

Hernando County School District

Deltona Elementary 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	17
Budget to Support Goals	0

Deltona Elementary School

2055 DELTONA BLVD, Spring Hill, FL 34606

<https://www.hernandoschools.org/des>

Demographics

Principal: Debi Shellabarger

Start Date for this Principal: 7/24/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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 Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: C (42%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: B (54%) 2014-15: B (54%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 Hernando 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	17
Budget to Support Goals	0

Deltona Elementary School

2055 DELTONA BLVD, Spring Hill, FL 34606

<https://www.hernandoschools.org/des>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2018-19 Title I School</p> <p style="font-size: 1.2em;">Yes</p>	<p>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="font-size: 1.2em;">100%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="font-size: 1.2em;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="font-size: 1.2em;">38%</p>

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 Hernando 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.

In Partnership with parents and the community Deltona Elementary School is:
Determined to provide
Outstanding educational
Values to
Empower
Students

Perseverance, Respect, Integrity, Determination, Empowerment

Provide the school's vision statement.

ALL children WILL achieve at high levels.

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
Shellabarger, Debi	Principal	Oversees the implementation of the SIP with fidelity.
Keiper, Maureen	Assistant Principal	Assists the principal with overseeing the SIP with fidelity.
Divins, Kirk	Teacher, K-12	Grade level teacher and member of the School Based Leadership Team responsible for obtaining and reporting grade level data at bi-weekly SBLT meetings.
Casto, Cynthia	Teacher, K-12	Assessment teacher and member of the School Based Leadership Team responsible for obtaining and reporting all grade level data at bi-weekly SBLT meetings. Also responsible for obtaining and reporting state and county (AP1, AP2, and AP3) data for continuous monitoring of students achievement.
Gracy, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	Grade level teacher and member of the School Based Leadership Team responsible for obtaining and reporting grade level data at bi-weekly SBLT meetings.
Gill, Brooke	Teacher, K-12	Grade level teacher and member of the School Based Leadership Team responsible for obtaining and reporting grade level data at bi-weekly SBLT meetings.
Steele, Michelle	Other	Resource teacher and member of the School Based Leadership Team responsible for obtaining and reporting of MTSS data at bi-weekly SBLT meetings. Also responsible for obtaining and deciding individual targeted instructional paths for students based on state and county (AP1, AP2, and AP3) data. Monitoring of students instructional paths for fidelity in accordance with state and district guidelines.
Iannaccone, Michael	Teacher, K-12	Grade level teacher and member of the School Based Leadership Team responsible for obtaining and reporting grade level data at bi-weekly SBLT meetings.
Roush, Cindy	Instructional Coach	Instructional Math Coach and member of the School Based Leadership Team responsible for monitoring and guiding math instruction with an intense focus on grades 3 through 5. Also is in charge of the Mentoring Program for "New to Teaching Teachers" and "New to Deltona Teachers" to insure district and school wide procedures are followed.
Gendron, Amy	School Counselor	Guidance Counselor and member of the School Based Leadership Team responsible coordinates and teaches social skills and provides counseling for the overall well being of all students. Also part of the Threat Assessment and SBLT Teams.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Hill, Kenneth	Other	ESE Resource and Team Leader responsible for overseeing the ESE department. The collection of data, the writing and monitoring of IEPs for Students with Disabilities subgroup.
Falkinburg, Marcia	Teacher, K-12	Grade level teacher and member of the School Based Leadership Team responsible for obtaining and reporting grade level data at bi-weekly SBLT meetings.
Dibble, Julie	Teacher, K-12	Grade level teacher and member of the School Based Leadership Team responsible for obtaining and reporting grade level data at bi-weekly SBLT meetings.
Dill, JB	Other	Title 1 Facilitator monitors the purchases made are tied to the areas of need based on the data. The coordination of family engagement activities and ensures that Federal Compliance is being meet.

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	120	119	108	106	104	105	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	662
Attendance below 90 percent	46	36	22	33	31	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	200
One or more suspensions	15	39	49	66	63	79	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	311
Course failure in ELA or Math	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	11	33	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79

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	8	24	24	27	38	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	166

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	4	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/24/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Attendance below 90 percent	19	62	46	49	51	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	268
One or more suspensions	1	6	9	7	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Course failure in ELA or Math	12	1	1	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	11	22	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75

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	12	6	8	8	23	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90

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	19	62	46	49	51	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	268
One or more suspensions	1	6	9	7	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Course failure in ELA or Math	12	1	1	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	11	22	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75

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	12	6	8	8	23	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90

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	52%	54%	57%	56%	54%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	47%	53%	58%	53%	54%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	52%	53%	52%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	55%	58%	63%	60%	63%	61%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Learning Gains	49%	57%	62%	57%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	48%	51%	59%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	40%	54%	53%	59%	54%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	120 (0)	119 (0)	108 (0)	106 (0)	104 (0)	105 (0)	662 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	46 (19)	36 (62)	22 (46)	33 (49)	31 (51)	32 (41)	200 (268)
One or more suspensions	15 (1)	39 (6)	49 (9)	66 (7)	63 (10)	79 (10)	311 (43)
Course failure in ELA or Math	4 (12)	1 (1)	0 (1)	0 (3)	0 (0)	0 (2)	5 (19)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	11 (11)	33 (22)	35 (42)	79 (75)

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
03	2019	57%	57%	0%	58%	-1%
	2018	57%	62%	-5%	57%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	58%	59%	-1%	58%	0%
	2018	50%	53%	-3%	56%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2019	40%	52%	-12%	56%	-16%
	2018	43%	53%	-10%	55%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	66%	62%	4%	62%	4%
	2018	54%	67%	-13%	62%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison						

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
04	2019	63%	62%	1%	64%	-1%
	2018	48%	60%	-12%	62%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
05	2019	38%	54%	-16%	60%	-22%
	2018	32%	56%	-24%	61%	-29%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	42%	55%	-13%	53%	-11%
	2018	42%	56%	-14%	55%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						

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	18	21	28	20	26	28	9				
ELL	29	36		41	45						
BLK	32	57		36	43						
HSP	46	41	15	56	56	60	33				
MUL	75	62		63	54						
WHT	54	46	41	56	45	31	41				
FRL	52	47	45	54	52	44	43				

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	20	32	44	24	30	28	13				
ELL	56	67		38	27						
BLK	31	40		35	8						
HSP	58	53	53	47	26	27	33				
MUL	53			59							
WHT	53	49	41	48	29	24	46				
FRL	51	51	48	45	27	17	43				

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	27	37	40	36	49	58	29				
ELL	27	50		36	80						
BLK	47	58		47	33						
HSP	49	51	60	55	67	67	56				
MUL	60	50		73	50						
WHT	58	53	51	62	56	59	63				
FRL	55	51	54	59	55	57	56				

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	49
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	64
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	388
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	21
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	43
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	42
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	46
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	64
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	45
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	50
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.

Our bottom quartile in Math showed the lowest school wide performance. Last year's lowest performance was our bottom quartile in Math as well. We are seeing an overall trend with our Math bottom quartile, however we did have a 15% gain.

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

Our fifth grade Science showed the greatest decline with 5% from the year before. We believe there was a lack of overall rigor with the core instruction in Science in the 18-19 school year.

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

Math lowest 25th percentile with a gap of -14%. Fidelity in core instruction.

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

Percentage of students making adequate progress in Math showed a gain of 21%. Focused on fidelity of core instruction.

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

Attendance and discipline.

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

1. Attendance
2. Fidelity of Core Instruction
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	All teachers will teach core curriculum with fidelity while engaging students in learning. ELA overall achievement 52%, Learning gains 47%, lowest 25% gains 44%. Math overall achievement 55%, learning gains 49%, lowest 25% gains 37%. Science 40%.
Rationale	Under performing group: SWD ELA achievement for SWD 18%, learning gains 21%, lowest 25% gains 28%. Math achievement for SWD 20%, learning gains 26%, and lowest 25% gains 28%. Science achievement for SWD 9%.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increasing student engagement in the classroom will reflect an increase of percentage of students with disabilities meeting the 41% ESSA Federal Index. In addition 5% increase in overall student achievement in ELA, Math, and Science.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Debi Shellabarger (shellabarger_d@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Improve on fidelity in core curriculum areas and increase overall student engagement. Facilitative planning and a focus on effective reading strategies. Proactive team meetings focusing on growth of all students bi-monthly. Increasing data chats and incentives for students which will include individual mentors.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Based on Florida Standards Assessment proficiency scores professional development is needed to plan for the core curriculum areas. Planning should include teaching the standards in depth while discussing delivery to increase overall engagement of all students. Data chats and incentives for students are necessary to ensure all students show a documented increase on overall diagnostics scores.

Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Professional Learning Communities - Weekly 2. Student Work Analysis Protocol - Bi-Monthly 3. School Based Leadership Team- Bi-Monthly 4. Administrative Walkthroughs - Daily 5. Data Chats - Daily for teachers and administration will review with teachers monthly 6. Resource Teachers/Site-based Coaches - Modeling and professional development-Monthly
Person Responsible	Debi Shellabarger (shellabarger_d@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

#2

Title

Rationale

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve

Person responsible for monitoring outcome [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy

Action Step

Description

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Person Responsible

[no one identified]

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).

We will implement attendance incentive programs, increase walk-throughs, Professional development for instructional staff, and S.W.A.P. Grade levels will share lesson plans across all content areas on Google share drive for consistency with all Gen ed and ESE teachers.

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.

From the beginning of school we begin to develop positive relationships and open communication between parents and teachers. School communication folders and agendas are used daily to communicate academic and behavioral progress daily. Parents are invited to participate in monthly Title 1 Parent/SAC Meetings. Parents and local community partners participate various Family Nights and school activities through out the year. Community stake holders such as Operation HEARTfelt and People Helping People provide weekend food services to our students as well. The Title 1 compact encourages and sets expectations between students, parents, and teachers.

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.

Social-emotional needs of the students are being met by providing counseling, mentoring, and social services. All students in Tier 1 are part of the school wide PBIS program. Tier 2 students focus on social skills daily by using the Check In/Check Out mentoring process. Tier 3 students are provided counseling by the Guidance Counselor.

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

Deltona Elementary School invites community preschools with incoming kindergarten students to visit and take a tour of the school. Overall school wide expectations and grade level expectations are reviewed. A special Kindergarten open house presentation is given to all parents of incoming kindergarten students where expectations are shared.

Students being promoted to 6th grade attend an assembly orientation from the middle school that they will be attending. In addition the students are invited to spend a day in the life of a middle school student in preparation for their upcoming year. Students identified with an Individual education plan may attend transition staffing to make sure their individual needs are met.

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 Elementary School has a school based leadership team which meets on the first and third Wednesday of each month. This team consists of curriculum leaders, administration, core members, and a representative from each grade level, specials department, and resource/special programs. At each meeting the representatives share weekly common assessments/formative assessments/ and standard mastery data specific to their grade level and/or program by displaying graphs representing student performance. The team discusses possible areas of concern and brainstorms solutions that will have the highest impact on student performance and achievement. These meetings allow vertical alignment as well as provide an understanding of how each additional program supports every student. Title I provides funding for most of the the additional programs at Deltona such as computer labs, resource teachers, and supplemental programs. A staff member ensures that there is an agenda, meeting minutes, an action plan is created, and a sign-in sheet is available for all participants. Title I Facilitator is also responsible for the coordination and integration of federal, state, and local services and programs for Deltona Elementary School.

In addition, core school based leadership team meets bi-weekly at a separate meeting to address any areas of concern discussed during regular meetings. Once discussed, future Professional Learning Communities are set up based on schools current needs. These meetings are also used to discuss individual students receiving Multi-tiered System of Student Support to monitor their performance and decide the best course of action for their continued educational success. The Title I facilitator maintains a property inventory using Alexandria which is our district wide management software for tracking the cost, location and condition of items purchased using Title I funds.

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

N/A