

Volusia County Schools

Deltona High School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	19
Budget to Support Goals	20

Deltona High School

100 WOLF PACK RUN, Deltona, FL 32725

<http://dhswolves.com/>

Demographics

Principal: Michael Micallef

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2015

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	98%
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: B (59%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (48%) 2014-15: B (58%)
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	19
Budget to Support Goals	20

Deltona High School

100 WOLF PACK RUN, Deltona, FL 32725

<http://dhswolves.com/>

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 9-12	Yes	68%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	61%

School Grades History

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

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.

Believing all students will learn, Deltona High School empowers students by providing challenging educational experiences in a caring environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

As stated in all of Volusia County Schools:

“Through the individual commitment of all, our students will graduate with the knowledge, skills, and values necessary to be successful contributors to our democratic 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
Carbonell, Carolyn	Principal	Our principal oversees all roles, responsibilities, and daily operations of the school.
Micallef, Michael	Assistant Principal	
Velez, Eidie	Assistant Principal	
Lapnow, Christina	Assistant Principal	
Grieve, Bobbie Jo	Assistant Principal	
Cowan, Ky	Dean	
Zarbo, Alisha	Teacher, Career/ Technical	
Carson, Julia	Administrative Support	
Brennan, Joseph	Teacher, K-12	
Beavers, Deb	Teacher, K-12	
Emerick Brown, Dylan	Teacher, K-12	
McElhaney, Samantha	Teacher, K-12	
O'Brien, Maria	Teacher, K-12	
Ramer, Chris	Teacher, K-12	
Sterrett-Pegg, Judy	Instructional Coach	
Jenkins, Melanie	Teacher, K-12	
Kauffman, Kara	School Counselor	
Palmer, Adrienne	Teacher, ESE	
Goropuescheck, Franz	Teacher, ESE	

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	0	465	445	366	406	1682
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63	65	38	33	199
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	12	9	6	48
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	74	95	92	297
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	183	120	93	80	476
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	64	53	48	232

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	51	56	41	27	175
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	56	41	27	175

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

110

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/20/2019

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	75	34	23	21	153
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130	73	49	48	300
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	74	95	92	297
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	184	120	93	80	477

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	122	82	57	58	319

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	54%	52%	56%	42%	49%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	51%	49%	51%	44%	48%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	37%	42%	43%	37%	41%
Math Achievement	49%	48%	51%	33%	50%	49%
Math Learning Gains	60%	49%	48%	34%	42%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	38%	45%	32%	34%	39%
Science Achievement	75%	76%	68%	72%	72%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	78%	69%	73%	73%	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	465 (0)	445 (0)	366 (0)	406 (0)	1682 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	63 ()	65 ()	38 ()	33 ()	199 (0)
One or more suspensions	21 (0)	12 (0)	9 (0)	6 (0)	48 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	36 (0)	74 (0)	95 (0)	92 (0)	297 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	183 (0)	120 (0)	93 (0)	80 (0)	476 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

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

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	58%	51%	7%	55%	3%
	2018	41%	50%	-9%	53%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		17%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	44%	50%	-6%	53%	-9%
	2018	46%	49%	-3%	53%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

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	73%	72%	1%	67%	6%
2018	64%	65%	-1%	65%	-1%
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	76%	63%	13%	70%	6%
2018	66%	63%	3%	68%	-2%
Compare		10%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	23%	54%	-31%	61%	-38%
2018	34%	57%	-23%	62%	-28%
Compare		-11%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	58%	55%	3%	57%	1%
2018	41%	55%	-14%	56%	-15%
Compare		17%			

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	23	40	39	29	49	33	39	61		73	16
ELL	23	38	30	27	50	36	45	48		52	31
ASN	92	54									
BLK	41	44	47	30	48	43	64	69		79	40
HSP	49	49	41	44	55	44	71	71		77	40
MUL	36	38		48	57		93				
WHT	64	57	38	62	66	76	81	88		90	54
FRL	47	48	40	46	59	48	72	76		79	39
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	19	38	35	26	55	52	38	43		76	19
ELL	11	48	54	29	42	43	35	48		52	57
BLK	31	48	45	31	60	65	64	52		65	35
HSP	38	54	47	40	48	29	58	61		74	47
MUL	41	45		53	70					86	33
WHT	53	51	48	53	61	67	80	84		82	56
FRL	39	51	45	40	54	54	65	64		74	45
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	19	43	44	8	29	34	40	28		69	18
ELL	12	39	39	15	30	25	40	50		50	47
BLK	29	40	34	24	30	27	52	54		73	33
HSP	35	42	45	28	34	31	68	72		72	45
MUL	45	63		33	21					74	53
WHT	52	44	38	41	36	40	83	84		81	52
FRL	36	42	43	29	30	28	67	71		70	41

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	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	42
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	632
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	38
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	73
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	51
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	53
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	54
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	68
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	54
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.

Upon looking at the data from the 18-19 school year in both ESSA subgroups and school grade data, it was clear to our team that we had the lowest performance trend indicated in our ELP at 42% and our ELA lowest quartile. Another area of focus that we need to address is our Algebra 1 scores that also decreased.

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

One area that is alarming to the team is the ELP (20% decline) performance. The team agrees that more resources and attention need to be allocated to see an increase and this could have had an impact

in the previous year. Additional impacts were a lack of paraprofessional strategies within the classroom. Communication and collaboration with our PLC's and our ESOL team need to continue to happen across the board, especially the expectations of the WIDA exam and progress monitoring of our ELL and ESE students.

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.

As stated previously, our ELP students had the greatest gap and the trends and factors are listed above. Both areas need to be monitored closely within our team and within all PLC's to ensure growth of our ESOL and ESE subpopulations.

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

Increase in 6 out of the 10 school grade components

ELA - 9th grade with the largest increase in the district

US History - 8%

Graduation rate - 7%

Some of the actions included the following strategies and implementations:

Focused work within the school at every opportunity including SIP monitoring meetings, administrative meetings, PLC meetings, and school leadership meetings

Work with Instructional Partners

Teamwork within PLC

District support

Support classes

Grad assurance positions

Support classes

Summer pilot

SAT/ACT support

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

The first and most alarming area of concern is the number of students that are currently reading or achieving at a level 1 on state standardized tests. Another area of concern are the students failing ELA and Math courses.

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

1. Resources for ELL
2. Resources for SWD
3. ELA across the board
4. Teacher training
5. Quality discussions in PLC - targeted discussions

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Lowest quartile earning learning gains in ELA
Rationale	Upon reflection of our school grade, trend data, and ESSA data, the lowest quartile in ELA is our lowest percentage overall in our school grade and had the most significant drop (5% drop) since the previous year.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Our school grade reflects 42% of our lowest quartile earning learning gains for the 18-19 school year. We are hopeful that we can increase this percentage to at least 60% for the 19-20 school year with increased attention, focus, communication, and data analysis and awareness.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Carolyn Carbonell (cscarbon@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>Intensive PLC strategies within the 9/10 ELA teachers, utilizing data from multiple sources and standards-based lesson planning.</p> <p>A team of teachers and leaders attended summer training on PLCs and have focused on a book study to help support the utilization of PLC's across campus.</p> <p>According to Dufour (2019), "After synthesizing over 800 meta-analyses on the factors that impact student achievement, John Hattie concluded that the best way to improve schools was to organize teachers into collaborative teams that clarify what each student must learn and the indicators of learning the team will track, to gather evidence of that learning on an ongoing basis, and to analyze the results together so that they could learn which instructional strategies were working and which were not. In other words, he urged schools to function as Professional Learning Communities. Robert Marzano came to a similar conclusion when he described the PLC concept as "one of the most powerful initiatives for school improvement I have seen in the last decade." The quality of the individual teacher remains paramount in student learning, and the PLC concept is our best strategy for creating the system that ensures more good teaching in more classrooms more of the time."</p> <p>Hattie, J. (2009). Visible Learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to student achievement. New York: Routledge.</p> <p>Marzano, R. (2003). What works in schools: Translating research into action. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.</p> <p>.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Administrative team and teacher leaders attended a Solutions Tree conference over the summer on full implementation of PLC's to bring to Deltona High to have a positive impact on our school grade, communication, and student achievement. 2. Lowest quartile data will be pulled and analyzed by the leadership team and PLC teams. 3. Individual plans for success will be created to ensure success of all students utilizing data from baseline assessments, standards-aligned learning, and data-driven interventions. 4. Conduct weekly PLC's to ensure implementation and monitoring.

5. Meet with the Reading Coach and Dr. Lapnow to continue discussions and strategies for success with lowest quartile, including ESE and ESOL strategies.
6. Monitor and provide feedback as needed throughout the process.

Person Responsible Carolyn Carbonell (cscarbon@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2

Title Increase proficiency of our ELL students - as data from FSA ELA and WIDA indicates that this is an area for growth

Rationale According to our data from WIDA, our students had a 20% decrease from the previous year. This subgroup needs additional support to continue to make progress towards proficiency.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve An increase in both WIDA scores and as reflected in our lowest quartile data on FSA ELA by a 20% increase

Person responsible for monitoring outcome Carolyn Carbonell (cscarbon@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy Both PLC's and standards-aligned learning utilizing data have been proven to have significant impacts on students learning as referenced by Hattie and Marzano.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy Intensive PLC strategies within all PLC's across the school and within our ESOL and 9/10 ELA PLC's utilizing data from multiple sources and standards-based lesson planning.

Action Step

- Description**
1. Administrative team and teacher leaders attended a Solutions Tree conference over the summer on full implementation of PLC's to bring to Deltona High to have a positive impact on our school grade, communication, and student achievement.
 2. Lowest quartile data will be pulled and analyzed by the leadership team and PLC teams.
 3. Individual plans for success will be created to ensure success of all students utilizing data from baseline assessments, standards-aligned learning, and data-driven interventions.
 4. Conduct weekly PLCs to ensure implementation and monitoring.
 5. Meet with the Reading Coach, ESOL teachers and Dr. Lapnow to continue discussions and strategies for success with the lowest quartile, including ESE and ESOL strategies.
 6. Monitor and feedback as needed throughout the process.

Person Responsible Carolyn Carbonell (cscarbon@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Increase Math Achievement - with a specific focus on the Algebra 1 course
Rationale	After review of our school grade, trend data, and comparative district/state data, the school recorded an 11% pass rate deficit from the previous year. There is a substantial deficit in Algebra 1 achievement and additional academic supports need to be enacted for these students and teachers to meet with mastery.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	An increase in Algebra 1 achievement is possible with added support, immediate intervention/remediation plans, effective use of common planning, and continual data analysis. The 11% decrease from the 2018 to the 2019 school year can improve and we are focusing efforts in hopes of demonstrating a 20% increase (from 23% to 43% achievement).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Carolyn Carbonell (cscarbon@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Common planning for all Algebra 1 teachers, intensive PLC data-focused weekly meetings, standards-based lesson-planning, online learning enrichment, and additional support by academic coaches.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Hattie concluded "the best way to improve schools was to organize teachers into collaborative teams that clarify what each student must learn and the indicators of learning the team will track, to gather evidence of that learning on an ongoing basis, and to analyze the results together so that they could learn which instructional strategies were working and which were not. In other words, he urged schools to function as Professional Learning Communities."
	Common planning for Algebra teachers and regular meetings will help create common assessments/effective lesson planning. PLC's will focus on student data, promote standards aligned learning, and utilize multiple data sources. Online tools for Algebra courses will be implemented and available for all students.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Administrative team and teacher leaders attended a Solutions Tree conference over the summer on full implementation of PLC's to bring to Deltona HS to have a positive impact on our future school grade, communication, and student achievement. 2. Lowest quartile, SWD, and ESOL student data will be pulled and analyzed by leadership team and PLC teams, in addition to district math assessments throughout the year. 3. Individual plans for success will be created to ensure success of all students utilizing data from baseline assessments, standards-aligned learning, and data-driven interventions. 4. Professional development for Algebra 1 teachers, including the use of online learning tools for at-home remediation and differentiated instruction within the classroom for all students. 5. Conduct weekly PLC's to ensure implementation and monitoring. 6. Meet with academic coach and Mrs. Carbonell to continue discussions and strategies for success with the lowest quartile students, including ESE and ESOL strategies. 7. Participate in district and school-based Learning walks. 8. Monitor and provide feedback as needed throughout the process.
Person Responsible	Carolyn Carbonell (cscarbon@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).

This year, Deltona High will continue work with standards-aligned learning utilizing individual student data and monitoring to ensure that there is school wide improvement. We will continue to focus on reaching the depth of the standards, learning the full depth of the standards, and strategies to ensure that all students can reach those standards. We will also continue to utilize individual student data to meet the needs of different students. This year, the additional emphasis on PLCs and AVID strategies, we will continue to work with our teacher leaders should have a positive impact on all areas of student achievement and school growth.

Part IV: Title I Requirements**Additional Title I Requirements**

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

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

Deltona High is not a Title 1 school for the 2019-2020 school year.

PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

Deltona High is not a Title 1 school for the 2019-2020 school year.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

Deltona High is not a Title 1 school for the 2019-2020 school year.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

Deltona High is not a Title 1 school for the 2019-2020 school year.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

Deltona High is not a Title 1 school for the 2019-2020 school year.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Lowest quartile earning learning gains in ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase proficiency of our ELL students - as data from FSA ELA and WIDA indicates that this is an area for growth	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase Math Achievement - with a specific focus on the Algebra 1 course	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00