Discovery Academy Of Lake Alfred

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Discovery Academy Of Lake Alfred

1000 N. BUENA VISTA DR, Lake Alfred, FL 33850

http://www.discoveryacademy.org/

Demographics

Principal: Kevin Warren

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2008

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	78%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: B (54%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

N/A

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.](http://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 Academy Of Lake Alfred

1000 N. BUENA VISTA DR, Lake Alfred, FL 33850

http://www.discoveryacademy.org/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	74%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	62%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	B	B

School Board Approval

N/A

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.

We are dedicated to actively engaging all individuals in quality learning experiences that will enable them to value themselves and become responsible, productive citizens in a changing world.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is that every student needs to succeed in the 21st century with an education that is both academically rigorous and "real-world" relevant. We think of academic rigor as students being able to apply their skills and knowledge to real-world problems, to adapt solutions to an ever-changing society, and to solve problems we have yet to recognize. Teaching through application is a very effective way to engage students and ensure they can apply what they have learned.

We believe that the Discovery Academy family works together and shares responsibility for guiding our students' education by:

*Providing a safe and orderly environment conducive to learning for students,
*Actively engaging students in the learning process through a variety of teaching strategies and modality styles,
*Encouraging students to value themselves and have an acceptance of cultural differences of idea and feelings,
*Providing ongoing technological training for growth in a changing world.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Warren, Kevin	Principal	
FULKS, CAROL	Other	Supervises principals and other admin

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 7/1/2008, Kevin Warren

Number of teachers with a 2019 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.*
3

Number of teachers with a 2019 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.*

13

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

50

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	78%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: B (54%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by 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	312	311	317	0	0	0	0	940
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	13	28	0	0	0	0	66
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	43	41	0	0	0	0	115
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	1	8	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	66	53	59	0	0	0	0	178
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	70	72	76	0	0	0	0	218

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	68	75	101	0	0	0	0	244

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	8	3	8	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	6

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 6/22/2020

Prior Year - 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	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	316	325	310	0	0	0	0	951
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	33	35	0	0	0	0	105
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	88	76	0	0	0	0	233
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	95	109	0	0	0	0	304

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	21	28	22	0	0	0	0	71

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	60	46	36	0	0	0	0	142
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	6

Prior Year - 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	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	316	325	310	0	0	0	0	951
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	33	35	0	0	0	0	105
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	88	76	0	0	0	0	233
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	95	109	0	0	0	0	304

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	21	28	22	0	0	0	0	71

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	60	46	36	0	0	0	0	142
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	6

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	56%	48%	54%	53%	48%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	57%	52%	54%	53%	51%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	48%	47%	52%	43%	44%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	52%	50%	58%	55%	47%	56%
Math Learning Gains	52%	50%	57%	58%	50%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	48%	51%	48%	46%	50%
Science Achievement	57%	44%	51%	57%	44%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	77%	72%	72%	72%	64%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

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
06	2019	55%	48%	7%	54%	1%
	2018	55%	41%	14%	52%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	52%	42%	10%	52%	0%
	2018	42%	42%	0%	51%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
08	2019	56%	48%	8%	56%	0%
	2018	50%	49%	1%	58%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	50%	47%	3%	55%	-5%
	2018	49%	40%	9%	52%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	43%	39%	4%	54%	-11%
	2018	41%	40%	1%	54%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
08	2019	49%	35%	14%	46%	3%

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
	2018	52%	34%	18%	45%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
08	2019	56%	41%	15%	48%	8%
	2018	47%	42%	5%	50%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	77%	70%	7%	71%	6%
2018	71%	84%	-13%	71%	0%
Compare	6%				
HISTORY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	100%	50%	50%	61%	39%
2018	97%	60%	37%	62%	35%
Compare	3%				
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	100%	53%	47%	57%	43%
2018	95%	41%	54%	56%	39%
Compare	5%				

Subgroup Data

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	19	43	39	25	43	38	5	54			
ELL	31	48	46	29	46	41	28	53			
BLK	41	51	62	35	44	36	33	74	25		
HSP	56	57	46	50	53	40	51	70	42		
MUL	68	59		52	62						
WHT	61	59	53	61	55	50	72	84	54		
FRL	52	56	54	47	50	39	52	73	39		

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	19	45	52	28	47	37	17	50			
ELL	24	46	51	33	55	48	18	57	33		
ASN	62	69		77	69						
BLK	43	48	45	39	53	57	44	63	38		
HSP	44	50	50	49	57	46	39	69	44		
MUL	58	42		58	53						
WHT	57	54	53	63	62	44	63	80	62		
FRL	46	51	48	49	57	46	45	71	45		

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	17	45	47	23	51	46	12	39			
ELL	25	48	50	28	44	45	14	44	50		
ASN	57	38		62	58						
BLK	43	47	33	42	52	48	48	76	32		
HSP	45	52	55	52	56	46	49	65	43		
MUL	77	63		76	72		67				
WHT	61	55	59	62	60	50	68	79	53		
FRL	49	52	51	51	56	45	52	68	45		

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
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	65

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	559
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	43
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	45
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	53
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	60

Multiracial Students	
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	61
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	53
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

The lowest performing data component was the learning gains for the lowest 25th percentile in Math. After analyzing the data, 55% of the students with disabilities (SWD) scored a level one. Of that group, only 13% made gains from the 17/18 FSA to the 18/19 FSA. Our ESE students are not having their individual needs met. Our staff need training in differentiating instruction. The majority of our SWD's continually score in achievement level one in Math and very
few make gains from one year to the next.

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

The data component showing the greatest decline is the SWD group in the lowest 25th percentile for ELA. There was a 12% point decline from the 17/18 school year to the 18/19 school year. The factors that contributed to the decline are the same as they are in math; the bulk of
the SWD students continue to make less than a years worth of growth. Teacher need training in using instructional strategies to assist SWD's.

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.

The greatest gap compared to the state was the data component of learning gains for the lowest 25th percentile in Math. There was a 9 percentage point gap during the 18/19 school year, but only a 5 percentage point gap the year before. The majority of our SWD's continually score in achievement level one in Math and very few make gains from one year to the next. The contributing factor
was the scores of our SWD's and the fact that teachers need training in meeting individual student needs.
Our teachers are also at different levels of readiness for training, and differentiating instruction training is difficult professional development.

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

Student success of Black students in the lowest quartile for ELA gains was the data component that showed the most improvement. Our strength is our school climate and building relationships with all of our students. When students feel safe and know what to expect in our classrooms they are much more likely to take a risk and not be afraid of failing which leads to success.
During the 2018-2019 school year, DALA implemented a new opportunity to meet the needs of our lowest quartile. A designated resource room, called The M.I.N.T. (Meeting Individual Needs Together), was made available to students for 25 minutes for each grade per day. In this room, students had access to a variety of assistance such as: a resource teacher certified in math and special education, a resource teacher certified in in ELA, reading and special education, laptop computers and math manipulatives.
Students also had access to tools such as: multiplication tables, grammar quick reference sheets, calculators, writing outlines, graphic organizers, etc. Based on needs, students were also instructed on organizational assistance and study skills.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

When looking at trends, one of the biggest issues we have is students absent 20 days or more during the school year. We are a Title One school and we have students from all over Polk County. There are many reasons students do not make it to school when they are not sick, but the fact that many families do not have reliable transportation impacts our student's attendance.

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

1. SWD achievement in core academics
2. ELL achievement in core academics

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our area of focus will be the student with disabilities (SWD). SWD's scored below the 41% bar in the Federal Index. This demographic continues to score below district and state averages in both reading and math. Our inclusion model serves our ESE students in ELA and Math, but we have not seen academic growth over the years. We have changed our planning process between the ESE teachers and regular ed teachers so that a structured planning time was arranged weekly so differentiation and Universal Design strategies could be developed before the lesson was taught. Unfortunately, the ESE teacher could only serve the ESE students in ELA and Math classes so the other classes struggled with supporting their ESE students, hence the need for professional development in differentiation and Universal Design. Also a mentoring program will be put in to effect so that individual ESE students have an adult mentor to assist them not only in their core academics, but their social emotional learning (SEL) as well.
Measurable Outcome:	100% of teachers will plan for differentiation daily as evidenced in their lesson plans. 80% of teachers will use differentiation strategies daily and document in the reflection section on the lesson plan template once a week.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kevin Warren (kevin.warren@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	*Teachers will document their daily differentiation strategies in their lesson plans. *Guidance counselors, media specialist, and academic coaches will be trained to assist teachers in the use of differentiated strategies. *Instructional coaches, media specialist, and the guidance counselor will offer monthly-tiered professional development to model and assist with specific differentiation strategies. *Teachers will observe other teachers with the implementation aspect of differentiation. *Teachers will be observed using differentiated strategies by the instructional coaches, media specialist, and guidance counselors. *Teachers will participate in PLCs to discuss differentiated instructional practices once a month. *Mentoring Program - Instructional coaches, media specialist, guidance counselors, and administrators will mentor SWD students throughout the year. Individual and/or small group tutoring will be provided not only for core academics but for social and emotional learning as well. Mentors will communicate with teachers and parents on a regular basis.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The data shows that SWD have made very little if any learning gains in their core academics. We feel that the strategies will increase supports to the SWD's in a holistic way. The teachers have to take the time and have the knowledge to meet the SWD's individual needs.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Professional Development (PD) for Staff - Instructional Coaches, Guidance Counselors, and Media Specialist - They will develop and provide PD for all of the staff for follow-up on

the Differentiated Instruction workshop and the Universal Design training.

2. Observations - Instructional Coaches, Guidance Counselors, and Media Specialist - develop a calendar to observe teachers and give feedback/ coach regarding differentiation.

3. Mentoring - Instructional Coaches, Guidance Counselors, Media Specialist, and admin will identify SWD students that have had issues over their recent school years, in the area of grades, attendance, test scores, trauma outside of school, and discipline. Once identified the mentor will begin building a rapport with the student(s) and opening the lines of communication with parents and school staff. Documentation will be kept for each student that is being mentored.

Person Responsible   Kevin Warren (kevin.warren@polk-fl.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

1. SWD achievement in core academics
2. ELL achievement in core academics

Our ELL population will benefit from the focus on differentiation and universal design as well as the SWD population. The focus of differentiation and universal design is on meeting the students individual needs. Our guidance counselor that is paid through Title One has been working directly with our ELL population for many, many years. Also the ELL population is well served through our PFEP. All of our communication home are translated and/or directly interacted with one of our staff that communicates in the same language. Our parent liaison is heavily involved in our ELL community on a daily basis.

Part IV: 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 to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. 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.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Discovery Academy continuously strives to build relationships with all stakeholders. Please see attached Parent and Family Engagement Plan for full details on how we plan to build

positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

At Discovery we have chosen to stay the course in providing proven middle school practices, such as an affective advisory program and teaming which establishes a small community of learners.

Discovery Academy utilizes our distinct Advisory/Advisee Program to build relationships with both the teacher/student and student/student relationships. This program is an effective educational program that focuses on assisting middle school students to maximize their social, emotional, and academic potential in a diverse learning environment. Each grade level has structured curriculum where students interact with their peers, as well as their advisory teacher, sharing opportunities to communicate experiences and viewpoints while exhibiting the life skills being taught. The Advisor/Advisee Program helps to provide this transition by ensuring that every student has an adult advocate --a teacher who has a special concern for the student as an individual. Our Advisory teachers serve as a support network for each one of their students. The Advisory curriculum including Lifelong Guidelines and Lifeskills, Skills for Adolescence, and The 7 Habits of Highly Effective Teens provides students with the communication and social skills necessary to work collaboratively. Lifelong Guidelines and Lifeskills are posted in every classroom and are part of our school culture, including before and after school activities. These character-based programs result in a safe and nurturing environment, which values the character and academic achievement of students.

Teachers as well as administrators serve as mentors for students, which focus on goal setting for the students' academic, social, and emotional needs. Students identified as having social-emotional needs are given the opportunity to meet with the guidance counselor or can be met through the classroom staff on a one-to-one basis. Severe cases may be handled with a contracted mental health counselor. The IEP also identifies and addresses social emotional goals for all of our students.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00