

Volusia County Schools

Discovery Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	12
III. Planning for Improvement	17
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	23
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	23
VI. Title I Requirements	27
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Discovery Elementary School

975 ABAGAIL DR, Deltona, FL 32725

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/discovery/pages/default.aspx>

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Volusia County School Board on 10/31/2023.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Everyone, every day, in some way is a winner at Discovery Elementary. We believe all students will learn and develop academically, behaviorally, and socially to achieve success in school.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The quest of Discovery Elementary is to create a cooperative learning atmosphere that stimulates the awakening of each student's potential while encouraging an environment of mutual respect and community pride.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Dietz, Jennifer	Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Involving the leadership team in making decisions to govern the school (shared decision making) • Emulating the school’s mission, vision, core values • Ensuring communication to all stakeholders (e.g. SAC, PTA, SGA) • Planning, delivering, supporting, and evaluating school’s professional development • Reviewing and aligning school-based resources based on interim assessment data • Monitoring achievement, climate, and satisfaction data to assure that the learning environment is producing results • Determining progress monitoring towards goal such as classroom look-for • Identifying gaps in performance or processes and planning for their improvement
Snipes, Buffy	Assistant Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assisting the principal in making decisions to govern the school (shared decision making) • Emulating the school’s mission, vision, core values • Ensuring communication to all stakeholders (e.g. SAC, PTA, SGA) • Planning, delivering, supporting, and evaluating school’s professional development • Reviewing and aligning school-based resources based on interim assessment data • Monitoring achievement, climate, and satisfaction data to assure that the learning environment is producing results • Determining progress monitoring towards goal such as classroom look-for • Identifying gaps in performance or processes and planning for their improvement • Ensuring DOJ guidelines are being followed and services are aligned to the IEP • Monitoring achievement data of SWD to assure that the learning environment is producing results and students are meeting their IEP goals
Falk, Paul	Math Coach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitating PLC and collaborative planning • supporting standards aligned collaborative planning • Planning, delivering, supporting, and evaluating school’s professional development • Monitoring achievement data to assure that the learning environment is

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<p>producing results</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Align coaching cycles to needs based on data trends • Determining progress monitoring towards goal such as classroom look-for • Providing ongoing feedback
Lemelin, Melissa	Reading Coach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitating PLC and collaborative planning • supporting standards aligned collaborative planning • Planning, delivering, supporting, and evaluating school’s professional development • Monitoring achievement data to assure that the learning environment is producing results • Align coaching cycles to needs based on data trends • Determining progress monitoring towards goal such as classroom look-for • Providing ongoing feedback
Hernandez-Garay, Kayleen	Administrative Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishing expectations regarding emotional responses, discipline and attendance to ensure an environment that is conducive to learning • Ensuring communication to all stakeholders regarding SEL needs, discipline and attendance data • Planning, delivering, supporting, and evaluating school’s professional development regarding PBIS, which includes SEL needs, discipline and attendance • Monitoring disciplinary and attendance data and ensuring initiatives are aligned to the goals and followed with fidelity to decrease distractions and increase engagement in curriculum
Thomas, Marchelle	Teacher, K-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participating in PLCs and collaborative planning • Supporting standards aligned collaborative planning • Monitoring achievement data to assure that the learning environment is producing results • Providing a teacher voice during Leadership Team meetings

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
McGahan, Lynn	Teacher, ESE	Supporting general education with providing accommodations while maintaining standards alignment during collaborative planning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensuring DOJ guidelines are being followed and services are aligned to the IEP • Monitoring achievement data of SWD to assure that the learning environment is producing results and students are meeting their IEP goals • Participating in PLCs and collaborative planning • supporting standards aligned collaborative planning

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Our School Advisory Council consist of administrators, teachers, support staff, business partners, and community members. Learning outcomes are shared with the Council. Data is broken down into ESSA groups and targeted areas are identified. Ideas brought forth by the School Leadership Team are shared to allow for input in the development of our School Improvement plan. Once a draft is prepared, it is made available to the public and community and family input is also encouraged through social media platforms.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Monthly data chats have been scheduled to monitor student progress, including our impact on closing achievement gaps. Benchmark task alignment will be monitored during the planning process and implementation of the plan will be monitored using the look-for tool. Walk through data and learning outcome will guide data driven decisions regarding tiered teacher support and any needed changes to the SIP. The SIP will be a living document that will be adjusted, based on need, throughout the academic year to increase the rate at which learning gains are being made.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	55%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%

Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	348	34	34	36	26	32	0	0	0	510
One or more suspensions	0	4	6	14	4	10	0	0	0	38
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	9	12	10	0	0	0	31
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	6	7	7	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	27	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	32	0	0	0	37
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	3	2	12	13	25	0	0	0	55

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	8	37	32	49	28	29	0	0	0	183
One or more suspensions	0	3	8	7	3	8	0	0	0	29
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	6	6	5	0	0	0	17
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	3	5	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	25	30	0	0	0	67
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	9	35	29	0	0	0	73
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	5	4	6	3	4	3	0	0	0	25

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	1	3	6	14	20	24	0	0	0	68

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	2	13	1	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	8	37	32	49	28	29	0	0	0	183
One or more suspensions	0	3	8	7	3	8	0	0	0	29
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	6	6	5	0	0	0	17
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	3	5	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	25	30	0	0	0	67
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	9	35	29	0	0	0	73
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	5	4	6	3	4	3	0	0	0	25

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	1	3	6	14	20	24	0	0	0	68

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	2	13	1	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	44	52	53	41	53	56	30		
ELA Learning Gains				47			36		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				37			20		
Math Achievement*	46	55	59	42	42	50	33		
Math Learning Gains				50			46		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				35			47		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	49	62	54	53	55	59	25		
Social Studies Achievement*					59	64			
Middle School Acceleration					45	52			
Graduation Rate					58	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	57	60	59	54			66		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	247
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	359
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	32	Yes	3	
ELL	43			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	35	Yes	3	
HSP	48			
MUL	55			
PAC				
WHT	53			
FRL	47			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	31	Yes	2	2
ELL	39	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	33	Yes	2	
HSP	43			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	56			
FRL	43			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	44			46			49					57
SWD	23			34			35				5	43
ELL	30			30			37				5	57
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	36			33			27				4	
HSP	39			44			39				5	62
MUL	55			55							2	
PAC												
WHT	49			50			68				5	50
FRL	43			43			47				5	55

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	41	47	37	42	50	35	53					54
SWD	16	30	30	28	48	32	18					42
ELL	23	36	40	26	50	44	39					54
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	30	29		33	41		30					
HSP	35	46	35	36	49	38	50					57
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	50	53		49	57		71					
FRL	40	46	34	39	48	36	47					53

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	30	36	20	33	46	47	25					66
SWD	9	22		16	44	36	18					52
ELL	28	50		26	45	40	24					66

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	11			16								
HSP	30	36		27	38		24					67
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	37	46		48	57		32					73
FRL	28	37	21	30	47	43	22					66

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	39%	53%	-14%	54%	-15%
04	2023 - Spring	47%	57%	-10%	58%	-11%
03	2023 - Spring	49%	53%	-4%	50%	-1%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	52%	57%	-5%	59%	-7%
04	2023 - Spring	50%	59%	-9%	61%	-11%
05	2023 - Spring	43%	55%	-12%	55%	-12%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	46%	61%	-15%	51%	-5%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

According to PM3 data, our 5th grade ELA data had the lowest performance at 41% proficient. PM1 21% and PM2 5% proficient data also demonstrated underperformance in comparison to 3rd & 4th grade proficiency all year.

Contributing Factors: Evidence of implementation of Benchmark aligned instruction and coaches were used to supplement small group intervention.

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

According to PM 3 data, our 5th grade science had the greatest decline from the prior year. Performance decreased by 4% from 53% to 49% proficient.

Contributing Factors: The science block decreased from 60 to 45 minutes. The proficiency in ELA of the rising students were the lowest proficiency area for the 2021-2022 school year.

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.

According to PM3 data, our 5th grade ELA data had the greatest gap compared to the state. The state average was 55%. We were at 39% for a difference of 16%.

Contributing Factors: Vacancies in support facilitation that impacted student support groups, making larger groups as a result of merged instructional groups.

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

According to PM3 data, our overall math data showed the greatest improvement with an overall increased of 9%, going from 42% to 51%.

Contributing Factors: After school planning and the addition of a designated math intervention teacher and superior math coaching.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

According EWS, attendance is one area of concern with 138 students, or 21%, of our students have an absence rate of 10% or greater.

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

The systems identified as needing the most attention on our campus for the upcoming school year are:

-planning and implementation of instruction

-MTSS/problem solving.

A trend that has been identified is the need to provide ongoing monitoring of these systems to ensure there is evidence of implementation and impact.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

At Discovery Elementary, we have had inconsistencies with the structure, facilitation, and implementation of collaborative planning. There is work to be done to do on defining and strengthening this system as well as how collaborative planning supports and multi Tiered Systems of Support in order to positively impact student outcomes and teacher practice.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Student Practice:

- After administration of PM1 and PM 2, all students will show growth consistent with state growth trends.
- By February of 2024, 55% of students in ELA will show proficiency on VBAs, 58% of students in Math, and 57% proficiency in Science.

Teacher Practice:

- By May 2024, 90% of classroom teachers will provide students benchmark-aligned tasks and provide questions to deepen understanding as evidenced in walkthroughs.

Coaching Practice:

- By April 2024, the number of teachers receiving Tier 2-3 support will decrease by 70%.
- By May 2024, 90% of classroom teachers will provide students with

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Student Practice:

- Student data will be disaggregated after PM1 and PM2 and compared to state proficiency and growth trends.
- 55% of student proficiency in ELA, 58% in math, and 57% in science will be the common goal across all content areas for the 23-24 school year. After each benchmark-aligned common assessment is administered, teachers, with the support of coaches will track and chart this data to measure progress over time.

Teacher Practice:

- Classroom walkthrough trends data will be collected and analyzed weekly.
- Administration and coaches will attend common planning to monitor for benchmark-aligned planning and questioning.

Coaching Practice:

Administration and Coaches will meet weekly as a team to analyze the coaching support plan and data trends collected to make adjustments as needed.

- Administration will collect coaching plans/notes and provide feedback to instructional coaches.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Dietz (jmdietz@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

To increase both Tier 1 Core instruction and effectiveness of interventions at Tier 2 and 3 we will develop and implement the use of schoolwide collaborative planning protocols and expectations that guides teachers in the development of intentional and targeted lesson planning at all three Tiers of instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Increasing teacher capacity in the area of strategic planning for core instruction and providing interventions for students with learning needs will increase learning outcomes at the proficiency level, as well as learning gains.

According to John Hattie, response to intervention has an effect size of 1.29, interventions for students with learning needs has an effect size of 0.79, and deliberate practices has an effect size of 0.79.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Instructional coaches and administrators will participate in collaborative planning sessions at all grade levels to ensure that learning targets and tasks during whole group, small group, and tiered interventions align to the benchmark. During collaborative planning, teachers will establish desired learning outcomes and target differentiated instructional needs for our ESSA subgroups. In addition, teachers will demonstrate their understanding of the benchmark by doing the work (e.g. working the math problem using the targeted strategy). Falk

Person Responsible: Paul Falk (pcfalk@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: October 31, 2023

Utilize "look for" tool that can be used to track instructional priorities during walk-throughs.

Person Responsible: Buffy Snipes (bmsnipes@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: September 15, 2023

Continue Collaborative Instructional Planning and Intervention Framework, which includes attending weekly collaborative planning, conduct walk throughs to monitor execution, and implementation of feedback cycles to improve upon the effectiveness of planning and instructional delivery practices

Person Responsible: Jennifer Dietz (jmdietz@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: September 14, 2023

Conduct classroom walks using look for document based on a schedule created with the coaches and administration team.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Dietz (jmdietz@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: September 14, 2023

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Discovery will focus on improving our positive culture and environment by targeting students who are struggling in our current environment. This would include students who struggle with referrals, attendance, significant learning deficits placing them in tier 3 instruction as well as unsatisfactory progress seen in D's and F's on report cards, ultimately leading to retentions.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

EWS data for 2022-22023

Attendance below 90% - 11%

One or more suspensions - 6%

Course Failure ELA- 5%

Course Failure Math - 3%

ELA level 1 - 9%

Math level 1 - 6%

Substantial Reading Deficiency- 0%

Two or More Indicators - 11%

Retained Current Year - 1%

Retained Two or More Years - 0%

Of the 66 students with two or more indicators, 73% have an attendance record below 10%. 45% failed ELA, 29% failed Math and 29% were suspended one or more times. In response, our positive culture and environment focus will target the EWS subgroups attendance below 90% and students with one or more suspensions, since it directly effects attendance. Course failure in ELA and Math will be addressed in Area of Focus #1.

At Discovery Elementary, attendance below 90% will be reduced by 20% decreasing from 11% to 9%.

One or more suspensions will also be reduced by 17% decreasing from 6% to 5%. By increasing student time in class, the percent of students with course failure in Math and ELA will also be reduced.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Focus attendance reports will be ran on a weekly basis as part of our weekly attendance challenge initiative. Students will also record and monitor their own attendance on a daily basis as a part of this initiative. EWS data will be reviewed during our monthly MTSS committee meeting and shared with teachers during our monthly faculty meetings.

Focus disciplinary reports and EWS data will also be reviewed during our monthly MTSS committee meeting and shared with teachers during our monthly faculty meetings. EWS data will be used to create an effective plan to address individual student needs and interventions.

Discovery will be using the early warning system to monitor our focus group of students in the following categories:

Attendance below 90 %

One or more suspensions

Substantial Reading Deficiency (Tier 3 interventions)

Course Failure in ELA/Math

During our PLC's, quarterly or when district assessments are given, we will work collaboratively with our grade level teachers to examine and analyze data for these specific students to make sure they are making academic progress. Also during these PLC"s collaborative discussions, we will include the EWS

data on the students so as to create an effective plan to address individual student needs and interventions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kayleen Hernandez-Garay (khernan1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Attendance Challenge Initiative-weekly and monthly rewards for students who were in attendance every day and on time.

Implementation of new PBIS interventions: Cool down corner, buddy classroom, the addition of SEL TOA, and SEL groups with school counselor

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Many students are not intrinsically motivated to attend school and other attend on a regular basis but arrive late, missing vital instruction. By extrinsically motivating students to be at school and on time, it will develop healthy habits.

Many of our students have difficulty regulating their emotions. By implementing the PBIS interventions: cool down corner, buddy classroom, sensory room, the addition of an SEL TOA, and SEL groups with the school counselor, students will develop self-regulating skills which will increase time engaged in instruction, which will positively impact learning outcomes.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Teachers will designate a cool down corner in their room as well as a buddy classroom where students can go for up to 10 minutes and complete a reflection sheet which asks them to identify the inappropriate behavior and a preferred replacement response.

Person Responsible: Buffy Snipes (bmsnipes@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: August 30, 2023

The addition of an SEL TOA will allow us to approach behavioral concerns with a restorative practice approach that will address the function of the behavior and reduce the number of incidences rather than focusing on consequence.

Person Responsible: Kayleen Hernandez-Garay (khernan1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: August 30, 2023

The school counselor will develop SEL groups based on EWS discipline and attendance data.

Person Responsible: Buffy Snipes (bmsnipes@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: September 29, 2023

Monthly monitoring meetings to review EWS during monthly MTSS meetings.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Dietz (jmdietz@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing

Weekly and monthly attendance initiative school wide.

Person Responsible: Kayleen Hernandez-Garay (khernan1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: August 30, 2023 and ongoing for the remainder of the year.

Implementation of the Girls on the Run program, targeting girls in 3rd-5th who have been identified by EWS.

Person Responsible: Buffy Snipes (bmsnipes@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: The program will be implemented year round with fall and spring sessions

Provide Professional development to teachers on school wide PBIS initiatives.

Person Responsible: Kayleen Hernandez-Garay (khernan1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: August 2023

Provide coaching cycles to teachers in need of PBIS strategies to be implemented with fidelity. Teachers will be identified by tiers as noted during classroom walk throughs.

Person Responsible: Melissa Lemelin (malemeli@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Based on data our ESSA subgroups need additional supports. We purchased intervention teachers and resources using Title 1 funding. Our interventions are focused on state supplied Tier 1 and 2 resources. School improvement funds are voted on by our school advisory council that includes all stakeholders and funds are aligned to our school improvement plan.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

In grades K-2 we had the following percentage of students scoring below 40th percentile according to Star Reading Assessment:

- K- 32%
- 1st - 48%
- 2nd - 58%

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA

In grades 3-5 we had the following percentage of students scoring below level 3 on FAST

- 3rd - 51%
- 4th - 50%
- 5th - 58%

Measurable Outcomes

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

We will decrease the number of 2nd grade students not scoring at the 40th percentile according to the Star Literacy Assessment by 10% (from 58% to 48%).

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

We will decrease the number of 3rd grade students not scoring at level 3 on FAST by 6% (from 51% to 45%).

We will decrease the number of 4th grade students not scoring at level 3 on FAST by 5% (from 50% to 45%).

We will decrease the number of 5th grade students not scoring at level 3 on FAST by 13% (from 58% to 45%).

Monitoring

Monitoring

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Our area of focus Instructional Practice specifically related to Collaborative Planning will be monitored by the following:

- Students will be baselined using district decision trees to determine students at Tier 1, 2 and 3.
- Students will be grouped according to need for intervention and small group instruction.
- Student data will be disaggregated after PM1 and PM2 and compared to state proficiency and growth trends.
- 55% of student proficiency in ELA is our target goals.

- After each benchmark-aligned common assessment is administered, teachers, with the support of coaches will track and chart this data to measure progress over time.

Teacher Practice:

-Classroom walkthrough trends data will be collected and analyzed weekly.

-Administration and coaches will attend common planning to monitor for benchmark-aligned planning and questioning.

Coaching Practice:

Administration and Coaches will meet weekly as a team to analyze the coaching support plan and data trends collected to make adjustments as needed.

-Administration will collect coaching plans/notes and provide feedback to instructional coaches.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Dietz, Jennifer, jmdietz@volusia.k12.fl.us

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term “evidence-based” means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida’s definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida’s definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district’s K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

We purchased intervention teachers and resources using Title 1 funding. Our interventions are focused on state supplied Tier 1 and 2 resources. School improvement funds are voted on by our school advisory council that includes all stakeholders and funds are aligned to our school improvement plan.

Collaborative planning is a state approved Tier 1 strategy and we will be implementing district and state approved resources such as Being a Reader and SIPPS in grades K-2 for intervention supports and REWARDS, Rally Reading, Magnetic Reading and Benchmark Interventions for grades 3-5.

Implementation of the programs is monitored through classroom walks, administration of ongoing progress monitoring as determined by the decision tree and PM 1, 2 and 3.

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Students at Discovery have been increasingly showing positive trends according to PM data determined by Star Reading and FAST. These programs are approved and suggested by the district for their effectiveness.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Literacy Leadership Establish a literacy leadership team involving primary teachers.	Dietz, Jennifer, jmdietz@volusia.k12.fl.us
Literacy Leadership Hold quarterly data meetings to discuss and determine progress towards literacy outcomes.	Dietz, Jennifer, jmdietz@volusia.k12.fl.us
Literacy Coaching Establish a coaching schedule that allows the ela coach time to focus on kindergarten, first and second grade.	Lemelin, Melissa, malemeli@volusia.k12.fl.us
Literacy Coaching Monitor the ela coaches schedule to ensure proper time is being dedicated to kindergarten, first and second grade coaching cycles.	Dietz, Jennifer, jmdietz@volusia.k12.fl.us
Literacy Coaching Utilize district ela support personnel in primary grade levels.	Lemelin, Melissa, malemeli@volusia.k12.fl.us
Assessment Monitor progress of literacy outcome through progress monitoring assessments after each assessment.	Dietz, Jennifer, jmdietz@volusia.k12.fl.us
Assessment Monitor tier 1, 2 and 3 data and ongoing progress monitoring points with teachers during scheduled PLC's to ensure we are progressing towards our outcomes expected.	Lemelin, Melissa, malemeli@volusia.k12.fl.us
Professional Learning Provide all K-2 teachers training in Being a Reader.	Lemelin, Melissa, malemeli@volusia.k12.fl.us
Professional Learning Using walk through data determine professional development needs of teachers.	Dietz, Jennifer, jmdietz@volusia.k12.fl.us
Professional Development Provide professional development and coaching cycles determined by administration walk throughs with selected teachers.	Lemelin, Melissa, malemeli@volusia.k12.fl.us

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

- Use of webpage and social media to share SIP.
- Monthly SAC meetings to share with all stakeholders.
- Monthly updates to leadership and faculty during after school meetings.
- Quarterly data chats during PLC's with teachers during grade levels.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

- Use of webpage to share SIP.
- Monthly SAC meetings where parent involvement is discussed.
- Parent and Family Engagement Plan shared via social media and website.
- Monthly parent night events where academics and social emotional strategies are shared
- Monthly spirit nights held off campus to encourage school and parent relationships outside of the school grounds.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

Collaborative planning strategies and techniques are used by all grade levels. Funding is provided through Title 1 to allow teachers the time after school to complete this. Collaborative planning is aligned to our four look fors to ensure that benchmark aligned teaching and collaborative structures are delivered in the classroom. All levels of student learning are addressed in collaborative planning. Master schedule is run to fidelity in all grade levels and is monitored by learning walks.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

NA