Deland High School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Deland High School

800 N HILL AVE, Deland, FL 32724

http://www.delandhs.org/

Demographics

Principal: Michael Deg IR Olmo

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2017

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

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Volusia County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Deland High School

800 N HILL AVE, Deland, FL 32724

http://www.delandhs.org/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
High School PK, 9-12	No	60%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	45%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	I	C	C	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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Carr, Melissa	Principal	School Principal
Degirolmo, Mike	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of Exceptional Student Education
Mitchell, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	Social Emotional Learning Team Leader; SAC Member
Nehrig, Lisa	SAC Member	IB Coordinator; SAC Chairperson
Nunez, Julia	School Counselor	Director of School Counseling
Lueth, Marylea	Teacher, ESE	Exceptional Student Education Department Chair
Sedore, Monica	Teacher, K-12	English Teacher
Wetter, Justin	Teacher, K-12	Social Studies Department Chair
Sibio, Kimberly	Teacher, K-12	World Languages Department Chair
Lowenstein, James	Teacher, Career/ Technical	CTE Department Chair
Sniffen, April	Teacher, K-12	English Department Chair
Banker, Sabrina	Teacher, K-12	Math Teacher; SAC Member
Bismore, Roger	Teacher, K-12	CTE Teacher
Battaglino, Kathryn	Instructional Technology	Literacy Coach and Digital Learning Leader
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
White, Natalie	School Counselor	Counselor and Mentor Contact

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Wilson, Shirley	Teacher, ESE	ESE Math Support Teacher
Brown, Ken	Dean	Dean of Student Relations and Mentor Liaison
Pio, Courtney	Instructional Coach	Math Coach
Lundell, Melissa	Teacher, Career/ Technical	CTE Program Facilitator
D'Aquino, Kristen	Teacher, K-12	AVID Coordinator

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 6/1/2017, Michael Deg IR Olmo

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

67

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

76

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

147

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School PK, 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	90%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students

(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: B (58%)
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](#).	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	753	643	527	455	2378
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	179	89	66	67	401
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	179	83	48	21	331
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98	130	67	37	332
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98	127	48	41	314
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	236	142	115	53	546
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	217	121	61	42	441

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	284	200	113	67	664

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	103	70	25	34	232
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	50	20	25	168

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/17/2020

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	
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

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	
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

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	
	(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.

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						

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State 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
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%	2
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%	1
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%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	71
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	43

Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0

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.

Based on the 2018-19 state testing data, the component that showed the lowest performance was math achievement, at 31%. During that school year, we'd begun double blocking math (Algebra 1) students who had traditionally under performed in the area of math. After discussion with district curriculum specialists and our teacher teams, we determined that the dogged pace of the Algebra 1 curriculum map offered little flexibility to truly accommodate struggling learners. We answered this issue by building in more time for those students to grapple with and dive into those math standards and concepts necessary for future Algebra 1 and future math success. However, we realize in retrospect that while we had buy-in from the teachers, we'd not equipped them with the professional learning they needed to adjust their practices for this longer block of time to best maximize this opportunity for student learning. Additionally, we lacked the consistency of math support and feedback from a math coach as we were not provided a full time coach until mid January of 2020. So

even as support and training were provided, content specific instructional follow-up and support lagged without a full time coach on campus.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the previous testing year was math achievement. Math had an 11% achievement loss. Regarding that particular data component, the aforementioned need for specific training to support teachers with the shifted model was certainly a contributing factor. Additionally, the cohort of students that populated the Geometry portion of Math data had previously established gaps in math content and skill knowledge that could be traced back over the course of their math performance data since middle school. Further, there is a shift occurring in middle and high school math that has fostered a change in the classroom makeup. As a school, we are just beginning to adjust to this shifted student make-up and as a result, more training is needed to support teachers with the scaffolding and differentiation needed to best reach their 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.

When compared to the state average, the data component that had the greatest gap was math. The state average was 38% achievement for Algebra 1, compared to our 19% achievement rate, constituting a 19 percentage point gap. For Geometry, the state had an achievement score of 53%, which was 16 percentage points higher than our 37% achievement rate. As a whole, math achievement was the academic area with the greatest gap, largely attributed to the reasons previously detailed.

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

The data component that showed the greatest improvement was graduation rate, growing from 78% to 82% to 89%. We have employed an initiative we call Project Graduation that engages teams of teachers per graduation cohort as secondary and tertiary tiers of support and intervention for students at varying 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. This added layer of support and accountability has provided a focused team approach to support students most needing it.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

While the Covid-19 pandemic has certainly played a part, the attendance below 90% has increased for a second year from 151 to 332 to now 401. With virtual instruction and the uncertainties created by the pandemic, student attendance was obviously impacted. The other area is the number of students with two or more EWS indicators: 664. That's equivalent to a grade level which is a quarter of the school population.

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. Equity and Diversity training to support increased achievement for our ESSA subgroups (English Language Learners, Students with Disabilities, African-American students)
3. Data training and tracking to monitor progress for increased learning gains in literacy
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the needs assessment and data review, math achievement gaps and deficits were the lowest performing area in regards to EOC data. This area was also an area of underachievement for our ESSA subgroups that fell below the federal index. As a result, we selected instructional practice as the area of focus, targeting math instruction as an area we wanted to address to increase student achievement across all students.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase Math EOC achievement from 31% to 41%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Melissa Carr (mcarr@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Standards-aligned instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Since achievement levels in math have had a two-year decline, the focus is to reinforce the tier 1 instruction that all students receive by ensuring lesson activities, instruction and the assessment of the same are aligned to the depth of the standards and the instructional practice guide shifts.

Action Steps to Implement

Facilitate professional learning for PLCs (aligning instructional practice and assessment to the depth of the standards; differentiating instruction to support diverse learners and ESSA subgroups; formative assessment and effective learner feedback)

Person Responsible	Courtney Pio (capio@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Engage in Coaching Cycles for teachers and PLCs to shift practices for increased impact

Person Responsible	Courtney Pio (capio@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct student boot camps for targeted math instruction and intervention

Person Responsible	Shirley Wilson (smwilson@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Progress monitoring of student performance data

Person Responsible	Courtney Pio (capio@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Classroom observations and walk-throughs for progress-monitoring and fidelity of implementation

Person Responsible	Tiffany Fuller (tnfuller@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Engage PLCs in reflective data analysis to inform and guide instructional practices

Person Responsible	Sabrina Banker (slbanker@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Utilize, promote and support AVID tutorials to help students troubleshoot and articulate gaps in their learning.

Person Responsible   Sabrina Banker (slbanker@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We selected our ESSA Subgroups as the area of focus after review of our previous state assessment data. After analysis of all subgroups and populations, three of our ESSA subgroups fell below the 41% federal index in achievement: Our English Language Learners (28%), our Students with Disabilities (29%) and our African-American students (38%).
Measurable Outcome:	Increase achievement for English Language Learners, Students with Disabilities and African-America students to 41%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tiffany Fuller (tnfuller@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence-based strategy being implemented for this area of focus is differentiated instruction, to provide varied pathways and approaches for students to access and learn content and then demonstrate that learning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rationale for selecting this strategy came from recognizing the need for variation in instructional and support approaches for these varied group of students. Gaps in achievement ranging from language barrier to disability and beyond cannot be remedied in one monolithic approach. By focusing on differentiation approaches for learning process, product and content, teachers will be better able to engage learners in culturally responsive, relevant and authentic ways that support student learning, their connection to school, and post high school preparedness, ultimately driving up student learning gains and achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

Utilize a co-teach model in core courses to support more inclusive instruction practices for our SWD population.

Person Responsible	Mike Degirolmo (mjdegiro@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Train and support co-teach and gen-ed teachers in collaborative teaching and planning processes to best support the students and maximize the learning potential of this model.

Person Responsible	Mike Degirolmo (mjdegiro@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Reduce the number of resource classes to keep students in the least restrictive environment and ensure equitable access to content standards and practice for SWD.

Person Responsible	Mike Degirolmo (mjdegiro@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Provide professional learning for teachers on differentiation approaches addressing curriculum content, learning process and product (including the use of technology, learning interventions and RTI).

Person Responsible	Kathryn Battaglino (klbattag@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Progress monitor PLC data with an emphasis on ESSA subgroup data

Person Responsible	Kathryn Battaglino (klbattag@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Enact Project Graduation for secondary and tertiary intervention support and progress monitor identified students

| **Person Responsible** | Marylea Lueth (melueth@volusia.k12.fl.us) |

Provide student tutoring and testing boot camps

| **Person Responsible** | Shirley Wilson (smwilson@volusia.k12.fl.us) |

Classroom observations and walk-throughs for progress-monitoring and fidelity of implementation

| **Person Responsible** | Melissa Carr (mcarr@volusia.k12.fl.us) |

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This area of focus was selected after reviewing state summative data as well as internal school data recognizing disparity data among our subgroups in discipline, achievement and EWS data markers. For that reason, we decided to focus on Culture and Climate to provide a more supportive school environment that's conducive to meeting the needs of all students by strategically working to remove barriers and maximize student's educational potential.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase the number and demographic composition of students graduating college and career ready by 5%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lisa Nehrig (lknehrig@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The intentional and purposeful use of enrichment programs to elevate students' learning and school experience and prepare them for post-high school success
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Enrichment programs yield a .55 effect size based on John Hattie's meta research. As a school that offers an Advanced Placement program, AVID, Career Academies and Industry Certification courses as well as an International Baccalaureate Diploma Program, the research is rife that students graduating from high school with these courses have higher graduation rates, better attendance rates, have increased rates of college graduation and increased employment in the career sector. By focusing on expanding opportunities to and support within this program, we will not only enrich these programs with more diverse students, but enrich student's school experience and post-high school preparedness.

Action Steps to Implement

Professional Learning on Equitable and Restorative Practices

Person Responsible	Jennifer Mitchell (jlmitch@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Extend Mentoring program as an accessible intervention and support for students

Person Responsible	Natalie White (nnwhite@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Market and monitor student enrollment in advanced courses and career programs

Person Responsible	Mike Lucero (mjlucero@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Monitor and support student progress in advanced, college, and career-ready courses

Person Responsible	Lisa Nehrig (lknehrig@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Tutoring and Academic Support for advanced courses and industry certifications

Person Responsible	Lisa Nehrig (lknehrig@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Extend access to and support for students taking career and industry certifications and courses

Person Responsible	Melissa Lundell (milundel@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Provide AVID strategies training to faculty to better support student access and learning in advanced courses and programs

Person Responsible   Kristen D'Aquino (kldaquin@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

To fully support the varied needs identified, our school leadership team is working on revising discipline procedures on our campus. After analyzing the gaps in student academic performance and recognizing similar disparities when analyzing discipline and attendance data, our school is revising our in school suspension program and training staff in restorative practices to build stronger relationships between students and staff, encouraging a more supportive environment for student learning and success across cultural and demographic lines. By training and supporting teachers to foster stronger relationships with all students, and teaching students how to repair relationships they've damaged, we can form stronger connections and positive habits for students, and begin reducing the disparities in data by providing a more supportive learning environment.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Our school benefits from being a community school. We're the only high school in the city, and our community embraces the school as its own. As a result of our school's rich history and community connections, we seek feedback and partnership from them and are fortunate to often receive that which we seek.

This is accomplished in a number of ways, one of which being our School Advisory Council (SAC). Our SAC meets regularly throughout the school year and is comprised of teachers, students, staff members, administrators, parents and community members. They provide us feedback on our SIP goals, action steps and overall plan. Then contribute to budget decisions that can go to support teacher, student and school initiatives toward school improvement. One strategy we employ to ensure we have a representative sample in this decision making body is to ensure that we have student representation included. We promote SAC membership and election information each year through a variety of platforms in hopes of reaching a wide audience.

We offer several events throughout the course of the school year that act to open the school gates and bring the community in. We've revised our school's Open House design so that stakeholders not only get an opportunity to see the campus and meet the teachers, but are also provided an opportunity for information

sessions that matter to parents, things like technology assistance and college planning information. Recognizing the diversity in our school make-up, we are sensitive to have translation services available to support our growing Hispanic population who are not always native English speakers. For events like Open House or Bulldog Palooza, we enlist our advanced world language students and English Language Learners as aids to translate for families and help them navigate the campus. We send material home in both English and Spanish. Several of our office specialists are bilingual so our families can communicate with ease when they call the school.

For students we have clubs that celebrate and affirm various cultures and identities, from National Spanish Honor Society, to Asian Students Association, to Gay Straight Alliance. We offer dozens of student organizations that provide a welcome space for students to grow, develop, hone their voice and make their space on our campus and larger community. While we still have work to do in growing equitable practices and reaching even more students, we are consciously striving to better this effort each year.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				$2,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			1453 - Deland High School	School Improvement Funds		$2,000.00
			Notes: This will go to support professional learning for teachers to receive training in curricular and instructional practices to support student learning. This funding will also fund support for tutoring and intervention sessions outside of the school day.			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups				$2,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			1453 - Deland High School	School Improvement Funds		$2,500.00
			Notes: This will go to support professional learning for educators to receive training in differentiated instructional practices necessary to support and advance student learning, as well as help fund supplemental resources, tutoring and intervention sessions that provide extended practice and support outside of the school day so students can demonstrate increased achievement.			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Equity & Diversity				$1,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			1453 - Deland High School	School Improvement Funds		$1,500.00
			Notes: This will go to support professional learning and support services for equitable and inclusive practices. This will help support trainings, support materials and resources to build a more equitable culture and environment for all students.			
					Total:	$6,000.00