Volusia County Schools

Deltona Lakes Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Deltona Lakes Elementary School

2022 ADELIA BLVD, Deltona, FL 32725

http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/deltonalakes/pages/default.aspx

Demographics

Principal: Chad Miller A

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2016

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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 Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (48%) 2015-16: D (40%)
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 Lakes Elementary School

2022 ADELIA BLVD, Deltona, FL 32725

http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/deltonalakes/pages/default.aspx

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)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	82%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	64%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	C

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Through collaborative efforts of the school community, students will be enriched, motivated and encouraged to achieve their highest individual potential; empowering them to participate in a diverse global community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Ensuring all students receive a superior 21st century education.

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
Ortiz, Ramonita	Principal	Principal--Oversees all of school operations
Noga, Hope	Other	Teacher on Assignment-Handles discipline for the school.
Brown, Kerrie	Instructional Coach	Academic Coach-K & 1
Diallo, Jennifer	Instructional Coach	Academic Coach-4 & 5
Zeidwig, Catherine	Instructional Coach	Academic Coach-2 & 3
Griffin, Tonya	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal-Oversees school operations

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 7/1/2016, Chad Miller A

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.*
0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
63

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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 Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (48%) 2015-16: D (40%)
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	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	68	99	86	80	95	114	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	542
Attendance below 90 percent	6	18	15	11	10	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
One or more suspensions	0	5	2	3	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	4	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	0	4	3	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/25/2020

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	113	104	98	95	127	115	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	652
Attendance below 90 percent	22	29	16	17	24	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	134
One or more suspensions	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	5	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	13	23	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84

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	1	1	1	6	7	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29

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	3	4	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	113	104	98	95	127	115	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	652
Attendance below 90 percent	22	29	16	17	24	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	134
One or more suspensions	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	5	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	13	23	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84

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	1	1	1	6	7	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29

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	3	4	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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%	56%	57%	51%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	50%	56%	58%	53%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	46%	53%	39%	44%	52%
Math Achievement	56%	59%	63%	53%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	47%	56%	62%	51%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	43%	51%	37%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	53%	57%	53%	52%	59%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	57%	58%	-1%	58%	-1%
	2018	60%	56%	4%	57%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	48%	54%	-6%	58%	-10%
	2018	50%	54%	-4%	56%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				
05	2019	46%	54%	-8%	56%	-10%
	2018	41%	51%	-10%	55%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	66%	60%	6%	62%	4%
	2018	62%	58%	4%	62%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	53%	59%	-6%	64%	-11%
	2018	59%	60%	-1%	62%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
05	2019	46%	54%	-8%	60%	-14%
	2018	43%	57%	-14%	61%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-13%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	50%	56%	-6%	53%	-3%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	54%	56%	-2%	55%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
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	16	36	37	20	39	44	26				
ELL	28	36	32	37	36	35	48				
BLK	49	52		35	48	45	33				
HSP	48	43	35	54	44	34	51				
MUL	47			60							
WHT	58	56	61	64	50	53	59				
FRL	49	49	50	55	45	45	49				

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	11	33	32	18	35	23	23				
ELL	39	48	64	44	50	36	54				
BLK	37	33	21	35	27	21	29				
HSP	54	54	63	53	50	27	58				
MUL	64			73							
WHT	54	53	38	68	52	44	67				
FRL	50	51	45	54	47	33	53				

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	11	27	21	26	38	35	5				
ELL	34	42	42	39	42	31	15				
BLK	42	40	25	29	47	50	50				
HSP	49	54	44	49	54	35	40				
MUL	90			80							
WHT	54	53	36	64	48	24	59				
FRL	47	49	40	49	50	36	50				

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

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	66
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	412
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	40
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	44
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	47
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Hispanic Students	
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	57
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	51
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.

Subgroup: SWD 35%
Deltona Lakes has a large population of ESE students that contribute to these gaps. An additional ESE support facilitation teacher has been allotted to our school for this year for a total of 6 teachers. This will help meet the needs of our ESE students to promote learning gains.

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

Science data declined from 57% to 53%. DLE is still at the state average and slightly behind the district.

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 Learning Gains --DLE 47% State 62%
Deltona Lakes has a large population of ESE students that contribute to these gaps. An additional ESE support facilitation teacher has been allotted to our school for this year for a total of 6 teachers. This will help meet the needs of our ESE students to promote learning gains.

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

Math Lowest 25% showed the most improvement. DLE improved from 31% to 41% making gains. This is still low and an area of need this year but overall improvement was noted.

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

Attendance is a concern. Also, students with an FSA level 1 in ELA and/or Math.

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

1. Math Learning Gains and Lowest Quartile
2. ELA Learning Gains and Lowest Quartile
3. SWD proficiency
4. ELL proficiency

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Rationale: Math proficiency 56%, Learning Gains 47%, Lowest Quartile 31% ELL subgroup: Math: 35% Proficiency, 48% Learning Gains, 45% Lowest Quartile SWD subgroup: Math: 20% Proficiency, 39% Learning Gains, 44% Lowest Quartile
Measurable Outcome:	Increase proficiency by 3-5%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ramonita Ortiz (rortiz@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Collaborative planning
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Collaborative Planning has an Effect Size of 1.57. Collaborative planning this year is extremely important because of the Math Pearson curriculum and the addition of iready math.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Continued Professional Learning on the Pearson Math curriculum R. Ortiz/T. Griffin
2. Professional Learning on the iready instructional program. R. Ortiz/T. Griffin
2. Coaching, Feedback and monitoring of implementation of the Math curriculum and iready. R. Ortiz/T. Griffin, K. Brown, C. Zeidwig, J. Diallo
3. Conduct Learning Walks during Math Instruction R. Ortiz/T. Griffin,K. Brown, C. Zeidwig, J. Diallo
5. Analysis of data: iready math, district, Formative Assess.., ESGI R. Ortiz/T. Griffin, K. Brown, C. Zeidwig, J. Diallo
6. Targeted Math tutoring for the lowest quartile students K. Brown, C. Zeidwig, J. Diallo
7. Collaborative planning days with student data chats. R. Ortiz/T. Griffin, K. Brown, C. Zeidwig, J. Diallo
8. Data Chats; ESSA subgroups, SWD and ELL, General Ed. teachers R. Ortiz/T. Griffin
9. Family Math Night-Make & Take Activities; explore options of virtual and lower numbers. H. Noga
10. iready intervention materials for Tier 2 and Tier 3 students. R. Ortiz/T. Griffin
11. Tier 2 & 3 students a focus on math fluency. R. Ortiz/T. Griffin

Person Responsible	Ramonita Ortiz (rortiz@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Rationale ELA Proficiency 52%, Learning Gains 50%, 47% Lowest Quartile ELL subgroup: ELA: 28% Proficiency, 36% Learning Gains, 32% Lowest Quartile SWD subgroup: ELA: 16% Proficiency, 36% Learning Gains, 37% Lowest Quartile
Measurable Outcome:	Increase proficiency 3-5%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ramonita Ortiz (rortiz@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Collaborative Planning has an Effect Size of 1.57.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Collaborative Planning has an Effect Size of 1.57. Collaborative planning this year is extremely important because of the ELA Wonders curriculum and iready.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Professional Learning on the ELA Wonders curriculum and iready R. Ortiz/T. Griffin, K. Brown, C. Zeidwig, J. Diallo
2. Professional Learning on Core Connections. R. Ortiz/T. Griffin
2. Coaching, Feedback and monitoring of implementation of the Wonders curriculum, core connections and iready. K. Brown, C. Zeidwig, J. Diallo
3. Conduct Learning Walks during ELA Instruction R. Ortiz/T. Griffin, K. Brown, C. Zeidwig, J. Diallo
5. Analysis of data: iready, district, Formative Assess.., ESGI R. Ortiz/T. Griffin, K. Brown, C. Zeidwig, J. Diallo
6. Targeted ELA tutoring for the lowest quartile students R. Ortiz/T. Griffin, K. Brown, C. Zeidwig, J. Diallo
7. Collaborative planning days with student data chats R. Ortiz/T. Griffin, K. Brown, C. Zeidwig, J. Diallo
8. Data Chats; ESSA subgroups, SWD and ELL, General Ed. teachers. R. Ortiz/T. Griffin, K. Brown, C. Zeidwig, J. Diallo
9. Additional PLC ELA Best Practices; focus on standards aligned instruction. R. Ortiz/T. Griffin, K. Brown, C. Zeidwig, J. Diallo
10. Family Literacy Night Activities--Math & Take; explore options of virtual and lower numbers. H. Noga
11. Tier 2 & 3 students will receive additional support. R. Ortiz/T. Griffin, K. Brown, C. Zeidwig, J. Diallo

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Science proficiency 53% which was a decline. SMT 2 data-26%
Measurable Outcome:	Increase 3-5% proficiency
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ramonita Ortiz (rortiz@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Colllaborative planning and standards aligned instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Colllaborative planning has an Effect Size of 1.57. Standards aligned instruction. DLE saw a decline in Science scores and teachers need to increase standards aligned instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Continued Professional Learning on the Science curriculum. R. Ortiz/T. Griffin
2. Professional Learning on Standards based instruction for science. R. Ortiz/T. Griffin
3. Coaching, Feedback and monitoring of implementation of the Science curriculum and standards. K. Brown, C. Zeidwig, J. Diallo
4. Conduct Learning Walks during Science Instruction R. Ortiz, K. Brown, C. Zeidwig, J. Diallo
5. Analysis of data: SMT and district R. Ortiz, T. Griffin, K. Brown, C. Zeidwig, J. Diallo
6. Targeted Science tutoring for students J. Diallo
7. Collaborative planning days with student data chats for science. R. Ortiz/T. Griffin
8. Data Chats; ESSA subgroups, SWD and ELL, General Ed. teachers R. Ortiz/T. Griffin
9. Family Science Night-Explore options of virtual and lower numbers. H. Noga
10. Design Your Story-Science planning tool. J. Diallo

Person Responsible	Ramonita Ortiz (rortiz@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.

Increase daily attendance and reduce tardies.
Deltona Lakes Elementary will monitor daily attendance of students. Students who exhibited attendance issues the previous year will be on a 'monitor' list. A plan is in place for students who have 5, 10 and 15 days absent. Personal phone calls will be made to see how the school can help the parent improve attendance. Students who are frequently tardy an improvement plan will be created with the student and the parent. An initiative of 'we are here to help' will be shared with families.

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 Lakes Elementary will foster positive relationships with our families and community members in various ways. DLE will host many family engagement activities that will focus specifically on fostering academics. For example, a math night make and take will take place. Also, we will conduct a Science Night to engage families in the science standards. This will allow the parents to learn a skill along with their child and take that skill home to continue to practice. Events and classroom activities are communicated in various ways such as our school website, school newsletter and school marquee. Our daily school news is viewable on youtube for our families as well. Due to the challenges of COVID 19 this year, many of our activities may take place virtually or with limited numbers at a time. It may look very different but we want to continue to engage our families in creative ways.

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**	**$0.00**
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA**	**$0.00**
3	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science**	**$0.00**
		Total:	**$0.00**