



---

## Table of Contents

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>            | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>16</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>20</b> |

# 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

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | High School<br>PK, 9-12  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2018-19 Title I School</b>  | No   |
| <b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 90%  |
| <b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: C (49%)<br>2017-18: C (52%)<br>2016-17: B (58%)<br>2015-16: B (58%)<br>2014-15: A (65%)   |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |  |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southeast  |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>   |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A  |
| <b>Year</b>  |  |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |  |

| ESSA Status  | TS&I |
|--|------|
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> . |      |

### 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](http://www.floridacims.org).

### Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

---

## Table of Contents

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>16</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>20</b> |

# Deland High School

800 N HILL AVE, Deland, FL 32724

<http://www.delandhs.org/>

## School Demographics

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br/>(per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">High School<br/>PK, 9-12</p> | <p><b>2018-19 Title I School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p> | <p><b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br/>(as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">57%</p> |
| <p><b>Primary Service Type</b><br/>(per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>            | <p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>         | <p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b><br/>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">44%</p>               |

## School Grades History

|              |                |                |                |                |
|--------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| <b>Year</b>  | <b>2018-19</b> | <b>2017-18</b> | <b>2016-17</b> | <b>2015-16</b> |
| <b>Grade</b> | 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:

| <b>Name</b>         | <b>Title</b>               | <b>Job Duties and Responsibilities</b>                 |
|---------------------|----------------------------|--|
| 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 area 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:**



|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>#1</b>   |   |
| <b>Title</b>  | Math Achievement  |
| <b>Rationale</b>  | 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.   |
| <b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b> | Increase Math EOC Achievement from 31% to 41%   |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>                | Tiffany Fuller (tnfuller@volusia.k12.fl.us)   |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>                                  | Standards-aligned instruction   |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>                    | 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.   |
| <b>Action Step</b>  |   |
| <b>Description</b>  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Review and unpack summative EOC data with Math department and PLCs for trends and areas of focus</li> <li>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)</li> <li>3. Conduct Data days and Student Boot Camps for targeted math instruction and interventions</li> <li>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.</li> <li>5. Progress monitoring by PLCs &amp; Project Graduation teams with an emphasis on ESSA subgroups (English language learners, students with disabilities, and African-American students)</li> <li>6. Increase testing participation percentage with clarifying structures for monitoring and tracking student numbers</li> <li>7. Administrative walk throughs for fidelity and implementation of the action steps</li> </ol> |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>                                       | Jennifer Jackson (jajacks1@volusia.k12.fl.us)   |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>#2</b>   |   |
| <b>Title</b>  | ELA Lowest Quartile Learning Gains  |
| <b>Rationale</b>  | 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 minimum mandate and the state average (45%). Additionally, many of our students in the lowest quartile are also in our priority 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.   |
| <b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b> | Increase ELA Lowest Quartile Learning Gains from 31% to 41%   |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>                | Tiffany Fuller (tnfuller@volusia.k12.fl.us)   |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>                                  | Differentiating Literacy Instruction  |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>                    | 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.   |
| <b>Action Step</b>  |   |
| <b>Description</b>  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Review lowest quartile data to ensure proper placement of students for intervention, ESE and ESOL support services</li> <li>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)</li> <li>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.</li> <li>4. Progress monitoring by PLCs &amp; Project Graduation teams with an emphasis on ESSA subgroups (English language learners, students with disabilities, and African-American students)</li> <li>5. Student Tutoring and Testing Boot Camps</li> <li>6. Increase testing participation percentage with clarifying structures for monitoring and tracking student numbers</li> <li>7. Administrative walk throughs for fidelity and implementation of the action steps</li> </ol> |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>                                       | Kathryn Battaglino (klbattag@volusia.k12.fl.us)   |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>#3</b>   |   |
| <b>Title</b>  | Achievement for Students with Disabilities  |
| <b>Rationale</b>  | 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.  |
| <b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b> | Increase achievement for students with disabilities from 29% to 41%   |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>                | Marylea Lueth (melueth@volusia.k12.fl.us)   |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>                                  | Targeted interventions  |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>                    | 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.  |
| <b>Action Step</b>  |   |
| <b>Description</b>  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Review achievement data to ensure proper placement of students for ESE support services</li> <li>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)</li> <li>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.</li> <li>4. Progress monitoring by PLCs &amp; Project Graduation teams with an emphasis on ESSA subgroups (English language learners, students with disabilities, and African-American students)</li> <li>5. Student Tutoring and Testing Bootcamps</li> <li>6. Increase testing participation percentage with clarifying structures for monitoring and tracking student numbers</li> <li>7. Administrative walk throughs for fidelity and implementation of the action steps</li> </ol> |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>                                       | 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        |
|   |          |  | <i>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.</i>  |                          |               |                   |
| 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        |
|   |          |  | <i>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.</i>                   |                          |               |                   |
| 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        |
|   |          |  | <i>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.</i> |                          |               |                   |
|   |          |  |   |                          | <b>Total:</b> | <b>\$9,000.00</b> |