Dream Lake Elementary

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Dream Lake Elementary

500 N PARK AVENUE, 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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (55%) 2018-19: B (61%) 2017-18: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Orange County School Board on 1/24/2023.

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.](www.floridacims.org)

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Dream Lake Elementary

500 N PARK AVENUE, Apopka, FL 32712

https://dreamlakees.ocps.net/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	81%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	B		B	B

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Orange County School Board on 1/24/2023.

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Clenton-Martin, Carol-Ann	Principal	Serves as the instructional leader of the school. Creates the vision for the staff and all stakeholders. Assists and observes teachers using data based decision making to ensure that all students are meeting or exceeding expectations. Meets with teachers to discuss progress monitoring of all students in Tiers 1, 2 and 3. Also supports teachers with changing/enhance their instructional strategies based on data to meet the individual needs of all students.
Pinchevsky, Terri	Assistant Principal	Supports the Principal and serves as an instructional leader. Asists and observes teachers using data based decision making to ensure that all students are meeting or exceeding expectations. Meets with teachers to discuss progress monitoring of all students in Tiers 1, 2 and 3. Also supports teachers with changing/enhance their instructional strategies based on data to meet the individual needs of all students.
Powell, Jessica	Instructional Coach	Ms. Powell collaborates with the other coaches to facilitate and evaluate content standards and instruction by providing guidance on the K-12 reading and math plan components.Support is provided to the teachers through coaching and leading common planning. In addition, she facilitates whole school screening programs, identifying those at risk, and the specific interventions needed (Tiers 1, 2, and 3). Ensuring the process of progress monitoring through the systematic collection and analysis of data, she ensures that instructional practices are appropriate, and that the MTSS Intervention plan is implemented with fidelity. Throughout the school year, as the needs of the students and teachers are identified, professional development is designed, presented and supported.
O'Dell, Leslie	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Ms. O'Dell collaborates with the other coaches to facilitate and evaluate content standards and instruction by providing guidance on the K-12 reading and math plan components.Support is provided to the teachers through coaching and leading common planning. In addition, she facilitates whole school screening programs, identifying those at risk, and the specific interventions needed (Tiers 1, 2, and 3). Ensuring the process of progress monitoring through the systematic collection and analysis of data, she ensures that instructional practices are appropriate, and that the MTSS Intervention plan is implemented with fidelity. Throughout the school year, as the needs of the students and teachers are identified, professional development is designed, presented and supported.
Farran, Angel	Instructional Media	Ms. Farran supports District and school-wide initiatives implemented by the leadership and instructional staff. As the leader in the use of technology, she coordinates all digital media, and provides professional development on the use of digital devices for staff, parents and students. Additionally, she facilitates several reading programs and supports the other instructional coaches.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Biaggi, Kelli	Behavior Specialist	Ms.Biaggi supports the staff, students and families in providing behavioral and academic support to ensure students' success. She analyzes existing literature and intervention programs, and systematically matches these programs and strategies to meet the individual needs of students. She provides coaching support to ensure the teacher's implementation of these interventions through modeling, observing and providing feedback. Student progress is monitored, and depending on the need, may pull small or individual students for increased support including social skills instruction.
Dorlus, Lucy	School Counselor	Ms. Dorlus collaborates with the instructional coaches providing support to staff, students and families. She shares the lead in supporting the staff in implementation of SEL instruction in the classrooms. Additionally, she facilitates the School Threat Assessment Team, and communicates with district and community resources to ensure that she can support the social and emotional needs of all stakeholders of the school.
Santana, Kimberly	Staffing Specialist	Ms. Santana ensures that the school is compliant with current district and state rules and procedures regarding Exceptional Student Education. She supports the the staff in ensuring the development and implementation of Quality IEPs and EPs. She provides professional development for all staff in the implementation and documentation required for those IEPs and 504 plans in collaboration with the ESE teachers and 504 lead.. She also participates in the decision making for intervention and enrichment, as she collaborates with the other coaches in determining initial eligibility and reevaluation.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Saturday 6/4/2016, Carol Ann Clenton Martin

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

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

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
49

Total number of students enrolled at the school
629

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
2

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
6

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	79	92	96	119	117	99	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	602
Attendance below 90 percent	7	10	6	8	8	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
One or more suspensions	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	6	0	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in Math	3	4	3	7	2	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	9	6	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	10	7	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	12	8	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	7	10	6	13	9	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated
Saturday 7/23/2022

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	26	83	111	125	100	137	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	582
Attendance below 90 percent	8	18	19	17	11	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	4	6	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	4	6	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	3	3	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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	1	3	3	12	11	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	26	83	111	125	100	137	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	582
Attendance below 90 percent	8	18	19	17	11	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	4	6	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	4	6	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	3	3	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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	1	3	3	12	11	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	50%	56%	56%				60%	57%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	57%						60%	58%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52%						52%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	60%	46%	50%				71%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	64%						68%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	53%						53%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	49%	61%	59%				65%	56%	53%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	58%	55%	3%	58%	0%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	53%	57%	-4%	58%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
	2019	59%	54%	5%	56%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	64%	62%	2%	62%	2%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	72%	63%	9%	64%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				
05	2022					
	2019	65%	57%	8%	60%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2022					
	2019	64%	54%	10%	53%	11%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	**ELA Ach.**	**ELA LG**	**ELA LG L25%**	**Math Ach.**	**Math LG**	**Math LG L25%**	**Sci Ach.**	**SS Ach.**	**MS Accel.**	**Grad Rate 2020-21**	**C & C Accel 2020-21**
SWD	23	43	46	31	53	52	18				
ELL	36	54	48	49	60	52	26				
BLK	53	58	54	56	61	50	44				
HSP	41	56	52	53	65	56	39				
WHT	65	57		76	65		73				
FRL	44	55	56	53	59	54	41				

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	25	41	35	27	50	50	46				
ELL	44	46	27	41	29	15	53				
BLK	45	42		46	13		70				
HSP	46	52	40	46	36	32	55				
WHT	73	63		73	50		72				
FRL	47	47	35	47	28	44	58				

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	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				

ESSA Data Review

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	66
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	451
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	49
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	54
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	54
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

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	67
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	53
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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

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

FSA data indicates that the students struggle with proficiency in ELA as only 50% are proficient compared to math proficiency of 60%. All subgroups continue to make progress, except for our Students with Disabilities who continue to struggle in their proficiency in ELA and Math.

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

FSA Science proficiency of 49% indicates a great need for improvement based on the decline in proficiency since 2019. ELA proficiency is greatly impacted by weakness noted in the area of vocabulary.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

The impact of COVID, as indicated by early warning indicators continues to identify attendance as impacting student progress. This is evident by the increase from 22 students in 2020 to 54 students this past year, 2021 who had less than 90% attendance. The 5th grade students had the greatest increase in truancy, along with decrease in test scores, as especially noted in the decline in Science achievement.

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

Overall, learning gains showed improvement in both ELA and Math as compared to proficiency. Math proficiency was significantly greater in grades 3 and 4.

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

With the addition of three intervention teachers, and increased progress monitoring, this resulted in ongoing instructional changes to meet students' reading needs for both Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention instruction. Additionally, the increased time for math intervention that was built into the schedule allowed for math teachers to adjust their instruction to meet their students' needs based on continuous progress monitoring throughout the school year.

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

Continued emphasis on progress monitoring by teachers in both ELA and math along with common and responsive instructional planning, and an increase focus on grade level vocabulary instruction for all content areas
Continue homogeneous groupings of students based on data for Tier 2 and 3 interventions in both

reading and math
Acceleration strategies during enrichment and tutoring to assist students in front loading their understanding of upcoming benchmarks and content
Increased monitoring and implementation of the procedures required to increase attendance and decrease truancy

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

To provide professional development opportunities including coaching and feedback to ensure the fidelity of implementation of instructional strategies and programs including vocabulary instruction, SIPPS, OG, Wonders, writing and acceleration strategy training
Additionally, collaboration with the district's science team focused on science instruction PD for 5th grade

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Continued emphasis on the development of social and academic goals by teachers and students that will enhance progress monitoring by teachers and students (SOAR Cards) as they take ownership for instruction and learning

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

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	With the introduction of B.E.S.T. standards and the new Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) as well as our our overall 2022 ELA data indicating that proficiency for students in grades 3-5 was at 50% (it had been 53% in 2019), Dream Lake ES continues to demonstrate ongoing issues in the area of proficiency.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Students in grades 3-5 will increase their ELA proficiency by 8 percentage points (50->58%) on the 2022-2023 Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST English Language Arts 3-5, PM3).
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Classroom and intervention teachers, in collaboration with the Instructional Coach and administration, will monitor various data sources including classroom, common and CRM assessments, i-Ready Diagnostic, and FAST 3-5 ELA (PM 1 & 2).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jessica Powell (jessica.powell@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Differentiation meets the needs of all students based on the ongoing use of progress monitoring data to adjust instruction in a timely manner. Additionally, homogeneous grouping of students during Intervention time will be implemented. Both of these evidence based strategies, when implemented with fidelity, yields high results.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	When teachers/coaches consistently monitor student progress, they are able to analyze and interpret the data, resulting in the increased ability to respond to students needs in a timely manner by planning and adjusting instruction. Additionally, the consistent monitoring of student data in intervention and enrichment allows for timely adjustments to be made to their programs.

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

Data based decisions will drive instruction. Instruction will be differentiated as identified by student need. This will be evident in small group instruction, tiered intervention, enrichment and tutoring groups. A minimum of 3 data points will be used to progress monitor and adjustments will be made on a quarterly basis.

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

Implementation of the Instructional Focus Calendar with committed dates for explicit and well-paced instruction; progress monitoring through formative and common assessments with time embedded for reteach as needed.

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

ESE Resource Teachers will push in, pull out and provide Support Facilitation to meet the needs of the students with disabilities. The ESE Resource will plan on a weekly basis with general education teachers to ensure access to the B.E.S.T. ELA standards through the implementation and High Yield strategies and compliance of accommodation implementation.

Person Responsible Kimberly Santana (kimberly.santana2@ocps.net)

Progress monitoring of student data on a regular basis (weekly) by grade level with the teachers will be facilitated and supported by the Instructional Coach, CRT and resource teachers.

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	With the introduction of B.E.S.T. standards in math and the new Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST), as well as our our overall 2022 Math data indicating that proficiency for students in grades 3-5 was at 60% (it had been 53% in 2019). We continue to demonstrate a need to keep the area of proficiency progressing.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Students in grades 3-5 will increase their Math proficiency by 8 percentage points (60->68%) on the 2022-2023 Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST Mathematics 3-5, PM3).
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Classroom and intervention teachers, in collaboration with the CRT. and administration, will monitor various data sources including classroom, common and CRM assessments, ST MATH, and FAST 3-5 Mathematics (PM 1 & 2).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Leslie O'Dell (34688@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Teachers will implement effective instructional strategies in response to purposeful monitoring of student data 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 formative and common assessments, ST Math and District instructional math resources (CRM's).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	When teachers/coaches consistently monitor student progress, they are able to analyze and interpret the data, resulting in the increased ability to respond to students needs in a timely manner by planning and adjusting instruction. Additionally, the consistent monitoring of student data in intervention/ enrichment allows for timely adjustments to be made to their program.

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

Implement small group instruction that is the result of identification and scheduling of students based on data; adapt groups as data indicates. Provide tiered levels of support and enrichment based on progress monitoring data and responsive differentiated skill instruction and acceleration strategies in enrichment and tutoring. Instruction will be differentiated based on the identified needs and instructional groupings of the students. Ongoing monitoring and adjustment of groups at a minimum of a quarterly basis.

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

Implementation of the Instructional Focus Calendar with committed dates for explicit and well-paced instruction; progress monitoring through formative and common assessments with time embedded for

reteach
as needed.

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

Progress monitoring of student data on a regular basis (weekly) by grade level with the teachers will be facilitated and supported by the Instructional Coach, CRT and resource teachers.

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

ESE Resource Teachers will push in, pull out and provide Support Facilitation to meet the needs of the students with disabilities. The ESE Resource will plan on a weekly basis with general education teachers to ensure access to the B.E.S.T. math standards through the implementation and High Yield strategies and compliance of accommodation implementation.

Person Responsible   Kimberly Santana (kimberly.santana2@ocps.net)

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

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

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

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

Based on 2021-2022 progress monitoring data using i-Ready, there is a concern that the rising 3rd graders (past year 2nd grade) are not on track to score a Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.Thier diagnostic score indicated that only 44% of the students were proficient, and that 18% of the students were two or more grade levels below.

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

Based on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment 2021-2022 , only 41% of the 5th grade students, scored a level 3 or above (59% scored below Level 3).

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

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

58 percent or more of the students on each grade level in K-3 will will demonstrate on the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system that they will be on track to pass the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST English Language Arts 3-5).

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

58 Percent or more of the students in grades 3-5 will will demonstrate that they are on track to test proficient on the the 2022-2023 Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST English Language Arts 3-5, PM 1.2.3).

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

Grade level teams will meet weekly in GLAM to review data, and instructional planning in response to the data, under the guidance of the instructional coach and administration. Students demonstrating ongoing reading difficulty will be closely monitored to ensure the support and differentiation required during small group and interventions. Those students who demonstrate increases in proficiency in reading will be scheduled into enrichment to ensure they maintain their proficiency. .

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Powell, Jessica, jessica.powell@ocps.net

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

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

With the implementation of the B.E.S.T. standards curriculum, the focus on foundational reading skills of phonemic awareness, phonics and fluency to support reading proficiency will include the use of Orton Gillam, SIPPS, and Hegerty (Grade K-2). For grades 3-5, in addition to instruction in the B.E.S.T. standards, the instructional approach of Orton Gillam (continue to struggle with phonics), and the use of Reading Plus will be implemented. Differentiation of the the instructional strategies will be ensured through the ongoing process of progress monitoring and responsive instructional planning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

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

It was evident that there was a need to get back to foundational skills instruction when teaching reading. Students demonstrated deficits in phonemic awareness and phonics which had an impact on fluency and reading comprehension.

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

- Literacy Leadership

- Literacy Coaching

- Assessment

- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Creation of the Literacy Council to ensure the collaboration of teachers from all grade levels in identifying critical instructional needs of students based on B.E.S.T. standards, and increase their understanding of vertical and horizontal alignment as it affects instruction and student learning. The council meets monthly to discuss and collaborate on various literacy needs including vetting various programs and resources to support reading proficiency. Schoolwide assessment data will be reviewed, and decisions made on needs to improve upon data. Information will be shared by the Literacy Council members with their individual grade level teams.	Powell, Jessica, jessica.powell@ocps.net
Ensure that all teachers are trained in and implement with fidelity the instructional strategies and programs needed to ensure their students' progress and proficiency. Professional development, including training, coaching, modeling and feedback will be provided throughout the year to ensure fidelity of implementation, and that the data is reflecting the instruction that the students are receiving. .	Powell, Jessica, jessica.powell@ocps.net

Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

In order to establish a positive school culture and climate, our school will continue to engage in ongoing district wide professional learning on leveraging social and emotional learning as well as leadership for student success. Through the implementation of a distributive leadership model, we will ensure that social and emotional leaning is used to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise in all our students. Dream Lake will implement the CASEL Core Competencies as a common language to support a positive culture of social and emotional learning and connect cognitive and conative strategies to support student success. A core team of teachers and leadership including administrators and our school counselor will participate in district wide professional learning throughout the year. The core team will work with a larger school team and is charged with personalizing and implementing professional learning with staff and families based on identified school and community needs. The school leadership team collaborates with students, staff and families, through processes such as the School Advisory Council, to reflect on implementation and determine next steps. Development of a positive culture and environment is further enhanced through school based and district wide opportunities focused on building capacity in families to support continuous school improvement and student success. Our school will strategically utilize staff to bridge the community and school, connect families with resources, and build a culture for authentic family engagement with school staff.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive school culture and environment.

Our entire staff will be involved in promoting a positive culture and environment. Due to a compressive positive approach with the implementation of our school's House System, Dream Lake is "Six houses, one family." Students have opportunities and are encouraged to interact with other students in the House they are assigned (Science, Technology, Reading, Engineering, Art, and Math). Positive behavior and rewards are built into the House System and implemented throughout the school including monthly celebrations. Additionally, through the leadership of the School Counselor and Behavior Specialist, instructional members will ensure students' participation in class meetings and SEL lessons. Individualized goal setting will be part of the students SOAR cards where they will have specific SEL and academic goals to monitor as they work towards meeting them. Finally, our staff, with the support of administration and our Parent Engagement Liaison, will work to bridge the community with DLE school culture!