Deltona High School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Deltona High School

100 WOLF PACK RUN, Deltona, FL 32725

http://dhswolves.com/

Demographics

Principal: Michael Micallef

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2020

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	98%
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: B (59%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (48%)
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

Deltona High School

100 WOLF PACK RUN, Deltona, FL 32725

http://dhswolves.com/

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 9-12	No	71%

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	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	B	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.

The mission of Deltona High School is presented in Mr. Micallef's "The Big 4". The Big 4 are pillars illustrating the mission of all stakeholders at Deltona HS: informed data-driven decision making, providing equity through standards-aligned instruction, ensuring all students graduate in 4 years or less, and ensuring all students leave Deltona HS college and/or career ready.

Provide the school's vision statement.

"In an environment established with high expectations, tradition, and deep community ties, the staff of Deltona High School will foster relationships as we continue to persevere towards academic excellence."

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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Micallef, Michael	Principal	Our Principal oversees all roles, responsibilities, and daily operations of the school.
Grieve, Bobbie Jo	Assistant Principal	
Carson, Julia	Administrative Support	
Brennan, Joseph	Teacher, K-12	
Emerick Brown, Dylan	Teacher, K-12	
McElhaney, Samantha	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	
Zarbo, Alisha	Assistant Principal	
Lapnow, Christina	Assistant Principal	
Meadows, Brandy	Teacher, K-12	
Franks, Eugene	Dean	
Musick, Katherine	Teacher, K-12	
Tankard, Patrice	Teacher, ESE	
Moore-Lobban, Alvesta	Teacher, K-12	
James, Amanda	Teacher, K-12	
Hauser, Shannon	Teacher, K-12	
KELLEHER, SUSAN	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/1/2020, Michael Micallef

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
110

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	98%
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: B (59%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (48%)
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	414	377	337	252	1380
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	57	45	19	150
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	38	46	30	144
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103	107	68	38	316
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89	84	54	27	254

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	81	97	67	28	273

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	41	24	2	91
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	26	18	7	67

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/18/2020

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	465	445	366	406	1682
Attendance below 90 percent	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	21	12	9	6	48
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	183	120	93	80	476

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

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	465	445	366	406	1682
Attendance below 90 percent	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	21	12	9	6	48
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	183	120	93	80	476

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

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**	
	(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	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

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
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%	0

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%	0

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	73
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	51
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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%	0

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%	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	68
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	54
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.

After looking at the data from the 2018-2019 school year in both ESSA subgroups and school grade data, it was clear to our team we had the lowest performance trend indicated in our ELL English Language Proficiency at 42% and our ELA lowest quartile. Another area of focus, based on our 2018-2019 school grade, was the decrease in Algebra 1 scores. Although there are no data samples for the 2019-2020 school year, based on our school based data that was collected, and various other sources of data, our team is wanting to not only focus again on the same areas for the 2020-2021 school year, but also continue supports for our SWD population.

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

Based on the 2018-2019 school grade data, the area that was the most alarming was the ELL ELP performance, which was a 20% decline. No official school grade/data for the 2019-2020 school year, however our team has agreed that more resources and attention need to continue to be allocated to these areas to see an increase. Additional impacts for the low performance was a lack of paraprofessionals and effective instructional strategies within the classrooms. Communication and collaboration with our PLC's and our ESOL team need to continue to occur across the board. 2019-2020 WIDA scores may shed some light on improvement within our ELL population, however the scores have not yet been studied at the time of this submission. For the 2020-2021 school year, this will be a continued focus.

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 mentioned before, based on our 2018-2019 school grade data, our ELL ELP students had the greatest gap and the trends and factors are listed in the areas above. Both areas need to be monitored closely within our team and within all PLC's to ensure continual growth of our ESOL and ESE subgroups.

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

The 2018-2019 school grade data showed an increase in 6 out of 10 components. 9th grade ELA showed the largest increase in the district. US History had an 8% increase and the Graduation rate improved by 7%. Some of the actions included: focused work during SIP/SAC/Admin/PLC/Dept meetings, teamwork within PLC's, district support, support classes, Graduation Assurance positions, Summer pilot program, SAT/ACT support, and work with Instructional Partners.

During the 2019-2020 school year, many of these actions continued to be supported and implemented however there was a loss of the Graduation Assurance position and Instructional Partners. To date, we are unsure how these losses impacted the school grade, however moving forward for the 2020-2021 school year we have a new "College and Career Coach" and will implement the same strategies from the previous year to continue to move forward.

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

Based on the 2018-2019 data, the most alarming area of concern is the number of students that are reading or achieving at a level 1 on state standardized assessments. Another area of concern are the number of students that are failing the ELA and Math courses on campus.

A focus on remediation, including re-teach and re-test, was implemented during the 2019-2020 school year in hopes of improving the overall pass rate for the ELA and Math courses.

Moving forward, there will be a huge emphasis on remediation of all courses for all students, to ensure that our students graduate on time (4 years or less).

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

1. Continued resources for ELL
2. Continued resources for SWD
3. ELA across the board
4. Teacher Training/Professional Development
5. Quality targeted discussions in PLC's

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	After reflection of the 2018-2019 school grade, trend data, and ESSA data, the lowest quartile in ELA is our lowest percentage overall and had the most significant drop (5% drop) from the previous year. Because there are no school grades from the 2019-2020 school year, the team feels this should be a continued area of focus for the upcoming school year in order to see growth.
Measurable Outcome:	Based on 2018-2019 school grade data, only 42% of our lowest quartile students showed learning gains. We were hoping to increase this to 60% for the 2019-2020 school year with increased attention, focus, communication, frequent data analysis and increased awareness. However, with no 2019-2020 school grade data, we will continue with increased supports and strategies for the 2020-2021 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michael Micallef (mrmicall1@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Utilization of data from multiple sources, standards-based lesson planning, and intensive PLC strategies with the 9/10 ELA teachers. In addition, there will be increased involvement with the ELL and SWD teachers, support facilitation, consultation, and paraprofessionals who can be an added layer of support for the ELL and SWD students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	According to Dufour (2019): "John Hattie concluded that the best way to improve schools was to organize teachers into collaborative teams that clarify what each students must learn and the indicators of learning the team will track, to gather evidence of that learning on an on-going 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 encouraged schools to function as Professional Learning Communities." Marzano came to the 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."

Action Steps to Implement

1. Administrative team continues to support implementation of PLC's through common planning.
2. New teacher professional development training opportunities.
3. Lowest quartile and ESSA subgroup data pulled/analyzed by the SLT and within PLC's.
4. Individualized plans for students utilizing data from school based assessments, standards aligned learning, and data-driven interventions to ensure student success.
5. Teachers conduct weekly/bi-weekly PLC meetings to ensure implementation/monitoring.
6. Teachers/PLC's meet with the Academic Coach and Dr. Lapnow/Mrs. Kelleher for continual discussions and implementation of strategies for success with the identified lowest quartile students, including ELL and SWD strategies.
7. Teacher PD to include: ESOL strategies, SWD strategies, and ELA test-taking strategies across all courses.
8. Weekly coaching days for all members of the Administrative team in classrooms, providing support and giving guidance.
9. Teacher participation in district and department Learning Walks.

10. Faculty Meeting providing feedback from Learning Walks.
11. Self-reflection analysis rubric.

Person Responsible   Christina Lapnow (cllapnow@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	After reflection of the 2018-2019 school grade, trend data, and comparative district/state data, the school recorded an 11% deficit from the previous year on standardized assessments. Based on the 2018-2019 school data, there was a substantial decrease in Algebra 1 achievement and additional continual supports are needed for students and teachers to meet with mastery. Because there are no school grades from the 2019-2020 school year, the team feels this should be a continued area of focus for the upcoming school year in order to see growth.
Measurable Outcome:	An increase in Algebra 1 achievement is possible with added support for students and teachers, immediate intervention/remediation plans, effective use of common planning, and continual data analysis. The 11% decrease from the 2017-2018 school year to the 2018-2019 school year can improve. Although 2019-2020 school data is not available, we are hoping to see a 20% overall increase in achievement from 23% (2017-2018) to 43% for the 2020-2021 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michael Micallef (mrmicall1@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Common planning for all Algebra teachers, intensive PLC data-focused weekly/bi-weekly meetings, standards based lesson planning, online learning enrichment, and additional support by the Academic Coach and District staff.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Common planning for Algebra teachers and regular meetings will help create common assessments and effective lesson planning. PLC's will focus on students data, promote standards aligned instruction, and utilize multiple data sources. Online tools for Algebra courses will continue to be implemented and available for all students.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Administration continues to support implementation of PLC's through common planning.
2. New teacher PD opportunities.
3. Algebra 1/Geometry data is pulled/analyzed by SLT and PLC teams, including district math assessments.
4. Individualized plans for students utilizing data from school based assessments, standards aligned learning, and data-driven interventions to ensure student success.
5. PD for math teachers, including the effective use of the online learning tools for remediation and differentiated instruction.
6. Teachers conduct weekly/bi-weekly PLC meetings to ensure implementation/monitoring and effective use of formative assessments..
7. Teachers/PLC's meet with the Academic Coach/Mr. Micallef for continual discussions/implementation of strategies for success.
8. Teacher participation in department and district Learning Walks with PD to provide feedback and self-reflection analysis rubric.
9. Progress monitor/provide data-informed feedback throughout the process (teachers and Admin team).
10. Weekly coaching days for all members of the Administrative team in classrooms, providing support and giving guidance.

Person Responsible	Michael Micallef (mrmicall1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	A school-wide effort to increase proficiency for our ELL and SWD subgroups, as ESSA data from the 2018-2019 school year indicated that this was an area for growth (specifically in ELL). Based on data from the 2018-2019 school year, WIDA scores dropped 20% from the previous school year. At the time of this submission, WIDA scores for the 2019-2020 school year were not available. The team has decided that in addition to ELL continued supports, we should also place an emphasis on our SWD subgroup as they too can quickly drop if additional supports are not in place and monitored.
Measurable Outcome:	An increase of 20% in achievement and WIDA scores for our ELL students from the 2018-2019 school year to the 2019-2020 school year was set previously, but without 2019-2020 school grade data the team would like to see an additional 5% increase for the 2020-2021 school year, making the total increase of 25% from the 2018-2019 school year to the 2020-2021 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michael Micallef (mrmicall1@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	PLC's and standards aligned instruction utilizing data have been proven to have significant impact on student learning as referenced by Hattie and Marzano.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Intensive instructional strategies implemented in all PLC's across the school campus and specifically within our ELL, SWD, and 9th/10th ELA PLC's utilizing data from multiple sources and standards based lesson planning.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Use/implementation of knowledgeable data relating to ELL/SWD subgroups & academic achievement.
2. Admin/leadership team to pull/analyze data with the involved PLC's.
3. Individualized plans for students utilizing data from school based assessments, standards aligned learning, and data-driven interventions.
4. Teachers conduct weekly/bi-weekly PLC meetings to ensure implementation/monitoring.
5. Teachers/PLC's meet with Academic Coach/Mrs. Kelleher for continual discussions/implementation of strategies for success with the identified ELL/SWD students.
6. Progress monitor/provide data-informed feedback throughout.
7. Proper use/placement of paraprofessionals/support facilitation/consultation/district staff to support the two subgroups.
8. Ensure that ELL/SWD students know "how to use" their accommodations to enhance their learning.
9. PD on the use/implementation of effective SWD/ESOL strategies for all classrooms .
9. Teacher participation in department and district Learning Walks with PD to provide feedback and self-reflection analysis rubric.
10. Weekly coaching days for all members of the Administrative team in classrooms, providing support and giving guidance.

Person Responsible	SUSAN KELLEHER (slkelleh@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.

Deltona High School will focus on the "4 Pillars To Academic Success" for the 2020-2021 school year:
1. Informed Data Driven Decision Making
2. Providing Equity Through Standards Aligned Instruction
3. Ensuring All Students Graduate in 4 Years Or Less
4. Ensuring All Students Leave Deltona High College And/Or Career Ready

The focus will continue work with standards aligned learning utilizing individual student data and progress monitoring to ensure that there is school wide improvement. Additionally, school wide implementation on the use of the AVID WICOR strategy, 21st Century Global Thinking to create independence and critical thinkers, and Cross-Curricular implementation to bring real-world ideas and future career options into instruction. The continual work with our teacher leaders should have a positive impact in all areas of student achievement and school growth.

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.

Deltona HS will focus on the mission at hand, under the new leadership of Mr. Micallef, "The Big 4" pillars of academic success, and will enforce the mission of "The Deltona Way". Teachers will be visible on campus at the classroom doors during class change, welcoming students. Posters will be displayed throughout campus of "The Big 4" and "The Deltona Way" in addition to the many covid-related signage this school year. DHS will continue it's social media presence (Twitter) and post/share all happenings on the campus (encouraging re-tweeting, etc as necessary). The school website will be all-inclusive and update stakeholders regularly, including the "Return To Learn" welcome video, Grade Level Safety & Security videos, and other recorded events as they occur through the school year. Input from all stakeholders will occur through optional faculty/staff "input meetings", student leadership groups, SAC, business partners, "live" Town Hall events, etc. Community partnerships and business partner recognition programs will continue through the school banner project (also known as the Howland Blvd project). Parent Nights will be scheduled throughout the year for Cambridge, Career Academies, Open House (if permitted), and Athletics and CDC guidelines relax and can accommodate large groups (until then most will occur through Teams or Zoom). Monthly recognition awards for students to include Wolf, Athlete, Citizen, and Scholar. Monthly faculty/staff recognition awards to include: New Wolf, Classroom, and Staff. Alma Mater Friday's (singing the alma mater over the PA during the morning announcements) and School Spirit Attire Friday's will continue as we try to build upon tradition and focus on our mission. Safety and Security, College & Career

Readiness, Graduation in 4 years or less, and Commitment to data-driven decisions are all focus areas in the success of the school.

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: ELA	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00