Discovery Key Elementary School

2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Discovery Key Elementary School

3550 LYONS RD, Lake Worth, FL 33467

https://dkes.palmbeachschools.org

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2017-18 Title I School**	**2017-18 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	No	41%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	52%

School Grades History

Year	**2017-18**	**2016-17**	**2015-16**	**2014-15**
Grade	A	A	A	A*

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Palm Beach County School Board on 11/14/2018.

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.

Discovery Key Elementary is committed to providing a world-class education with excellence and equity to empower each student to reach his or her highest potential with the most effective staff to foster the knowledge, skills, and ethics required for responsible and productive lives.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Discovery Key Elementary School envisions a dynamic, collaborative multi-cultural community where education and lifelong learning are valued and supported. All learners reach their highest potential and succeed in the global society.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title
Lewis, Catherine	Principal
Black, Nicole	Assistant Principal
Wallace, Susan	Teacher, ESE
	School Counselor

Duties

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

The schools leadership team provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision making, ensures
that the school-based team is implementing RtI with fidelity, conducts assessment of RtI skills of school staff,including students who are identified as ELL students,ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support RtI implementation, and designates liaisons to communicate with parents regarding school-based RtI plans and activities.

General Education Teachers (Primary and Intermediate): Provide information about core instruction, participate in student data collection, deliver Tier 1 instruction/intervention, collaborate with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrate Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2 activities.

Exceptional Student Education ESE Teachers: Participate in student data collection, integrate core instructional activities/materials into Tier 2 instruction, and collaborate with general education teachers through such activities as co-teaching and consultation.

The School Based Team (SBT) includes,Mrs. Lewis, Principal, Nicole Black, Assistant Principal, the ESE Coordinator, School Based Team Leader (June Neely-Williams), Guidance Counselor, Katherine Ribakoff, School Psychologist, Carlee Knight, School Nurse, the SLP, Analida Mortell, CLF and Jacqueline Gersley, SACC Director.

The SBT will identify and analyze existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and
intervention approaches. Identifies systematic patterns of student needs while working with one another on evidence-based intervention strategies; assist with whole school screening programs that provide early intervention services for children to be considered "at risk"; assist in the design and delivery of professional development; and provide support for assessment and implementation monitoring.

School Psychologist: Participates in collection, interpretation and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; provides professional development and technical assistance for problem-solving activities including data collection, data analysis, intervention planning, and program evaluation; facilities data-based decision making activities.

Speech Language Pathologist: Educates the team in ways to identify a language delay, assessing and instructing, as well as identifying the appropriate intervention; assists in the selection of screening measures; and helps identify systemic patterns of student need with respect to language skills.

Language Facilitator, Analida Mortell, will provide support to students identified as ELL.

Early Warning Systems

Year 2017-18

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	17	13	13	10	13	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83
One or more suspensions	1	1	1	0	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA or Math	38	30	38	56	43	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	225
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	12	19	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	10	5	4	14	22	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73

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	3	2	2	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	3	1	1	10	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

Date this data was collected
Friday 8/31/2018

Year 2016-17 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	9	7	9	13	10	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
One or more suspensions	3	3	1	3	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in ELA or Math	21	33	45	50	25	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	210
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	18	17	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	5	4	20	15	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70

Year 2016-17 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	9	7	9	13	10	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
One or more suspensions	3	3	1	3	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in ELA or Math	21	33	45	50	25	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	210
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	18	17	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	5	4	20	15	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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

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

ELA learning gains of the low 25% performed the lowest, decreasing by 10% when compared to FY17. Overall, our school trend reflects a need to focus on our low 25% for math and/or ELA. There is a lack of consistency in the low 25% making learning gains over the past few years.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

ELA learning gains of the low 25% dropped 10% showed the greatest decline for FY18.
Low 25% consist mostly of our ESE student population, 79% of which fall below proficiency (4th and 5th)
PYG for ELA dropped .16, mostly from 5th grade dropping PYG by .30 - despite increasing overall
proficiency.

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

There is no gap when compared to the state average in any area. The biggest gap when compared to
the district is the lowest 25% in ELA (6% less than the district).

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

With a focus on the L25% in math last year, L25% learning gains improved 9% FY18 and the overall
math proficiency increased from 78% to 81%.

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

The low 25% in math in FY18 was a focus due to the decrease in the low 25% learning gains in math
when compared to FY17. Teachers worked together in Professional Learning Communities, conducted
rotations in math to differentiate instruction, ESE and ELL teachers supported their students in small
group scaffolding the skills,
professional development opportunities (to include monitoring the L25% students by breaking down their
FSA and diagnostic test scores), iReady is conducted at a minimum of 45 min a week, and grade level
teams assessed and analyzed math common assessments and district diagnostics. Teachers also made
sure to include math vocabulary support because it was identified as a barrier.

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

School Grade Component	2018			2017		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	74%	57%	56%	70%	52%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	65%	61%	55%	63%	56%	52%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	56%	48%	51%	51%	46%
Math Achievement	81%	65%	62%	78%	61%	58%
Math Learning Gains	71%	63%	59%	81%	61%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	53%	47%	69%	51%	46%
Science Achievement	69%	56%	55%	70%	53%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Attendance below 90 percent	17 (9)	13 (7)	13 (9)	10 (13)	13 (10)	17 (14)	83 (62)
One or more suspensions	1 (3)	1 (3)	1 (1)	0 (3)	1 (2)	8 (6)	12 (18)
Course failure in ELA or Math	38 (21)	30 (33)	38 (45)	56 (50)	43 (25)	20 (36)	225 (210)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	12 (18)	19 (17)	24 (29)	55 (64)

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2018	77%	56%	21%	57%	20%
	2017	79%	54%	25%	58%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	73%	58%	15%	56%	17%
	2017	71%	57%	14%	56%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2018	70%	59%	11%	55%	15%
	2017	63%	52%	11%	53%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2018	83%	63%	20%	62%	21%
	2017	78%	62%	16%	62%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	76%	63%	13%	62%	14%
	2017	76%	64%	12%	64%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2018	73%	66%	7%	61%	12%
	2017	72%	61%	11%	57%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2018	69%	56%	13%	55%	14%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	37	38	38	49	42	29	33				
ELL	52	64	67	73	76	70					
ASN	75	78		96	78						
BLK	65	57		74	61						
HSP	68	62	54	74	63	44	69				
MUL	80			100							
WHT	78	65	45	83	76	56	75				
FRL	64	63	52	73	66	51	61				

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	39	52	55	42	46	26	34				
ELL	48	56	58	68	61						
ASN	65	73		88	93						
BLK	59	50	50	88	76		55				
HSP	69	58	61	73	68	40	60				
MUL	75			92							
WHT	76	70	61	78	69	39	74				
FRL	61	58	59	70	63	41	59				

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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

Areas of Focus:

Activity #1	
Title	If we deliver effective and relevant instruction to meet the needs of all students, then we will have an increase in learning gains for our lowest 25% in English Language Arts; which will ensure high school readiness.
Rationale	By using high-yield reading strategies and data-driven differentiated instruction, students will be able to receive the specific skills necessary to help them fill gaps in knowledge and therefore make learning gains and improve their academic achievement.
Intended Outcome	Improve lowest 25% learning gains in ELA by 10% in order to support the long-term outcome of ensuring high school readiness.
Point Person	Nicole Black (nicole.black@palmbeachschools.org)

Action Step	
Description	Pillars of Effective Instruction: Students are immersed in rigorous tasks encompassing the full intent of the Florida State Standards and content required by Florida State Statute 1003.42, are continuing to develop a single school culture and appreciation of multicultural diversity with a focus on Reading and Writing, and are ensured a shared commitment and collective responsibility for the academic success of every student. 1.Teachers will identify students in the lowest 25% in ELA 2. ELA teachers will work closely with ESE teachers in ensuring they are meeting with their students in a small group setting, planning intentional standard-aligned lessons, and monitoring student progress. 3. Teachers will analyze ongoing data to determine areas of specific need for each student. 4. Teachers will use various programs to support students, including iReady, Fundations, and LLI (SAI Students).
Person Responsible	Catherine Lewis (catherine.lewis@palmbeachschools.org)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	*Administration will monitor the core reading and writing instruction through walkthroughs, observations, and planning for instruction- PLC evidence, to include collaborating with ESE teachers (if applicable). *Teachers will analyze various forms of data (RRR, iReady, FastBridge (if they are receiving intensive support,classroom and district assessment data, and state assessments) and Fundations. Students not showing growth will be monitored in PLC discussions, data chats, and SBT. *Administration will monitor unit assessments through the assessment calendar (FSQ and USA). *Diagnostics, RRR, iReady, SRI, Fundations, and SBT data by conducting data chats with teachers. * Teachers and administration will monitor the monthly usage of iReady to make sure they are getting the

minimum of 45 minutes a week.

Person Responsible   Nicole Black (nicole.black@palmbeachschools.org)

Part V: Budget	
Total:	**$0.00**