

Polk County Public Schools

Discovery High School



2021-22 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	19
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	22

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
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	78%
2020-21 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%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* 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 Polk County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	22

Discovery High School

640 EVENHOUSE RD, Lake Alfred, FL 33850

discoveryhighschool.org

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) High School 9-12	2020-21 Title I School Yes	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) 69%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File) K-12 General Education	Charter School Yes	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) 65%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade	C	C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Polk 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.

"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	Position 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

46

Total number of students enrolled at the school

924

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

8

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

9

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	269	233	229	199	930
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	54	75	47	222
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	6	5	5	24
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	40	30	7	122
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	54	45	12	171
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	38	0	0	98
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94	65	0	0	159
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	57	0	0	111

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	46	40	5	2	93

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	26	11	10	0	47
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 6/10/2021

2020-21 - 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	249	219	186	69	723
Attendance below 90 percent	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	18	12	9	8	47
Course failure in ELA	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	6	2	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	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	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	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	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

2020-21 - 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	249	219	186	69	723
Attendance below 90 percent	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	18	12	9	8	47
Course failure in ELA	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	6	2	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	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	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	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	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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				46%	47%	56%	49%	46%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				47%	46%	51%	46%	47%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				39%	37%	42%	28%	39%	44%
Math Achievement				31%	43%	51%	37%	44%	51%
Math Learning Gains				31%	45%	48%	36%	42%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				27%	44%	45%	37%	38%	45%
Science Achievement				55%	58%	68%	50%	65%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				66%	61%	73%	57%	63%	71%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
09	2021					
	2019	46%	45%	1%	55%	-9%
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	44%	42%	2%	53%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				

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	
2021						
2019	53%	54%	-1%	67%	-14%	

CIVICS EOC						
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State	
2021						
2019						

HISTORY EOC						
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State	
2021						
2019	66%	57%	9%	70%	-4%	

ALGEBRA EOC						
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State	
2021						
2019	23%	50%	-27%	61%	-38%	

GEOMETRY EOC						
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State	
2021						

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	37%	53%	-16%	57%	-20%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

Reading Plus, Study Sync, School-Based Common Assessments through Unify.

Grade 9				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	40	43	47
	Economically Disadvantaged	38	41	44
	Students With Disabilities	25	26	28
	English Language Learners	21	23	24
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter
Mathematics	All Students	27	30	32
	Economically Disadvantaged	25	25	26
	Students With Disabilities	20	21	23
	English Language Learners	16	18	19
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter
Biology	All Students	48	53	60
	Economically Disadvantaged	45	50	56
	Students With Disabilities	28	30	32
	English Language Learners	23	25	27
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter
US History	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 10				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	38	39	41
	Economically Disadvantaged	33	35	37
	Students With Disabilities	24	26	28
	English Language Learners	20	23	24
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	31	33	35
	Economically Disadvantaged	30	31	33
	Students With Disabilities	23	25	27
	English Language Learners	20	21	22
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	45	50	55
	Economically Disadvantaged	43	45	47
	Students With Disabilities	25	27	29
	English Language Learners	16	18	19
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 11				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	45	48	50
	Economically Disadvantaged	39	41	45
	Students With Disabilities	23	24	26
	English Language Learners	19	20	22
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	28	31	33
	Economically Disadvantaged	27	29	32
	Students With Disabilities	21	22	23
	English Language Learners	20	21	22
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	55	63	66
	Economically Disadvantaged	50	52	58
	Students With Disabilities	29	29	30
	English Language Learners	20	20	21

Grade 12				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	47	50	52
	Economically Disadvantaged	43	45	47
	Students With Disabilities	29	29	31
	English Language Learners	22	23	26
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	34	37	39
	Economically Disadvantaged	33	35	36
	Students With Disabilities	20	21	21
	English Language Learners	18	18	19
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	7	23	33	6	7		13	33			
ELL	18	35	42	16	19	17	12	23		97	16
BLK	33	37	36	16	18	22	26	39		97	30
HSP	33	38	39	23	22	17	37	40		97	31
WHT	53	46	38	41	28	13	63	61		98	57

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
FRL	37	39	36	25	24	21	39	41		96	37
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				
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			

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	41
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	33
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	454
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	17

Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	30
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	35
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	38
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	50
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	39
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Our lowest performing area was our mathematics learning gains of the lowest 25%, and we also saw a trend that our ELL and Students with Disabilities populations are well below our student body as a whole.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Mathematics Achievement and Learning Gains of the lowest 25%

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

Besides virtual learning being an obstacle for students, not using Algebra Nation could have been a cause for the decline. We should implement more interventions, like Delta Math, instead of just teacher-created material for our intensive math students.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Our social studies achievement showed the biggest improvement.

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

Our teachers had more experience this year, and we also made an effort to have them implement more vocabulary strategies as well as added in common assessments.

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

Continuing to improve questioning and scaffolding for our SWD and ELL students.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

We will have a new literacy coach implementing literacy strategy PDs during Early release days. We will also have our new teachers paired with a mentor teacher and they will meet biweekly. We will also offer once a month optional trainings for veterans/mandatory for new teacher trainings regarding effective instructional strategies. We will also do training on our new Reading program (Achieve 3000) and new progress monitoring (iReady).

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

Additional progress monitoring using iReady and additional professional development for SWD.

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 from testing in 2018-2019, 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.

Monitoring: Area of focus will be monitored by administration through analysis of baseline and progress monitoring scores with teachers during PLCs throughout the school year.

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

Evidence-based Strategy: The area of focus will be in vocabulary and asking quality scaffolded questions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Vocabulary was found to be a specific area of concern during analysis of the progress monitoring tests. Resources will be from Bringing Words to Life and John Hattie's high effect size strategies.

Action Steps to Implement

1) Data analysis during PLC/ reading assigned

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

2) Breaking down standards during PLCs, creating quality, scaffolded questions

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

2) Walk Thru observations

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

#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:

Monitoring:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

1) Data Analysis/ Discussion during PLC

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

2) Create action plan: must implement small group lessons and decide how students will be ability grouped using cooperative learning strategies

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

3) Create quality questions during PLCs that are focused on scaffolding for the targeted standards.

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

4) Observe during walk thrus and coach as necessary

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

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Discovery is below average for the county and state in regards to incidents on campus. The only area in need of improvement is the property incidents. To improve in this area, there will be an increase of campus monitoring after school. The lack of behavior and discipline incidents is a testament to the positive school culture and environment at the school. If there are any issues as the year progresses, the necessary adjustments will be made to ensure continued safety for the students.

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.

In order to ensure that we have a positive school culture, we have created a Staff Advisory Council(SAC) to help assist administration in planning and addressing staff concerns. This council is made up of members from all groups at DHS.(Teachers, Secretaries, PARA's)

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

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.

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