

Orange County Public Schools

Dream Lake Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	12
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	23
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	23
VI. Title I Requirements	26
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	28

Dream Lake Elementary

500 N PARK AVENUE, Apopka, FL 32712

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure that every student has a promising and successful future.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

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/enhancing 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. 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/enhancing 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 guiding 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,

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<p>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.</p>
Biaggi, Kelli	Behavior Specialist	<p>Ms.Biaggi supports the staff, students, and families by providing behavioral and academic support to ensure students' success using our House system and the philosophy of positive behavioral support. 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.</p>
Dorlus, Lucy	Other	<p>Ms. Dorlus collaborates with the other instructional coaches in providing support to staff, students, and families. She shares the lead in supporting the staff in the implementation of resiliency standards 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.</p>
Santana, Kimberly	Other	<p>Ms. Santana ensures that the school is compliant with current district and state rules and procedures regarding Exceptional Student Education. She supports 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 who have IEPs and 504 plans. She participates in the decision-making for intervention and enrichment, as she collaborates with the other coaches in determining initial eligibility and reevaluation.</p>
Zulich, Carolyn	Reading Coach	<p>As the Reading coach, Ms. Carolyn. Zulich collaborates with the other instructional coaches to facilitate and evaluate content standards and instruction by guiding the K 12 reading and math plan components. She supports classroom teachers by coaching them on best practices and leading common planning in the areas of expertise. Additionally, she facilitates whole school screening programs that provide intervention services for those considered to be "at risk" while implementing progress monitoring through the systematic collection and analysis of data, ensuring the implementation of the MTSS Intervention plan. In response, as the needs of the students and teachers are identified, professional development is designed, presented, and supported.</p>

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

SIP development at Dream Lake E.S. is a collaborative process involving the leadership team including Team Leaders and the Interventionists. State testing results along with ongoing progress monitoring data and Panorama survey results were reviewed in consideration of our focuses. SAC members and teachers share the draft and feedback is taken into consideration before finalizing the SIP.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will act as our road map, regularly monitored every month by Administration and Instructional coaches to ensure the effective implementation of the plan and increase the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards. Monitoring will include responsive action based on progress, including revision of strategies and supports made available.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	81%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: B

	2018-19: B 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	6	24	29	27	21	26	0	0	0	133
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	2	3	4	0	0	0	12
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	1	3	6	6	0	2	0	0	0	18
Course failure in Math	0	2	3	2	3	1	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	18	25	26	0	0	0	69
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	15	19	30	0	0	0	64
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	16	22	53	25	0	0	0	0	117

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	1	7	9	28	28	28	0	0	0	101

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	7	10	6	8	8	15	0	0	0	54
One or more suspensions	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	6	0	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	19
Course failure in Math	3	4	3	7	2	14	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	9	6	20	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	10	7	24	0	0	0	41
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	12	8	25	0	0	0	45

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	7	10	6	8	8	15	0	0	0	54
One or more suspensions	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	6	0	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	19
Course failure in Math	3	4	3	7	2	14	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	9	6	20	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	10	7	24	0	0	0	41
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	12	8	25	0	0	0	45

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	49	57	53	50	56	56	53		
ELA Learning Gains				57			52		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				52			31		
Math Achievement*	60	60	59	60	46	50	53		
Math Learning Gains				64			36		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				53			32		
Science Achievement*	63	63	54	49	61	59	62		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	48	59	59	66			55		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	267
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	451
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	33	Yes	1	
ELL	43			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	47			
HSP	49			
MUL	81			
PAC				
WHT	67			

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	48			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	41			
ELL	49			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	54			
HSP	54			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	67			
FRL	53			

Accountability Components by Subgroup
 Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	49			60			63					48
SWD	27			32			50				5	43
ELL	37			52			60				5	48
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	43			50			58				4	
HSP	43			54			60				5	47
MUL	69			92							2	

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	64			74			76				4	
FRL	43			53			61				5	47

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	50	57	52	60	64	53	49					66
SWD	23	43	46	31	53	52	18					60
ELL	36	54	48	49	60	52	26					66
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	53	58	54	56	61	50	44					
HSP	41	56	52	53	65	56	39					67
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	65	57		76	65		73					
FRL	44	55	56	53	59	54	41					65

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	53	52	31	53	36	32	62					55
SWD	25	41	35	27	50	50	46					
ELL	44	46	27	41	29	15	53					55
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	45	42		46	13		70					
HSP	46	52	40	46	36	32	55					54
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	73	63		73	50		72					
FRL	47	47	35	47	28	44	58					51

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	50%	54%	-4%	54%	-4%
04	2023 - Spring	56%	60%	-4%	58%	-2%
03	2023 - Spring	44%	52%	-8%	50%	-6%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	60%	59%	1%	59%	1%
04	2023 - Spring	58%	62%	-4%	61%	-3%
05	2023 - Spring	60%	55%	5%	55%	5%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	58%	59%	-1%	51%	7%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Preliminary school PM3 data indicates a 3% increase in proficiency for students in grades 3-5 in both reading and math. When focusing on reading, the influence of Covid conditions on student achievement cannot be underestimated as seen by a national decrease in reading proficiency specifically in the 3rd-grade cadre including a lack of completing kindergarten, instruction at home, or in school with masks as they learned to read in first grade placing, this group significantly behind (evident also by the data indicating only 45% of the current 4th grade class is predicted to be proficient on the FAST ELA reading test.) Another factor contributing to low performance is the number of students with two or more early warning indicators in grades 3-5 (50 total) and the number of less than 90% attendance rate (74 students total). Finally, our ELL performance demonstrated that they struggled (compared to past years).

The need for more practice in oral language to enhance language acquisition and increase comprehension became clearly evident this year.

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

There was no decline, but an increase in both Reading and math proficiency of 3 percent and we experienced great growth in science from 49 to 63 percent.

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

Although state data is not currently available, our 53% proficiency in reading will probably be the greatest gap to the state average. 2022-2023 PM3 Data indicates a 6% discrepancy on PM3 3rd Grade ELA Reading between the state and our school; 27% of the students in the state scored Level 1 whereas 33% of our students scored level 3 .

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

Science showed the greatest improvement. Targeted instruction and hands-on experiences under the facilitation of the science coach, and in collaboration with the 5th-grade teachers, produced an increase of 13 percent.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part 1, attendance continues to be the greatest area of concern at our school where 133 students had 10 or more absences during the school year. This area is of great concern, as the number continues to increase over the past few years and it affects student achievement.

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

- To increase students' reading and math proficiency.
- To decrease the number of students with excessive absences.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority 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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Dream Lake students have struggled with reading proficiency for the past 8 years. Except for the year prior to Covid, reading proficiency was always in the 50+ percent range. Students need to be able to read proficiently and comprehend what they read in order to become contributing citizens.

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 proficiency in reading by 5 percent on the Spring 2024 FAST ELA from 53%-58%

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Progress monitoring of reading data will be monitored every week by the Instructional MTSS and Reading coaches, and on a monthly basis by Administration and Instructional coaches to ensure the effective implementation of the interventions and increase the achievement of students in meeting the BEST standards for ELA. Progress Monitoring will include responsive action based on data, including revision of strategies and supports made available based on the differentiated needs of the students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jessica Powell (jessica.powell@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Tier 1 - CRMs and common assessments, Exact Path, Heggerty, and Being a Reader (K-2)

Tier 2 - Exact Path, SIPPs, Orton Gillingham instructional methodology (science of reading)

Tier 3 - Heggerty, SIPPs, Orton Gillingham

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The diversity of our students requires a variety of interventions to ensure we meet their needs.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Meet with teams weekly; develop lesson plans, review common assessment data, respond to identified needs.

Person Responsible: Carolyn Zuclich (carolyn.zuclich@ocps.net)

By When: August 10, 2023

Implement a structured 120-minute reading and writing block based on district model (K-5).

Person Responsible: Carol-Ann Clenton-Martin (carol-ann.clenton-martin@ocps.net)

By When: August 10, 2023

Ensure daily small group instruction-based student data from Tier 1 instruction.

Person Responsible: Carolyn Zuclich (carolyn.zuclich@ocps.net)

By When: August 10, 2023

Provide tiered levels of support and enrichment based on progress; ensure that groups are fluid in response to progress monitoring and intervention data.

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

By When: Throughout the school year (weekly and bi-weekly)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

For two years, prior to Covid, Math proficiency was between 68-71 percent. Currently, our PM3 data indicates that only 63% of our students demonstrated proficiency on the FAST PM3 Mathematics Test. Dream Lake is focused on improving students' proficiency as we prepare them with skills necessary for a post-secondary setting.

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 proficiency in mathematics by 5 percent on the FAST Mathematics PM3 Spring 2024 from 63%-68%

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Progress monitoring of math data will be monitored bi-weekly by the CRT and Math Teacher Leader, and on a monthly basis by the Administration and all Instructional coaches to ensure the effective implementation of grade level and intervention instruction resulting in increased achievement of students in meeting the BEST Mathematics standards. Progress Monitoring will include responsive action based on progress (data), including revision of strategies and supports made available based on the differentiated needs of the students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Leslie O'Dell (34688@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Tier 1 - CRMs, SuccessMaker, and ST math.

Tier 2 - Reflex math and SuccessMaker

Tier 3 - SuccessMaker, Reflex math, Number World and SAVAAS MDIS Intervention Kits

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These are District Resources that have been vetted and identified to meet the needs of students based on the requirements of the FAST Mathematics assessment. Additionally, the impact the use of ST Math Reflex and students' math progress has been documented over the past four years by Dream Lake. A correlation has been documented that those students who actively engage in ST Math throughout the school year perform higher than those who don't.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Ensure implementation of fluid small group instruction based on student data during Tier 1 instruction.

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

By When: From the first day of school and throughout the academic year.

Provide tiered levels of intervention support and enrichment based on progress monitoring data and responsive differentiated skill instruction.

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

By When: August 28th, 2023

Ensure that Tier 2 and 3 Intervention groups are fluid in response to progress monitoring data (monthly focus).

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

By When: August 28th, 2023 - ongoing throughout the school year

Provide before and after school tutoring specific to students needs as indicated by student data.

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

By When: September 12, 2023

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Early Warning System indicates that Attendance continues to be an area of focus for our school. Since 2020, EWS indicates that lack of attendance is increasing and impacting student achievement. This is evident by the increase from 22 students in 2020 to 133 students in 2023 who had less than 90% attendance (21% of our student population). Additionally, 101 of these students were also identified as having two or more early warning indicators (affecting academic achievement.)

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

The number of students who attend school less than 90% will decrease by 20% (from 133 to 106) as indicated by the Early Warning System.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

1. Review student attendance reports on a weekly basis - monitor for 4 unexcused absences in a calendar month or 10 unexcused absences in 90 calendar days.
2. Monitor teacher attendance reports to ensure accurate and timely reporting of attendance daily
3. Ensure the collaborative effort between the social worker and attendance team on a weekly basis
4. Implement School-Based Truancy Interventions with fidelity

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Terri Pinchevsky (terri.pinchevsky@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Implement "School-Based Truancy Interventions" from the Attendance Policy and Procedures Handbook 2023-2024 and parent outreach on the importance of Attendance (Website, Talking Points)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

To increase motivation of the students to be at school, Dream Lake has embraced and put into practice the research of PBIS (USF) and the implementation of CHAMPS (Randy Sprick) using the HOUSE System (Ron Clark) to embrace our students. We are 6 Houses, but 1 Family. Greeting students, letting them know that they are valued and missed when they are absent, is part of the process. In addition, we use various Parent Outreach methods, and ensure compliance with District procedures

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 2 - Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Step 1 - Informal Meeting with Parent/Guardian - The attendance warning form. May require a doctor's note if 10 or more absences

Person Responsible: Terri Pinchevsky (terri.pinchevsky@ocps.net)

By When: September 2023 and throughout the school year.

Step 2 - (if no improvement) Formal Letter - Meet and sign a contract with the parent/guardian

Person Responsible: Terri Pinchevsky (terri.pinchevsky@ocps.net)

By When: September 2023 and throughout the school year.

Step 3- (if no improvement) Social worker reaches out to family - documented conversation

Person Responsible: Terri Pinchevsky (terri.pinchevsky@ocps.net)

By When: September 2023 and throughout the school year.

Step 4 - (If no improvement) Social worker and Principal/Designee work together in regard to Truancy Court Procedures

Person Responsible: Terri Pinchevsky (terri.pinchevsky@ocps.net)

By When: September 2023 and throughout the school year.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Not Applicable

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

Our area of focus is Grade level proficiency and Tier 1 instruction. 2022-2023 ELA STAR Early Literacy indicated that 56% of our 2nd grade (rising 3rd) were not on track to be proficient in reading. On the

2023-2024 PM1, 86% of the current 3rd graders scored below proficiency (70% Level 1 and 16% Level 2). On Exact Path, 76% are not meeting grade level proficiency: 30% are demonstrating below expectations, and 36% are approaching grade level.

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

Our area of focus is Grade level proficiency and Tier 1 instruction. 2022-2023 3rd grade FAST Reading indicated that 56% of our 3rd grade (rising 4th) were not on track to be proficient in reading. On the 2023-2024 PM1, 71% of the current 4th graders scored below proficiency (52% Level 1 and 19% Level 2). On Exact Path, 50% are not meeting grade level proficiency: 13% are demonstrating below expectations, and 37% are approaching grade level.

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 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 Measurable Outcomes

50% or more of the students in Grades K-2 will demonstrated proficiency on the STAR PM3 test in Reading/ELA in the Spring 2024.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Currently 55% of our current 4th grade students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment., and 56% of our current 3rd grade students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment. The number of nonproficient students in both 3rd and 4th grade students will decrease by 10%.

Monitoring

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 impact student achievement outcomes.

- Each classroom will be walked through bi-weekly by administration and/or coaches. Teachers will receive immediate feedback and assistance and/or resources will be provided to enrich the instruction and aid in improved student success.
- Data meetings will take place after each unit of instruction is taught and assessed. (SBUAs or teacher-created tests)
- FAST progress monitoring assessments, DIBELS progress monitoring data, Exact Path diagnostic data (3-5) and standards mastery, and district-created assessment data (SBUA) will be reviewed with grade-level teachers, administration, and coaches.
- Teachers will receive guidance from coaches on how to analyze the student data and use it to guide planning and instruction.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Zuclich, Carolyn, carolyn.zuclich@ocps.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs**Description:**

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?
- Exact Path (K-5) – provides direct instruction at the individual level in foundational skills, comprehension, and vocabulary
 - Reading Eggs (K-1)
 - Freckle (2nd) – provides foundational skills practice, comprehension practice, and vocabulary practice (also used for standards mastery formative assessments)
 - Reading Plus (on levels 3-5) – provides fluency, comprehension, and vocabulary practice as well as an initial and BM2, BM3 diagnostic assessment.

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Based on identified student needs and District recommendations, these programs will be closely monitored for both foundational and comprehension needs as identified.

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
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students are taught to analyze word parts through morphology lessons in grades 2-5. Morphemes are taught based on the sequence provided in the district CRMs. • Teachers provide reference to previously taught morphemes through anchor charts and interactive bulletin boards to provide students with the ability to use their knowledge of morphemes and their meanings to identify the meaning of unfamiliar words and their parts of speech. • Teachers in grades 2-5 encourage students to use words containing previously taught morphemes in their writing. • Spelling is also focused on during the foundational reading time as students are asked to encode words containing the phonics skill being taught or focused on at the time as well as previously taught phonics skills. These accurately spelled words are also being used in the students' writing. • Students who are still in need of explicit phonics instruction at the 3-5 grade level receive this during interventions 4x weekly. This instruction is based on their initial OG assessment and every student is placed in a class with others who have deficits in a particular phonics skill. These students are assessed weekly in order to move through the OG sequence of phonics skills and move into fluency and comprehension groups. • Fluency practice is provided both in the ELA classroom (for all students) and during the intervention (should they already have the foundational phonics skills mastered). • ELA teachers have employed the use of the DIBELS fluency benchmark as well as the MAZE benchmark assessment to provide detailed feedback for the teachers about who their students are as readers and to allow teachers to plan for targeted small groups. • In grades 4-5, students respond to text both orally and through written response daily. They are encouraged to work in collaborative groups to analyze text and write their responses in complete sentences or paragraphs. 	<p>Powell, Jessica, jessica.powell@ocps.net</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ELA teachers are using the Orton Gillingham scope and sequence along with the explicit strategies and procedures from OG training to implement rigorous phonics lessons daily in both whole group and small groups as well as interventions • All ELA teachers begin their reading block with foundational skills – following either the district CRM slides for foundational skills or the OG scope and sequence • Multisensory learning tools such as Elkonin boxes, letter cards, and letter stampers are employed to assist students with decoding words 	<p>Powell, Jessica, jessica.powell@ocps.net</p>

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements
 This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
 List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

Dissemination of this SIP to all stakeholders including students, families, school staff and leadership, and local businesses and organizations will be conducted through various methods. Besides the school's webpage, the SIP and progress will be shared at the monthly SAC meetings, and Open House, and a

copy will be maintained in the front office and available to all visitors. Family nights focused on academic themes will also spotlight the SIP.

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

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

A year-long school calendar with themes tied to monthly events is planned to involve stakeholders and students. Although many are focused on academics (Math night, Science lab, etc.) additional events including music and dramatic presentations are planned. We have found that when we showcase our students, more parents participate!

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

Our focus is in alignment with the Florida Formula for Success which includes the 6 Areas of Reading: oral language, phonological awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. 4 Forms of Assessment: Screening, Progress Monitoring, Diagnostic, and Summative, and 3 Tiers of standards-aligned instruction that include accommodations for SWDs and ELLs. Our Councils (Reading, Math, Science, etc.) will ensure that lesson plans reflect effective strategies that demonstrate literacy for all which includes communication skills and embedded strategies that support SWDs and ELLs.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

n/a

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

The school counselor provides weekly motivational videos to support learning: Mindful Mondays. Minutes Meetings and lessons are also routinely conducted. Our school counselor also facilitates monthly meetings with our student services team.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

n/a

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

n/a

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

n/a

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

n/a

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No