Orange County Public Schools

Discovery Middle

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Discovery Middle

601 WOODBURY RD, Orlando, FL 32828

https://discoveryms.ocps.net/

Demographics

Principal: Alexander Stubenbort

Start Date for this Principal: 5/31/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	55%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (59%) 2018-19: A (68%) 2017-18: A (63%)
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	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Orange County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Discovery Middle

601 WOODBURY RD, Orlando, FL 32828

https://discoveryms.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)
Middle School 6-8	No	55%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	68%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Orange County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

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
Aldridge, Jeffrey	Principal	
Wilson, Michael	Assistant Principal	
Kusner, Esther	Assistant Principal	
LaSala, Jennifer	Instructional Media	
Staley, Kimberly	ELL Compliance Specialist	
Duncan, Lirisa	School Counselor	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 5/31/2022, Alexander Stubenbort

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.*
1

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.*
15

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
51

Total number of students enrolled at the school
797

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
11

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
10

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	261	237	287	0	0	0	0	785
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	47	71	0	0	0	0	182
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	40	0	0	0	0	59
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	9	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	20	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	50	76	0	0	0	0	176
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	49	53	0	0	0	0	164
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	52	79	0	0	0	0	181

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	3

Date this data was collected or last updated
Monday 8/15/2022

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	231	263	276	0	0	0	0	770
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	31	35	0	0	0	0	89
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	26	18	0	0	0	0	47
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	23	27	0	0	0	0	54
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	38	16	0	0	0	0	83
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	27	34	0	0	0	0	74
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	49	57	0	0	0	0	126

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	231	263	276	0	0	0	0	770
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	31	35	0	0	0	0	89
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	26	18	0	0	0	0	47
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	23	27	0	0	0	0	54
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	38	16	0	0	0	0	83
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	27	34	0	0	0	0	74
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	49	57	0	0	0	0	126

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	52%	49%	50%				64%	52%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	50%						58%	52%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	36%						44%	45%	47%
Math Achievement	65%	36%	36%				71%	55%	58%
Math Learning Gains	64%						67%	55%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	49%						62%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	61%	55%	53%				75%	51%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	79%	61%	58%				82%	67%	72%

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
06	2022					
	2019	57%	52%	5%	54%	3%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	61%	48%	13%	52%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				
08	2022					
	2019	70%	54%	16%	56%	14%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	47%	43%	4%	55%	-8%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	63%	49%	14%	54%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				
08	2022					
	2019	47%	36%	11%	46%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	72%	49%	23%	48%	24%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	81%	66%	15%	71%	10%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

		ALGEBRA EOC				
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	90%	63%	27%	61%	29%
		GEOMETRY EOC				
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	99%	53%	46%	57%	42%

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	16	33	28	24	39	29	18	50			
ELL	33	46	33	50	58	46	29	63	84		
ASN	79	69		92	80		73		88		
BLK	39	31	22	50	55	52	58	60			
HSP	45	48	36	59	63	47	50	78	72		
MUL	47	57		74	68			83			
WHT	64	56	39	73	65	47	80	84	77		
FRL	42	43	32	54	59	44	48	74	73		

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	18	28	17	28	47	43	17	28			
ELL	30	42	28	41	51	46	17	49			
ASN	82	77		86	50			92	91		
BLK	51	43	22	44	42	56	42	67	62		
HSP	50	50	34	58	53	46	57	65	66		
MUL	56	54		56	50		70				
WHT	67	57	21	73	63	62	78	80	83		
FRL	44	44	27	48	51	49	48	59	60		

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	20	41	37	29	47	47	33	54			
ELL	41	44	37	51	57	54	70	61	81		
ASN	75	65		88	82		94	95	90		
BLK	57	60	55	64	62	64	62	78	89		
HSP	51	50	36	61	62	55	63	73	77		
MUL	77	52		76	70				71		
WHT	76	64	55	80	72	72	84	90	90		
FRL	50	49	39	57	61	59	59	70	78		

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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	37
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	568
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	48
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	80
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	46
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	66
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	65
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	48
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?

ELA scores declined from the previous year for overall proficiency and learning gains. ELA achievement declined from 57% to 52% while overall ELA learning gains declined from 53% to 50%. Science achievement also declined from 64% to 61%. Overall math learning gains increased from 55% to 64%. Our SWD subgroup continues to perform significantly below the general education population. This subgroup scored 39% proficient.

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

ELA achievement and learning gains demonstrate the greatest need for improvement as ELA achievement has declined by 12% over the last three years.

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

With the effects of the ongoing pandemic, students were getting accustomed to structure and learning setting of the brick and mortar school environment. Lack of engagement was a factor that led to overall decrease in proficiency. This year, we have a concentrated focus on school wide engagement through the use of collaborative group work, SEL strategies, and the addition of Intervention Specialists.

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

Overall math learning gains increased from 55% to 64% and social studies achievement increased from 72% to 79%.

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

There was an intense focus on each standard and providing enrichment and remediation as needed. In addition, having a support facilitator in math classrooms was effective in assisting our SWD students in math learning gains.

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

This year we will focus on professional learning which includes using appropriate scaffolding in their lesson planning. Teachers will plan and use frequent and effective formative assessments during instruction to monitor progress and make innovative, on-the-spot instructional adjustments.

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.

Professional development will be provided on formative assessments, strategies for processing content, and social and emotional learning strategies. The formative assessment professional learning will dive into how to create them, how to use them within the lesson, and ways to use the data to implement appropriate scaffolding. Arts Integration will support teachers across all core content areas to help improve reading and critical thinking skills for students; particularly English Language Learners, students from lower socioeconomic backgrounds and minority students. Arts integration helps with language acquisition and increases student engagement.

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

Increased focus on the MTSS process to identify struggling students and providing support as needed. Each PLC will have common assessments and closely align lessons in their planning to ensure that data discussions are timely and actionable.

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

:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Increasing academic achievement of students with disabilities. ESSA Federal Percent of Points Index indicates this is a high priority need and focusing on the success of these students will reduce achievement gaps and prepare these students for future academic success.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Increase achievement and learning gains for students with disabilities.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	This area of focus will be monitored through classroom walk throughs, review of progress monitoring data and through data chats with professional learning communities.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jeffrey Aldridge (jeffrey.aldridge@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Lessons aligned to Florida BEST Standards at the appropriate level of complexity with ongoing feedback loops between leadership and teachers, students and PLC's focused on data, instructional planning and student evidence of learning
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Standards based lessons differentiated to meet the needs of these specific student groups and data driven deliberate action planning will improve achievement and learning gains for our students. This strategy is aligned to having high expectations for all learners and teachers.

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.

Monitoring of lowest 30%

Person Responsible	Jeffrey Aldridge (jeffrey.aldridge@ocps.net)

Monitoring of "bubble" students who scored at High Level 1/High Level 2

Person Responsible	Jeffrey Aldridge (jeffrey.aldridge@ocps.net)

Collaboration during data-driven PLC meetings

Person Responsible	Jeffrey Aldridge (jeffrey.aldridge@ocps.net)

Continuation of support facilitation model to support students with disabilities

Person Responsible	Jeffrey Aldridge (jeffrey.aldridge@ocps.net)

#2. 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.	Data indicates a decline in the number of students scoring Level 3 or above. From 2019 to 2022, ELA proficiency decreased from 64% to 52%. Additionally, the number of students showing a learning gain decreased from 58% to 50% during this same time frame.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Focusing on improving tier 1 instructional strategies and the acceleration of student performance increases teacher capacity in delivering standards-aligned lessons and we anticipate student achievement and engagement to increase. Additionally, we anticipate ELA proficiency to improve by 3%, moving from 52% to 55%.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Progress will be monitored through common formative assessments and district-created Progress Monitoring Activities. Regular data chats within the Professional Learning Communities will be used to discuss standards and instructional strategies as well as remediation and enrichment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jeffrey Aldridge (jeffrey.aldridge@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Students interact in small groups and utilize effective cognitive skills necessary for collaboration to practice and deepen knowledge. A school-wide emphasis on processing strategies will be used to encourage academic discourse.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Small group instruction allows for differentiation of instruction along with a targeted focus for teachers to monitor student learning. Flexible grouping also provides a systematic structure for our Intervention Specialists to work with targeted students.

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.

The administrator and instructional coach will work with PLC's to design instruction around the curriculum resource materials and high-yield instructional strategies.

Person Responsible	Esther Kusner (esther.kusner@ocps.net)

Classroom and Intervention teachers will be utilizing collaborative learning stations in the classroom to provide targeted, differentiated instruction to best meet the needs of all learners.

Person Responsible	Esther Kusner (esther.kusner@ocps.net)

The PLC's will meet weekly during common planning time to discuss data, review the curriculum materials,
and plan instruction; including stations, remediation, and enrichment.

Person Responsible	Esther Kusner (esther.kusner@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.

Discovery Middle addresses building a positive school culture and environment by ensuring that a two-way communication process is in place for all stakeholders. We are committed to promoting social and emotional resources for our staff, students and families. This includes professional development aimed at coping strategies, mindfulness, having a growth mindset, self-regulation and classroom management practices. We also have a student support services team which includes our SAFE Coordinator, Guidance Counselors, School Psychologist, Social Worker and School Resource Officer. This team will be introduced to our students, staff and community during the first week of school so that our stakeholders are aware of each team member and their role in ensuring that students' emotional needs are met. The school will provide opportunities for families and alumni to participate in school events such as campus beautification. Discovery Middle will also partner with our SAC and PTSA to discuss school data and resources dedicated to helping our students and staff to thrive.

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

The stakeholders involved in promoting a positive culture and environment at Discovery Middle are:
- Student Services Support Team - serves as a triage for students who are in need of SEL support. Provides resources (school and/or community based) to students and families in need.
- School administrators - provides leadership to all stakeholders; examines data to include discipline and student services; communicates with staff, families, students and our community to determine needs; coordinates efforts of all stakeholders to ensure that the school's vision is upheld.
- SEL Team - provides instructional resource support and professional development to staff; creates meaningful activities for our stakeholders to engage in social emotional learning
- Cultural Responsiveness Standards Based Teaching Team - provides professional development to help teachers learn about unconscious bias, microaggressions, and classroom management to ensure that student cultures are respected, high academic expectations are in practice for all students, and proactive classroom management techniques are utilized.
- PTSA and SAC - communicates with school administrators and ensures that school goals pertaining to SEL are met.