Deland High School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Deland High School

800 N HILL AVE, Deland, FL 32724

http://www.delandhs.org/

Demographics

Principal: Michael Deg IR Olmo

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School PK, 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	90%
2018-19 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* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: B (58%) 2014-15: A (65%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Volusia 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

Deland High School

800 N HILL AVE, Deland, FL 32724

http://www.delandhs.org/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School PK, 9-12	No	57%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	44%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	C	C	B	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Volusia 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.

The mission of DeLand High School is to provide a safe learning environment which produces citizens who are prepared to face the challenges of an increasingly complex society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of the DeLand High family is that every student will become a high school graduate. We are committed to presenting a caring environment for learning, one that involves participatory decision making by students, parents, faculty, staff, and community leaders. DeLand High will provide opportunities for all students to realize their potential through involvement in the total school community. We realize it is our responsibility to challenge students to achieve and to encourage ethical behavior so as to produce responsible, productive members of society.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Carr, Melissa	Principal	School Principal
Degirolmo, Mike	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of Exceptional Student Education
Mitchell, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	Social Emotional Learning Team Leader; SAC Member
Nehrig, Lisa	SAC Member	IB Coordinator; SAC Chairperson
Nunez, Julia	School Counselor	Director of School Counseling
Lueth, Marylea	Teacher, ESE	Exceptional Student Education Department Chair
Sedore, Monica	Teacher, K-12	English Teacher
Wetter, Justin	Teacher, K-12	Social Studies Department Chair
Sibio, Kimberly	Teacher, K-12	World Languages Department Chair
Lowenstein, James	Teacher, Career/ Technical	CTE Department Chair
Sniffen, April	Teacher, K-12	English Department Chair
Banker, Sabrina	Teacher, K-12	Math Teacher; SAC Member
Bismore, Roger	Teacher, K-12	CTE Teacher
Battaglino, Kathryn	Instructional Technology	Literacy Coach and Digital Learning Leader
Jackson, Jennifer	Instructional Coach	Math Coach
Patron, Roberto	Teacher, K-12	ESOL Teacher; SAC Member
Vega, Issella	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of Instruction and Assessment
Lucero, Mike	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of Data and Master Scheduling
Fuller, Tiffany	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of Curriculum and Instruction; SIP

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	711	701	630	656	2698
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	76	62	94	332
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	8	4	1	32
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120	193	135	80	528
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	307	225	143	109	784

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	129	139	73	49	390

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	143	127	93	22	385
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112	92	56	162	422

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

149

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 4/15/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	50	41	26	151
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	132	101	65	35	333
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	175	149	150	492
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	179	212	186	119	696

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	73	161	117	74	425

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	47%	52%	56%	50%	49%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	44%	49%	51%	46%	48%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	31%	37%	42%	38%	37%	41%
Math Achievement	32%	48%	51%	63%	50%	49%
Math Learning Gains	37%	49%	48%	56%	42%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	31%	38%	45%	53%	34%	39%
Science Achievement	73%	76%	68%	74%	72%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	59%	69%	73%	69%	68%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey					
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	711 (0)	701 (0)	630 (0)	656 (0)	2698 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	100 ()	76 ()	62 ()	94 ()	332 (0)
One or more suspensions	19 (0)	8 (0)	4 (0)	1 (0)	32 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	120 (0)	193 (0)	135 (0)	80 (0)	528 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	307 (0)	225 (0)	143 (0)	109 (0)	784 (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.

NOTE: 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
09	2019	45%	51%	-6%	55%	-10%
	2018	47%	50%	-3%	53%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	48%	50%	-2%	53%	-5%
	2018	49%	49%	0%	53%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

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

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

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	71%	72%	-1%	67%	4%
2018	62%	65%	-3%	65%	-3%
Compare	9%				

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	57%	63%	-6%	70%	-13%
2018	63%	63%	0%	68%	-5%
Compare	-6%				

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	19%	54%	-35%	61%	-42%
2018	27%	57%	-30%	62%	-35%
Compare		-8%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	37%	55%	-18%	57%	-20%
2018	50%	55%	-5%	56%	-6%
Compare		-13%			

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	15	27	24	11	20	20	33	19		84	14
ELL	14	27	27	13	21	21	45	22		59	8
ASN	76	61		63	38		89			100	69
BLK	30	39	28	21	33	25	54	42		80	25
HSP	36	41	34	21	30	30	63	50		71	46
MUL	49	46		14	32		78	56		77	40
WHT	55	46	32	42	43	37	79	71		85	55
FRL	36	40	31	26	34	31	64	52		74	35
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	14	36	34	22	43	35	20	42		52	14
ELL	13	38	34	25	47	50	38	39		67	29
ASN	63	61		71	75		85				
BLK	28	38	35	27	27	19	40	39		66	31
HSP	39	43	30	36	46	35	53	61		65	37
MUL	49	44		48	47		84	92		77	65
WHT	56	48	40	48	48	40	77	73		81	64
FRL	39	42	34	39	46	37	57	60		63	40
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	13	27	27	26	35	50	37	44		57	25
ELL	6	42	46	52			50	24		53	
ASN	83	73		79	73		83			91	100
BLK	27	35	28	38	48	33	50	56		66	17
HSP	38	42	37	60	51	58	66	64		68	44
MUL	50	49		60	39		82			71	75

| 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
WHT	59	50	45	68	59	55	80	74		79	63
FRL	40	42	36	58	52	47	68	66		64	38

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	47
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	528
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	94%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
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	28
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	71
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Asian Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	38
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	43
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	49
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	55
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	43
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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 showing the lowest performance was math achievement, at 31%. Last year we began doubling blocking math (Algebra 1) students who had a traditionally struggled with math, but we realized that while they supported and agreed with the concept of the intensive math scheduling for support, there had not been much in the area of professional learning or support to help them adjust practice and maximize this opportunity for students.

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

The area that saw the greatest decline from the 2017-2018 school year was math achievement. Math lost 11% in achievement when compared to the prior year's achievement which was at 42%. In addition to the previously mentioned need for professional learning and support to aid the new intensive math block in Algebra 1, the previous cohort of Algebra students who rolled into Geometry had also demonstrated a decline in achievement while in Algebra 1, so the cohort in Geometry has previously established gaps in math content and skill knowledge. Finally, the comprehensive shift of Algebra 1 and even Geometry into the middle school acceleration plan, has significantly impacted the dynamic of the composition of high school Algebra 1 and Geometry classes, increasing the need for additional training and support for math teachers in differentiating and scaffolding their course content. As a result, the tested cohort in the are of math for the 2018-2019 school year was comprised of a cohort of students with greater needs, and a teaching cohort that had not yet been fully prepared for the shifting learning demands of the students that now populate these courses.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was math. The state average for Algebra 1 was 38% in achievement compared to our 19% achievement score, a 19 percentage point difference. In the area of Geometry, we had an achievement score of 37%, but the state's achievement scores was 53%, a 16 percentage point gap. Collectively, our math component demonstrated the largest gap, due largely to the aforementioned reasons detailed in letters a and b of this reflection.

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

The data components that showed the greatest improvement were Science achievement and graduation rate. Science achievement grew 6 percentage points from the 2017-2018 school year (66%) to the 2018-2019 school year (72%), and graduation rate grew from 78% during the 2017-2018 school year to 82% during the 2018-2019 school year. Science was able to benefit from vertical teaming with the Environmental PLC that pre-exposed Biology students to biology concepts, For graduation, we employed a new initiative called Project Graduation, which engaged teams of teachers per each graduation cohort, focused as a secondary and tertiary tier of support for students at various risk levels of not graduating. The teams comb through data, conference with students and parents and set-up success plans for students with adults for whom the student feels accountable. The additional focus allowed for greater support of all students, ensuring more of them reached the graduation milestone.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

The number of students scoring a Level 1 has increased from 696 in the 2017-2018 school year to 784 in the 2018-2019 school year, and the attendance below 90% has also increased from 151 during the 2017-2018 school year to 332 in the 2018-2019 school year. An increased focus on supporting tier 1 and differentiated instruction to help all learners make gains and achieve, in addition

to enriching whole student support services to engage more students in school to address the growing attendance issue will be a priority this school year.

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

1. Math support for students and teachers for increased math achievement
2. Increasing achievement for students with disabilities
3. Increasing achievement for English Language Learners
4. Increasing achievement for African American students
5. Increasing learning gains

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Math Achievement
Rationale	Based on the needs assessment and EOC analysis it revealed that our Algebra students demonstrated the lowest rate of achievement of all the core academic areas, and Geometry scores dropped 14% from the previous year. Additionally, our students with disabilities, English language learners and African-American sub-groups underperformed the 41% ESSA mandate.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase Math EOC Achievement from 31% to 41%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Tiffany Fuller (tnfuller@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Standards-aligned instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Since achievement levels in math have had a two-year decline, the focus is to reinforce the tier 1 instruction all students receive by ensuring lesson activities and instruction and the assessment of the same are aligned to the depth of the standards and the instructional practice guide shifts.
Action Step	
Description	1. Review and unpack summative EOC data with Math department and PLCs for trends and areas of focus 2. Facilitate Professional Learning (A: standards-aligned instruction in Math standards and instructional shifts practices; B: formative assessment, feedback and learner clarity; C: differentiating instruction in math to best support learning gains among our ESSA subgroups: English language learners, students with disabilities, and African-American students; D: learning walks) 3. Conduct Data days and Student Boot Camps for targeted math instruction and interventions 4. Engage in Coaching Cycles to analyze and reflect upon instructional practices, set goals and action plans based on implementing evidenced based strategies to improve teaching and learning. 5. Progress monitoring by PLCs & Project Graduation teams with an emphasis on ESSA subgroups (English language learners, students with disabilities, and African-American students) 6. Increase testing participation percentage with clarifying structures for monitoring and tracking student numbers 7. Administrative walk throughs for fidelity and implementation of the action steps
Person Responsible	Jennifer Jackson (jajacks1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	ELA Lowest Quartile Learning Gains
Rationale	As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis, it revealed that our ELA Learning Gains for our Lowest Quartile was only at 31% which was below the ESSA minimium mandate and the state average (45%). Additionally, many of our students in the lowest quartile are also in our prioeity ESSA subgroups which fell below the federal index. So, by focusing on this area, we will address the needs of our students with disabilities, our English language learners, and our African-American students, and thereby improve instruction and learning so an increased number of students are making learning gains and reaching achievement across all subgroups, but particularly ESSA focus sub-groups.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase ELA Lowest Quartile Learning Gains from 31% to 41%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Tiffany Fuller (tnfuller@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Differentiating Literacy Instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	To effectively reach the needs of students in our lowest quartile, particularly those falling in our ESSA sub-groups (students with disabilities, English language learners, and African-American students), classroom instruction in literacy has to use effectively differentiate process, product and content offerings to engage learners in literacy instruction that is engaging, accessible and culturally relevant for them equitably demonstrate their learning and make the gains they need for ultimate achievement.

Action Step	
Description	1. Review lowest quartile data to ensure proper placement of students for intervention, ESE and ESOL support services 2. Facilitate Professional Learning (A: Equity through standards, core actions, and learning clarity; B: AVID strategies of Focused and Process Note Taking; C: Differentiating Instruction and accommodations for English language learners; D: Learning Walks) 3. Engage in Coaching Cycles to analyze and reflect upon instructional practices, set goals and action plans based on implementing evidenced based strategies to improve teaching and learning. 4. Progress monitoring by PLCs & Project Graduation teams with an emphasis on ESSA subgroups (English language learners, students with disabilities, and African-American students) 5. Student Tutoring and Testing Boot Camps 6. Increase testing participation percentage with clarifying structures for monitoring and tracking student numbers 7. Administrative walk throughs for fidelity and implementation of the action steps
Person Responsible	Kathryn Battaglino (klbattag@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Achievement for Students with Disabilities
Rationale	After conducting our Needs Assessment and Analysis and seeing our ESSA data, we realized that our students with disabilities had significantly underperformed (29% achievement) comparative to the minimum ESSA performance threshold (41%) and the state average for the same subgroup (45%). Additionally, our students with disabilities was one of our lowest performing subgroups on our ESSA report. As a result of this analysis, our SLT determined this area should be one of our focus areas for the year.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase achievement for students with disabilities from 29% to 41%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Marylea Lueth (melueth@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Targeted interventions
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The SLT determined that since students with disabilities are largely included in the general education classroom setting, receiving the same content, often at the same pace as their peers, they wanted to focus on the accommodations and supports these students are receiving. By focusing on interventions and measuring the impact of those interventions on student learning, teachers can be more responsive to students with learning disabilities to help them better achieve. Further, John Hattie's research on effect sizes asserts that intervention for students with disabilities can have up to a .77 effect size on student learning, and Response to Intervention specifically can have an effect size of up to a 1.29.

Action Step	
Description	1. Review achievement data to ensure proper placement of students for ESE support services 2. Facilitate Professional Learning (A: Intervention and monitoring strategies specific to students with disabilities; B: Inclusion strategies and differentiating instruction for the inclusion classroom; C: Formative technologies and feedback; D: Learning Walks) 3. Engage in Coaching Cycles to analyze and reflect upon instructional practices, set goals and action plans based on implementing evidenced based strategies to improve teaching and learning. 4. Progress monitoring by PLCs & Project Graduation teams with an emphasis on ESSA subgroups (English language learners, students with disabilities, and African-American students) 5. Student Tutoring and Testing Bootcamps 6. Increase testing participation percentage with clarifying structures for monitoring and tracking student numbers 7. Administrative walk throughs for fidelity and implementation of the action steps
Person Responsible	Marylea Lueth (melueth@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Math Achievement				$3,100.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			1453 - Deland High School	School Improvement Funds		$3,100.00
			Notes: This will go to support professional learning for practicing educators to receive training in the curricular, instructional and data-based practices necessary to support and advance student learning, as well as to help fund student supports like tutoring and testing boot camps to help provide extended practice outside of the school day so students can demonstrate increased achievement.			

2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ELA Lowest Quartile Learning Gains				$2,600.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			1453 - Deland High School	School Improvement Funds		$2,600.00
			Notes: This will go to support professional learning for practicing educators to receive training in the differentiated instructional and data-based practices necessary to support and advance student learning, as well as to help fund student supports like supplemental resources, tutoring and testing boot camps to help provide extended practice outside of the school day so students can demonstrate increased achievement.			

3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Achievement for Students with Disabilities				$3,300.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			1453 - Deland High School	School Improvement Funds		$3,300.00
			Notes: This will go to support professional learning for practicing educators to receive training in different interventions techniques and strategies, as well as technology assistance programs and devices to support student learning and achievement. Additionally, this will help fund student supports like tutoring and testing boot camps to provide extended practice outside of the school day so they can demonstrate increased achievement.			
					Total:	**$9,000.00**