

Polk County Public Schools

Discovery High School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	19

Discovery High School

640 EVENHOUSE RD, Lake Alfred, FL 33850

discoveryhighschool.org

Demographics

Principal: Darryl Jemison

Start Date for this Principal: 6/30/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
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: C (43%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: D (37%) 2015-16: No Grade
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.

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

Discovery High School

640 EVENHOUSE RD, Lake Alfred, FL 33850

discoveryhighschool.org

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">High School 9-12</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>72%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>65%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	D

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 and belief 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 High School 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 ideas 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
Jemison, Darryl	Principal	
Fontaine, Beth	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 6/30/2017, Darryl Jemison

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.*

2

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.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

45

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
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: C (43%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: D (37%) 2015-16: No Grade
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	0	0	0	0	249	219	186	69	723
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	48	39	44	189
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	12	9	8	47
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	1	1	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	38	0	0	98
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94	65	0	0	159

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	0	0	0	0	60	38	0	0	98

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	1	0	2	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 6/18/2020

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	0	0	0	0	250	219	186	69	724
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	29	31	18	117
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	21	13	6	75
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	6	4	0	17
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	173	167	66	8	414

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	0	0	0	0	44	22	19	4	89

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	3	3	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	0	0	0	250	219	186	69	724
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	29	31	18	117
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	21	13	6	75
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	6	4	0	17
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	173	167	66	8	414

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	0	0	0	0	44	22	19	4	89

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	3	3	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	46%	47%	56%	51%	44%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	47%	46%	51%	44%	41%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	37%	42%	29%	33%	41%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	31%	43%	51%	36%	37%	49%
Math Learning Gains	31%	45%	48%	17%	33%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	27%	44%	45%	10%	32%	39%
Science Achievement	55%	58%	68%	71%	56%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	66%	61%	73%	0%	60%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey					
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
	(0)	(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
09	2019	46%	45%	1%	55%	-9%
	2018	54%	43%	11%	53%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	44%	42%	2%	53%	-9%
	2018	45%	42%	3%	53%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	53%	54%	-1%	67%	-14%
2018	49%	59%	-10%	65%	-16%

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
Compare		4%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	66%	57%	9%	70%	-4%
2018	57%	57%	0%	68%	-11%
Compare		9%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	23%	50%	-27%	61%	-38%
2018	32%	60%	-28%	62%	-30%
Compare		-9%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	37%	53%	-16%	57%	-20%
2018	34%	41%	-7%	56%	-22%
Compare		3%			

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	29	44	33	17	14	13					
ELL	18	35	37	7	24	32	20	30			
BLK	29	36	33	21	25	35	41	52			
HSP	44	50	38	30	34	27	48	60			
MUL	27	30									
WHT	59	50	55	40	32	26	73	77			
FRL	40	43	37	28	28	24	53	62			
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	20		31	40		20				

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
ELL	9	24	18	16	29	35	14				
BLK	40	42	22	26	42	39	30				
HSP	42	41	23	31	31	38	40	62			
MUL	36	50		43	42						
WHT	61	51	41	49	40	31	68	60			
FRL	47	47	28	33	37	41	47	55			

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
ELL	13	30	35	14	7		30				
BLK	35	43	33	30	13	8	69				
HSP	48	41	23	27	13	12	64				
WHT	59	48	31	46	21	7	79				
FRL	47	43	27	34	14	9	68				

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	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	47
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	389
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	25
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	28
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	2
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	34
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	42
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	29
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	52
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	40
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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.

Math Lowest 25% had the lowest performance. We had a large number of incoming 9th graders that were not on grade level when they arrived to us. We felt like we made progress with them throughout the year but not enough to raise our performance in this area.

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

Math Lowest 25% had the greatest decline. We had a large number of incoming 9th graders that were not on grade level when they arrived to us. We felt like we made progress with them throughout the year but not enough to raise our performance in this area.

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.

Math Lowest 25% had the biggest gap. We had a large number of incoming 9th graders that were not on grade level when they arrived to us. We felt like we made progress with them throughout the year but not enough to raise our performance in this area.

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

ELA Lowest 25% showed the most improvement. Select staff attended Learning Sciences International PD.

Those staff members then created several PDs to share with other staff members throughout the year. The training focused on helping teachers learn more research-based instructional strategies to help students to be successful in mastering content area standards. This will particularly helped with the lowest quartile students who were struggling to make gains.

Teachers also attended PLCs monthly led by admin that focused on effective literacy strategies and quality questioning.

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

English Language Learners and Students With Disabilities not meeting the 41% target.

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

1. Improving our learning gains in the Math Lowest 25%.
2. Continue Improving our learning gains in the ELA Lowest 25%
3. Coming up with more ways to assist our English Language Learners and Students With Disabilities.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Improving our learning gains in ELA for our lowest quartile. While our scores for this quartile actually improved, we are still working on ways to assist the students in this quartile so that all are able to meet the graduation requirements needed.

Measurable Outcome: ELA Lowest 25% will show gains of at least 3% from the previous year's data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Darryl Jemison (darryl.jemison@discoveryfl.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Select staff will attend the virtual Learning Sciences International PD in June. Those staff members will then create PDs to share with other staff members throughout the year. The training will focus on helping teachers learn more research-based instructional strategies to help students to be successful in mastering content area standards. This will particularly helped with the lowest quartile students who were struggling to make gains.

Teachers will also attend monthly Subject Area Meetings led by admin and coaches that focus on helping teachers examine their content area standards and understand the depth to which the standards need to be taught. Specific training will be provided in the areas of differentiation, HOT questioning, and data analysis.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers have expressed a need for PD in differentiation, and administration has also identified HOT questioning, data analysis, and depth of standard being taught as areas in need of improvement during classroom observations.

Action Steps to Implement

Select Teachers to attend LSI PD.

Person Responsible Darryl Jemison (darryl.jemison@discoveryfl.org)

Meet with staff that attended PD to formulate PD plan for sharing LSI Info with the whole staff.

Person Responsible Darryl Jemison (darryl.jemison@discoveryfl.org)

Deliver staff-wide PD about LSI strategies on student teaming and motivation.

Person Responsible Darryl Jemison (darryl.jemison@discoveryfl.org)

Create agendas/plan for Subject Area meetings that focus on differentiation, quality questioning, and data analysis.

Person Responsible Beth Fontaine (beth.fontaine@polk-fl.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Improving our learning gains in Math for our lowest quartile. We were 18% below the state Average and 17% the District average. We also decreased by 10% from the previous year. Helping our students achieve grade level proficiency is a critical need.

Measurable Outcome: Math Lowest 25% will show gains of at least 5% from the previous year's data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Darryl Jemison (darryl.jemison@discoveryfl.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Select staff will attend the virtual Learning Sciences International PD in June. Those staff members will then create PDs to share with other staff members throughout the year. The training will focus on helping teachers learn more research-based instructional strategies to help students to be successful in mastering content area standards. This will particularly helped with the lowest quartile students who were struggling to make gains.

Teachers will also attend monthly Subject Area Meetings led by admin and coaches that focus on helping teachers examine their content area standards and understand the depth to which the standards need to be taught. Specific training will be provided in the areas of differentiation, HOT questioning, and data analysis.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers have expressed a need for PD in differentiation, and administration has also identified HOT questioning, data analysis, and depth of standard being taught as areas in need of improvement during classroom observations.

Action Steps to Implement

Select Teachers to attend LSI PD.

Person Responsible Darryl Jemison (darryl.jemison@discoveryfl.org)

Meet with staff that attended PD to formulate PD plan for sharing LSI Info with the whole staff.

Person Responsible Darryl Jemison (darryl.jemison@discoveryfl.org)

Deliver staff-wide PD about LSI strategies on student teaming and motivation.

Person Responsible Darryl Jemison (darryl.jemison@discoveryfl.org)

Create agendas/plan for Subject Area meetings that focus on differentiation, quality questioning, and data analysis.

Person Responsible Beth Fontaine (beth.fontaine@polk-fl.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The School Leadership team will address the remaining improvement priorities by having our ESE Facilitator, Nichole Clark, and our ELL Coordinator/Counselor, Gina Cruz, provide specific trainings on the implementation of effective classroom strategies for SWD and ELLs.

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.

In order to ensure that our stakeholders are actively engaged in Discovery High School, we have added and will continue our work with the following two groups:

1. Staff Advisory Council(SAC) - we meet once a month with a group teachers to discuss issues and concerns at our school. We have at least one teacher from each subject group on the council.
2. Parent Advisory Council(PAC) - we meet once a month with parents to discuss issues and concerns from a parent perspective. We send out a letter at the beginning of the year to see which parents are interested in participating.

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: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00