

Clay County Schools

# Discovery Oaks Elementary



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>18</b>

# Discovery Oaks Elementary

950 OAKLEAF PLANTATION PKWY, Orange Park, FL 32065

<https://www.oneclay.net/>

## Demographics

**Principal: James Herrholtz**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	37%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (76%) 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A

\* 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 Clay 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](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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>18</b>

# Discovery Oaks Elementary

950 OAKLEAF PLANTATION PKWY, Orange Park, FL 32065

<https://www.oneclay.net/>

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-6</p>	<p><b>2019-20 Title I School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p><b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">27%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">59%</p>

## School Grades History

<p><b>Year</b></p>	<p><b>2019-20</b></p>	<p><b>2018-19</b></p>
<p><b>Grade</b></p>	<p>A</p>	<p>A</p>

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Clay 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.

Discovery Oaks Elementary provides authentic and rigorous learning experiences in a nurturing environment where students discover their full potential and feel appreciated as individuals, fostering confidence, creativity, critical thinking, and problem-solving skills in ALL students.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

Discovery Oaks Elementary is a safe, collaborative, and student-centered learning community that inspires students to develop into lifelong learners and productive global citizens through S.T.E.A.M based learning experiences.

### 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
McLaughlin, Tracy	Principal	Responsible for all leadership activities and vision for the school.
Beasley, Byanca	Attendance/Social Work	School Social Worker
Longo, Michelle	School Counselor	Guidance Counselor
Kriener, Breclyn	Teacher, K-12	Classroom Teacher
Willis, Tracina	Teacher, K-12	Teacher

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, James Herrholtz

**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.*

5

**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.*

9

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

51

**Demographic Data**

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	37%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (76%) 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

**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	101	88	110	136	119	116	131	0	0	0	0	0	0	801
Attendance below 90 percent	6	1	4	1	7	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

**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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

**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	1	4	5	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Monday 9/21/2020

**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	86	107	131	117	114	133	143	0	0	0	0	0	0	831
Attendance below 90 percent	0	12	6	5	5	8	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	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	86	107	131	117	114	133	143	0	0	0	0	0	0	831
Attendance below 90 percent	0	12	6	5	5	8	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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**

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	75%	65%	57%	0%	62%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	69%	62%	58%	0%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	63%	54%	53%	0%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	87%	70%	63%	0%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	83%	66%	62%	0%	60%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	75%	56%	51%	0%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	78%	65%	53%	0%	55%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey								
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(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
03	2019	76%	68%	8%	58%	18%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	75%	64%	11%	58%	17%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		75%				
05	2019	72%	62%	10%	56%	16%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		72%				
06	2019	72%	64%	8%	54%	18%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		72%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	91%	71%	20%	62%	29%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	81%	69%	12%	64%	17%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		81%				
05	2019	83%	64%	19%	60%	23%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		83%				
06	2019	86%	70%	16%	55%	31%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		86%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	77%	63%	14%	53%	24%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						

### 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	52	65	77	68	85	81	65				
ELL	55	72		73	74						
ASN	80	67		93	92						
BLK	62	67	64	81	80	72	63				
HSP	80	72	73	87	79		80				
MUL	75	58		74	83						
WHT	80	71	63	91	84	76	91				
FRL	66	71	70	81	84	72	70				
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
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

### 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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	74
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	64
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	594
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

### Subgroup Data

<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	70
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	68
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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
<b>Asian Students</b>	
Federal Index - Asian Students	83
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	70
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	79
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	73
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Pacific Islander Students</b>	
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	79
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	73
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 data component with the lowest performance was ELA Lowest 25th Percentile Learning Gains of 63%. Contributing factors could be due to a variety of issues such as differentiated instruction, grade-appropriate assignments, attendance, time and resources. We do not have any trend data.

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

We do not have any prior data to compare our scores to.

**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.**

DOE was above the state average in all areas.

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

We do not have any prior year data components to compare with.

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

Attendance rate particularly of our One Clay On-Line students is concerning.

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

1. ELA achievement and gains for all students.
2. Increase ELA learning gains for our bottom quartile students
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

#### #1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	If we provide strong instruction with consistent grade-appropriate, rigorous assignments, while setting high expectations for all students, we will improve engagement levels, and student ownership, which will increase learning gains in ELA.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	If we provide strong instruction with consistent grade-appropriate, rigorous assignments, while setting high expectations for all students, we will increase learning gains in ELA from 69% to 72%.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Tracy McLaughlin (tracy.mclaughlin@myoneclay.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	We will use grade appropriate , standards based curriculum including LAFS, i-Ready online, i-Ready toolbox materials, Achieve 3000 and Collections with fidelity.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	By using rigorous grade level appropriate curriculum we will increase student and teacher capacity to achieve increased learning gains for all students.

#### Action Steps to Implement

1. Use grade level appropriate curriculum: LAFS 2-6, i-Ready (on-line) instruction , 45 minutes per week grades K-4, Achieve 3000 grades 4-6 and Collections grade 6th.
  2. Monthly Professional Learning Communities focused on student engagement, rigor and best teaching practices.
  3. Quarterly data tracking meetings.
  4. Monthly grade level team meetings with administration.
  5. Monthly Student Success Team Meetings.
- Person Responsible**      Tracy McLaughlin (tracy.mclaughlin@myoneclay.net)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** If we provide strong differentiated instruction with consistent grade-appropriate, targeted assignments, we will increase learning gains in our ELA bottom quartile.

**Measurable Outcome:** If we provide strong differentiated instruction with consistent grade-appropriate, targeted assignments, we will increase learning gains in our ELA bottom quartile from 63% to 66%.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Tracy McLaughlin (tracy.mclaughlin@myoneclay.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** We will use targeted grade-level appropriate, standards based curriculum including LAFS, i-Ready on-line, i-Ready toolbox materials and Achieve 3000.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** By using targeted, rigorous grade-level appropriate curriculum we will increase student capacity to achieve learning gains for our bottom quartile students.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Intentionally track and progress monitor our bottom quartile students.
2. Monthly PLC's focused on student engagement, rigor and best teaching practices.
3. Quarterly data tracking meetings.
4. Monthly student success team meetings.

**Person Responsible:** Tracy McLaughlin (tracy.mclaughlin@myoneclay.net)



**#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning**

**Area of Focus** If we provide consistent instruction and/or professional development in the area of Social Emotional Learning for all students and faculty we will see an improvement to the culture and climate of the school.

**Measurable Outcome:** If we provide consistent instruction and/or professional development in the area of Social Emotional Learning for all students and faculty we will see a 20% decrease in behavior related referrals.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Tracy McLaughlin (tracy.mclaughlin@myoneclay.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** We will use grade-level appropriate Social Emotional Learning curriculum for all students grades K-6 and provide professional learning in SEL to all faculty.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** By providing grade-level appropriate Social Emotional Learning curriculum to all students, and professional development to all faculty, we will increase student and teacher capacity to improve the school's climate and culture.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Monthly PBIS TEAM meetings.
2. Weekly school-wide SEL guidance lessons
3. MFLC counselor deployment groups.
4. Professional Learning Communities focused on SEL.
5. Adoption and Implementation of the 7 Mindsets Curriculum.
6. Panorama Survey

**Person Responsible** Tracy McLaughlin (tracy.mclaughlin@myoneclay.net)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

N/A

**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 Oaks has numerous business and faith-based partners, an active Parent Volunteer Organization, PBIS Committee and Leadership team that all support our school's vision, goals and school improvement efforts.

**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: Differentiation	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>