasons]*		5%

Learning Gains

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Learning Gains	152	70%	75%
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and EOC)	29	57%	62%

Area 4: Science

Elementary School Science

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	28	27%	32%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	18	18%	23%

Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6	*[data excluded for privacy reasons]*		30%
Students scoring at or above Level 7	*[data excluded for privacy reasons]*		5%

Area 5: Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM)

All Levels

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target
# of STEM-related experiences provided for students (e.g. robotics competitions; field trips; science fairs)	5		5
Participation in STEM-related experiences provided for students	500	60%	65%

Area 6: Career and Technical Education (CTE)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students enrolling in one or more CTE courses			
Students who have completed one or more CTE courses who enroll in one or more *accelerated* courses			
Completion rate (%) for CTE students enrolled in *accelerated* courses			
Students taking CTE industry certification exams			
Passing rate (%) for students who take CTE industry certification exams			
CTE program concentrators			
CTE teachers holding appropriate industry certifications			

Area 7: Social Studies

U.S. History End-of-Course (EOC) Assessment

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3			
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4			

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Assessment

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3			
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4			

Area 8: Early Warning Systems

Elementary School Indicators

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students who miss 10 percent or more of available instructional time	91	10%	5%
Students retained, pursuant to s. 1008.25, F.S.	2	2%	2%
Students who are not proficient in reading by third grade	18	17%	12%
Students who receive two or more behavior referrals	3	3%	0%
Students who receive one or more behavior referrals that lead to suspension, as defined in s.1003.01(5), F.S.	3	3%	0%

Area 9: Parent Involvement

Title I Schools may use the Parent Involvement Plan to meet the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(F) and 1115(c)(1)(G), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Parental involvement targets for the school

N/A

Specific Parental Involvement Targets

Target	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %

Area 10: Additional Targets

Additional targets for the school

N/A

Specific Additional Targets

Target	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %

Goals Summary

G1. Writing Goal: Our goal is to improve students' writing skills by implementing a primary K-3 writing program to support our intermediate grade levels.

G2. Math Goal: Our goal is to increase students' understanding of mathematical problem solving with special emphasis on students who did not make 12-13 annual measurable objectives.

G3. Reading Goal: Our goal is to increase students' reading ability and comprehension level with special emphasis on students who did not make the 12-13 annual measurable objectives.

Goals Detail

G1. Writing Goal: Our goal is to improve students' writing skills by implementing a primary K-3 writing program to support our intermediate grade levels.

Targets Supported

- Writing

Resources Available to Support the Goal

- Write From the Beginning and Beyond curriculum and professional development, personnel, schedules, and funding.

Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal

- Lack of Professional Development

- Time

Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal

The Write From the Beginning and Beyond program will be monitored for implementation and student success throughout the year. We will be looking at student data, teacher growth in writing knowledge, and use of the curriculum in the 40 minute ELA writing block.

Person or Persons Responsible

K-3 Classroom Teachers, Resource Teachers, CRT, and Administrators

Target Dates or Schedule:

Daily within classrooms, Weekly at PLC meetings, and Quarterly with administrators the program will be monitored for progress.

Evidence of Completion:

Classroom Walk-Throughs, Student Grades/Portfolios, PLC Notes, End of the Year Teacher Observations/Thoughts

G2. Math Goal: Our goal is to increase students' understanding of mathematical problem solving with special emphasis on students who did not make 12-13 annual measurable objectives.

Targets Supported

- Math (Elementary and Middle School, Elementary and Middle AMO's, Elementary and Middle FCAT 2.0, Elementary and Middle FAA, Elementary and Middle Learning Gains)

Resources Available to Support the Goal

- Go Math Curriculum, Benchmark Tests/Mini Benchmark Assessments, STMath, Computer Labs, After School Tutoring

Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal

- Instructional personnel not familiar enough with the new Go Math! program and Common Core State Standards.

- Instructional personnel needs more professional development and time implementing the new Go Math! curriculum and CCSS

Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal

Special emphasis will be placed on students not making the AMO target. They will be monitored daily by teachers in the classroom, monthly in administrator data meetings with teachers, and through benchmark and mini benchmark assessments.

Person or Persons Responsible

Classroom Teachers, Resource Teachers, and Administrators

Target Dates or Schedule:

Daily in the classroom, Weekly through PLC meetings, Monthly in data meetings with administrators, RtI meetings, and through other meetings after benchmark testing data is released.

Evidence of Completion:

Classroom Walk-Throughs, Meeting Notes, Benchmark Data

G3. Reading Goal: Our goal is to increase students' reading ability and comprehension level with special emphasis on students who did not make the 12-13 annual measurable objectives.

Targets Supported

- Reading (AMO's, FCAT2.0, FAA, Learning Gains, CELLA)

Resources Available to Support the Goal

- Personnel, Professional Development, Schedules, Curriculum

Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal

- Teachers do not have enough flexibility in their daily schedules to increase instructional time (>90) in reading.

- Teachers have not completed enough professional development with the new reading program to implement with fidelity.

Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal

Teachers and Administrators are responsible for monitoring all the SM6 data to make sure students are meeting their goal of 75% or higher daily. Students are receiving individualized instructions when struggling and student data is graphed.

Person or Persons Responsible

Classroom Teachers, Reading Resource Teachers, Adminsitrators

Target Dates or Schedule:

Student growth/goals will be monitored on a daily basis by teachers, weekly by reading resource teachers, and monthly by administrators. When goals are not being reached, teachers will need to provide individual instruction to the student on the skill(s) they are struggling with.

Evidence of Completion:

Evidence of completion will be found by looking at the student graphing folders, teacher reports, and the monthly SM6 data meetings with administrators.

Action Plan for Improvement

Problem Solving Key

G = Goal   **B** = Barrier   **S** = Strategy

G1. Writing Goal: Our goal is to improve students' writing skills by implementing a primary K-3 writing program to support our intermediate grade levels.

G1.B1 Lack of Professional Development

G1.B1.S1 Train teachers and implement the Write from the Beginning and Beyond Curriculum in grades K-3.

Action Step 1

K-3 Teachers along with Resource Teachers will take part in a 3 day training with a Write From the Beginning and Beyond trainer. In this 3 day training teachers will become familiar with the curriculum, stage of writing, and how to teach both narrative and expository writing in their classrooms.

Person or Persons Responsible

K-3 Classroom Teachers, Resource Teachers, and Adminstrators

Target Dates or Schedule

Training will take place over 3 days. 2 days during preplanning week and an additional day on October 24th after teachers have begun using the curriculum.

Evidence of Completion

Evidence of completion will be found by looking at sign-in sheets for the 3 day training and classroom walk-throughs during ELA 40 minute writing blocks where Write From the Beginning and Beyond curriculum should be used.

Facilitator:

Write From the Beginning and Beyond Trainer, Gail Sansome.

Participants:

K-3 Teachers and Resource Teachers

Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G1.B1.S1

Write From the Beginning and Beyond training will be attended by all K-3 teachers and resource teachers. The attendance at the classes will be monitored by our CRT and administrators. Teachers will receive curriculum only by attending the training.

Person or Persons Responsible

CRT and Administrators will monitor attendance of the training.

Target Dates or Schedule

The training will happen for 2 days before the start of school and end with a 1 day training on October 24th.

Evidence of Completion

Evidence of completion of the training will be seen on sign-in sheets and use of curriculum in the the ELA 40 minute writing block.

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G1.B1.S1

Teachers will include the use of Write From the Beginning and Beyond in their 40 minute ELA Writing block daily. They will use their PLC time to discuss the curriculum and how to use it best in the classroom as they begin the first year of implementation. Teachers will grade writing samples and record student growth through the year.

Person or Persons Responsible

K-3 Teachers, Resource Teachers, CRT, and Administrators

Target Dates or Schedule

Monitoring will occur daily in classrooms, weekly in PLC meetings, and throughout the year with student writing grades/portfolios.

Evidence of Completion

Classroom Walk-Throughs, PLC Notes and Agendas, Student Grades/Writing Portfolio

G2. Math Goal: Our goal is to increase students' understanding of mathematical problem solving with special emphasis on students who did not make 12-13 annual measurable objectives.

G2.B1 Instructional personnel not familiar enough with the new Go Math! program and Common Core State Standards.

G2.B1.S1 Hire a new math resource teacher to provide interventions to students in grades K-5 who have been identified as Tier II or Tier III in the MTSS process.

Action Step 1

Interview and hire a math resource teacher to work with students in K-5 who struggle in math to provide them with Tier II and/or Tier III interventions.

Person or Persons Responsible

Leadership Team

Target Dates or Schedule

Hire new teacher over summer so they can begin working with students in the new school year.

Evidence of Completion

Completed Hiring Process Paperwork and New Member on Staff at Dream Lake Elementary.

Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G2.B1.S1

With input from the Leadership Team a new resource teacher will be hired to begin the new school year. Then a list of Tier II and Tier III students will be made for the teacher to serve as well as resources identified to be used with these students outside of the core curriculum.

Person or Persons Responsible

Leadership Team and Administrators

Target Dates or Schedule

The teacher will be hired over the summer and the list of students/resources will be developed within the first month of school starting.

Evidence of Completion

New Staff Member, Lists of Students, Schedule for Teacher, Math Resources

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G2.B1.S1

Effectiveness of the new intervention teacher will be monitored through student growth throughout the MTSS process. Students will be monitored within their tiers as well as the data collected to show continued interventions, exit from the group, or possible testing needed.

Person or Persons Responsible

RtI Team, Leadership Team, Math Resource Teacher, Administrators

Target Dates or Schedule

Student data and growth will be monitored by the teams every 6 weeks during our RtI meetings.

Evidence of Completion

MTSS Meeting Notes and Student Data

G2.B2 Instructional personnel needs more professional development and time implementing the new Go Math! curriculum and CCSS

G2.B2.S1 Refine the 75 minutes planning block during PLC's to use formative assessments, FCIM model, analyze mini benchmark assessments, align new GO Math! curriculum to CCSS and plan for the interventions and enrichment period in math.

Action Step 1

Classroom teachers will need to create focus calendars to serve as a pacing guide to get through the new Go Math curriculum and CCSS. Throughout the year they need to work as PLC's to develop formative assessments, analyze benchmark/minibenchmark assessments, and follow the FCIM model for students needing intervention.

Person or Persons Responsible

Grade Level Teams, Resource Teachers, Administrators

Target Dates or Schedule

Weekly in PLC meetings and as benchmark data is released.

Evidence of Completion

Focus Maps, Lesson Plans, Formative Assessments, Benchmark Assessments, PLC Notes

Facilitator:

CRT and Administrators

Participants:

Classroom and Resource Teachers

Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G2.B2.S1

Teacher focus calendars, lesson plans, formative assessments, benchmark/minibenchmark assessments will be monitored and reviewed for both data and implementation.

Person or Persons Responsible

Grade Level Teams, Leadership Team, and Administrators

Target Dates or Schedule

Weekly at PLC meetings, after benchmark assessments are released, and in monthly data meetings with administrators.

Evidence of Completion

PLC Notes, Focus Calendars, Lesson Plans, Formative Assessment Results, Benchmark Assessment Results

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G2.B2.S1

Review the focus calendars, formative assessments, and benchmark assessments for student growth.

Person or Persons Responsible

Grade Level Teams, Leadership Team, and Administators

Target Dates or Schedule

Weekly in PLC meetings, after benchmark data has been released, and quarterly review focus calendars

Evidence of Completion

PLC Notes, Focus Calendars, Benchmark and Formative Assessment Data

G3. Reading Goal: Our goal is to increase students' reading ability and comprehension level with special emphasis on students who did not make the 12-13 annual measurable objectives.

G3.B1 Teachers do not have enough flexibility in their daily schedules to increase instructional time (>90) in reading.

G3.B1.S1 Schedule grades 1-5 into our computer labs to do SuccessMaker Reading (SM6) daily for 20 minutes.

Action Step 1

Make a comprehensive schedule for grades 1-5 to use the computer lab daily for 20 minutes on SM6. Create student folders for all students in grades 2-5 to graph their SM6 data daily.

Person or Persons Responsible

Leadership Team

Target Dates or Schedule

Summer Leadership Meetings

Evidence of Completion

A completed schedule that teachers can begin using the 2nd week of school. Folders and graphs completed and ready in the lab by the 2nd week of school.

Facilitator:

SM6 Trainer, Frank Santos

Participants:

1-5 Classroom Teachers, Resource Teachers, Administrators, School Tech, and Computer Lab Paras

Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G3.B1.S1

With the input of the Leadership Team and a teacher from each grade level the lab schedule will be completed and approved along with the graphs that are included in the student folders.

Person or Persons Responsible

The assistant principal, Shannon Blake, will create the lab schedule and the graphs and have them approved through the Leadership Team and grade level teacher representative.

Target Dates or Schedule

The schedule and graphs will be completed and approved by the 2nd week of school.

Evidence of Completion

The evidence will be the schedule posted for all teachers and included on the school collaboration website. The graphing folders will be in the assigned lab for every student to complete daily.

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G3.B1.S1

Data from the SuccessMaker Reading (SM6) program will be monitored for student growth. Students have a goal of 75% or higher everyday they go into the lab.

Person or Persons Responsible

Students, Classroom Teachers, Reading Resource Teachers, and Administrators

Target Dates or Schedule

Students will record their score (data) on their lab folder graph daily to see if they are hitting their target. Teachers will print out the daily classroom report and monitor the whole class for student growth/weakness. Reading Resource Teachers will monitor grade level reports weekly for class growth/weakness. Administrators will meet with teachers monthly to go over classroom data.

Evidence of Completion

Evidence of completion will be monitored by the classroom teachers as the students fill out their graphs daily. Daily and Weekly reports will be evidence of the classroom teachers and reading resource teachers monitoring,and the monthly reports will be the evidence of the administrators monitoring. All these reports are printed and housed in a data binder.

G3.B2 Teachers have not completed enough professional development with the new reading program to implement with fidelity.

G3.B2.S1 Refine the 75 minute planning block during PLC's to use formative assessments, FCIM model, analyze mini benchmark assessments, align new Journey curriculum to common core standards and plan for the interventions and enrichment for reading.

Action Step 1

Classroom teachers will need to create focus calendars to serve as a pacing guide to get through the new Journeys curriculum and CCSS. Throughout the year they need to work as PLC's to develop formative assessments, analyze benchmark/mini-benchmark assessments, and follow the FCIM model for students needing interventions in reading.

Person or Persons Responsible

Grade Level Teams, Resource Teachers, Administrators

Target Dates or Schedule

Weekly in PLC meetings and as benchmark data is released

Evidence of Completion

Focus Calendars, Lesson Plans, Formative Assessments, Benchmark Assessments, PLC Notes

Facilitator:

CRT and Adminstrators

Participants:

Classroom and Resource Teachers

Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G3.B2.S1

Teacher focus calendars, lesson plans, formative assessments, benchmark/mini-benchmark assessments will be monitored and review for both data and implementation.

Person or Persons Responsible

Grade Level Teams, Leadership Team, and Administrators

Target Dates or Schedule

Weekly at PLC meetings, after benchmark assessments are released, and in monthly data meetings with administrators.

Evidence of Completion

PLC Notes, Focus Calendars, Lesson Plans, Formative Assessment Results, Benchmark Assessment Results

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G3.B2.S1

To monitor for effectiveness we will review the focus calendars, formative assessments, and benchmark assessments for student growth.

Person or Persons Responsible

Grade Level Teams, Leadership Team, and Administrators

Target Dates or Schedule

Weekly in PLC meetings, after benchmark assessments are released, and quarterly review focus calendars

Evidence of Completion

PLC Notes, Focus Calendars, Benchmark and Formative Assessment Data

Coordination and Integration

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(J) and 1115(c)(1)(H), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

How federal, state, and local funds, services, and programs are coordinated and integrated at the school

Title II Funds:
Teachers at Dream Lake Elementary will be able to participate in professional development in Success Maker 6. The purpose of the professional development is to provide teachers the opportunity to understand the program, read and analyze the reports, and change their instruction based on individual student data. This professional development activity relates to closing the achievement gap by directly supporting our Reading goals found in our School Improvement Plan. Students are measured daily in specific skills on the Success Maker program and teachers need to use this data to assign coursework, plan small group instruction, and make individual learning targets for students. Our goal is for this individualized instruction will move students higher in Reading in grades 1-5 and will show in our learning gains specifically with our bottom 25%.

Teachers in grades 1-5 will continue their Success Maker training for a total of 3 days. In this training teachers will experience the new Success Maker 6, learn how to assign students individualized curriculum, and analyze student reports/data to make instructional decisions in the classroom through small skill groups or individualized lessons.

The desired outcome is through the use of the Success Maker program teachers will be able to provide individualized skill based instruction, analyze student data, and change instruction based on data to obtain learning gains in every student. Data will be gathered daily by teachers as students work throughout the year but Reading Resource teachers will be collecting school wide data weekly and teachers will meet with administrators on their data monthly.

IDEA Funds:
These funds are used to support a behavior specialist and for 3 one on one paraprofessionals for specific ESE students.

SAI Funds:
Funds are used for after school tutoring. 8 reading teachers and 2 math teachers will be hired to work 3 days a week for an hour after school with small groups of 3-5 graders.

Free/Reduced Lunch Funds:
60%+ qualify for free/reduced lunch and/or breakfast at Dream Lake.

Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support School Improvement Goals

This section will satisfy the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(D) and 1115(c)(1)(F), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b), by demonstrating high-quality and ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals and, if appropriate, for pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff is being offered to enable all children in the school to meet the State's student academic achievement standards.

Professional development opportunities identified in the SIP as action steps to achieve the school's goals.

G1. Writing Goal: Our goal is to improve students' writing skills by implementing a primary K-3 writing program to support our intermediate grade levels.

G1.B1 Lack of Professional Development

G1.B1.S1 Train teachers and implement the Write from the Beginning and Beyond Curriculum in grades K-3.

PD Opportunity 1

K-3 Teachers along with Resource Teachers will take part in a 3 day training with a Write From the Beginning and Beyond trainer. In this 3 day training teachers will become familiar with the curriculum, stage of writing, and how to teach both narrative and expository writing in their classrooms.

Facilitator

Write From the Beginning and Beyond Trainer, Gail Sansome.

Participants

K-3 Teachers and Resource Teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

Training will take place over 3 days. 2 days during preplanning week and an additional day on October 24th after teachers have begun using the curriculum.

Evidence of Completion

Evidence of completion will be found by looking at sign-in sheets for the 3 day training and classroom walk-throughs during ELA 40 minute writing blocks where Write From the Beginning and Beyond curriculum should be used.

G2. Math Goal: Our goal is to increase students' understanding of mathematical problem solving with special emphasis on students who did not make 12-13 annual measurable objectives.

G2.B2 Instructional personnel needs more professional development and time implementing the new Go Math! curriculum and CCSS

G2.B2.S1 Refine the 75 minutes planning block during PLC's to use formative assessments, FCIM model, analyze mini benchmark assessments, align new GO Math! curriculum to CCSS and plan for the interventions and enrichment period in math.

PD Opportunity 1

Classroom teachers will need to create focus calendars to serve as a pacing guide to get through the new Go Math curriculum and CCSS. Throughout the year they need to work as PLC's to develop formative assessments, analyze benchmark/minibenchmark assessments, and follow the FCIM model for students needing intervention.

Facilitator

CRT and Administrators

Participants

Classroom and Resource Teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

Weekly in PLC meetings and as benchmark data is released.

Evidence of Completion

Focus Maps, Lesson Plans, Formative Assessments, Benchmark Assessments, PLC Notes

G3. Reading Goal: Our goal is to increase students' reading ability and comprehension level with special emphasis on students who did not make the 12-13 annual measurable objectives.

G3.B1 Teachers do not have enough flexibility in their daily schedules to increase instructional time (>90) in reading.

G3.B1.S1 Schedule grades 1-5 into our computer labs to do SuccessMaker Reading (SM6) daily for 20 minutes.

PD Opportunity 1

Make a comprehensive schedule for grades 1-5 to use the computer lab daily for 20 minutes on SM6. Create student folders for all students in grades 2-5 to graph their SM6 data daily.

Facilitator

SM6 Trainer, Frank Santos

Participants

1-5 Classroom Teachers, Resource Teachers, Administrators, School Tech, and Computer Lab Paras

Target Dates or Schedule

Summer Leadership Meetings

Evidence of Completion

A completed schedule that teachers can begin using the 2nd week of school. Folders and graphs completed and ready in the lab by the 2nd week of school.

G3.B2 Teachers have not completed enough professional development with the new reading program to implement with fidelity.

G3.B2.S1 Refine the 75 minute planning block during PLC's to use formative assessments, FCIM model, analyze mini benchmark assessments, align new Journey curriculum to common core standards and plan for the interventions and enrichment for reading.

PD Opportunity 1

Classroom teachers will need to create focus calendars to serve as a pacing guide to get through the new Journeys curriculum and CCSS. Throughout the year they need to work as PLC's to develop formative assessments, analyze benchmark/mini-benchmark assessments, and follow the FCIM model for students needing interventions in reading.

Facilitator

CRT and Adminstrators

Participants

Classroom and Resource Teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

Weekly in PLC meetings and as benchmark data is released

Evidence of Completion

Focus Calendars, Lesson Plans, Formative Assessments, Benchmark Assessments, PLC Notes

Appendix 2: Budget to Support School Improvement Goals

Budget Summary by Goal

Goal	Description	Total
G1.	Writing Goal: Our goal is to improve students' writing skills by implementing a primary K-3 writing program to support our intermediate grade levels.	$14,040
G2.	Math Goal: Our goal is to increase students' understanding of mathematical problem solving with special emphasis on students who did not make 12-13 annual measurable objectives.	$60,000
G3.	Reading Goal: Our goal is to increase students' reading ability and comprehension level with special emphasis on students who did not make the 12-13 annual measurable objectives.	$1,200
	Total	$75,240

Budget Summary by Funding Source and Resource Type

Funding Source	Technology	Professional Development	Personnel	Total
Title II	$1,200	$0	$0	$1,200
General Budget	$0	$14,040	$60,000	$74,040
Total	$1,200	$14,040	$60,000	$75,240

Budget Details

Budget items identified in the SIP as necessary to achieve the school's goals.

G1. Writing Goal: Our goal is to improve students' writing skills by implementing a primary K-3 writing program to support our intermediate grade levels.

G1.B1 Lack of Professional Development

G1.B1.S1 Train teachers and implement the Write from the Beginning and Beyond Curriculum in grades K-3.

Action Step 1

K-3 Teachers along with Resource Teachers will take part in a 3 day training with a Write From the Beginning and Beyond trainer. In this 3 day training teachers will become familiar with the curriculum, stage of writing, and how to teach both narrative and expository writing in their classrooms.

Resource Type

Professional Development

Resource

Funding Source

General Budget

Amount Needed

$14,040

G2. Math Goal: Our goal is to increase students' understanding of mathematical problem solving with special emphasis on students who did not make 12-13 annual measurable objectives.

G2.B1 Instructional personnel not familiar enough with the new Go Math! program and Common Core State Standards.

G2.B1.S1 Hire a new math resource teacher to provide interventions to students in grades K-5 who have been identified as Tier II or Tier III in the MTSS process.

Action Step 1

Interview and hire a math resource teacher to work with students in K-5 who struggle in math to provide them with Tier II and/or Tier III interventions.

Resource Type

Personnel

Resource

Math Resource Teacher

Funding Source

General Budget

Amount Needed

$60,000

G3. Reading Goal: Our goal is to increase students' reading ability and comprehension level with special emphasis on students who did not make the 12-13 annual measurable objectives.

G3.B1 Teachers do not have enough flexibility in their daily schedules to increase instructional time (>90) in reading.

G3.B1.S1 Schedule grades 1-5 into our computer labs to do SuccessMaker Reading (SM6) daily for 20 minutes.

Action Step 1

Make a comprehensive schedule for grades 1-5 to use the computer lab daily for 20 minutes on SM6. Create student folders for all students in grades 2-5 to graph their SM6 data daily.

Resource Type

Technology

Resource

SM6 Program-Subs for Teacher Training

Funding Source

Title II

Amount Needed

$1,200