

Volusia County Schools

Deltona Middle School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 17 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 23 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 23 |

Deltona Middle School

250 ENTERPRISE RD, Deltona, FL 32725

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/deltonamiddle/pages/default.aspx>

Demographics

Principal: Stephen Hinson C

Start Date for this Principal: 8/6/2019

| | |
|--|---|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Middle School 6-8 |
| 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* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: C (49%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Southeast |
| Regional Executive Director | LaShawn Russ-Porterfield |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | TS&I |

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 17 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 23 |

Deltona Middle School

250 ENTERPRISE RD, Deltona, FL 32725

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/deltonamiddle/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) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Middle School 6-8 | Yes | 80% |
| 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 | C | C | B | 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 faculty, staff, and community of Deltona Middle School share the responsibility for guiding our students toward academic growth and emotional development essential for continued learning and lifelong success in a culturally diverse society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Deltona Middle School family is dedicated to the maximum growth of our students. By forming a partnership with our community, we create a caring and accepting environment for all. We rise to the challenge as we charge toward a positive tomorrow.

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 |
|---------------------|---------------------|--|
| Feltner, Kim | Principal | Monitor fidelity of classroom instruction. Monitor faculty and integration of strategies. |
| Seidel, Susan | Assistant Principal | Monitor fidelity of classroom instruction. Monitor faculty and integration of strategies. |
| Rheinheimer, Julie | Instructional Coach | Monitor fidelity of classroom instruction. Monitor faculty and integration of strategies. |
| Robinson, Stephanie | Instructional Coach | Monitor fidelity of classroom instruction. Monitor faculty and integration of strategies. |
| Hulette, Denise | Teacher, K-12 | Facilitate SAC meetings |
| Acker, Amy | Instructional Coach | Monitor fidelity of classroom instruction. Monitor faculty and integration of strategies. |
| Caffieri, Tanya | Instructional Coach | Monitor fidelity of classroom instruction. Monitor faculty and integration of strategies. |
| Haynes, Lloyd | Assistant Principal | Monitor fidelity of classroom instruction. Monitor faculty and integration of strategies. |
| Iorio, Greg | Assistant Principal | Monitor fidelity of classroom instruction. Monitor faculty and integration of strategies. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 8/6/2019, Stephen Hinson C

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

80

Demographic Data

| | |
|--|---|
| 2020-21 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Middle School 6-8 |
| 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* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: C (49%) |
| 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 380 | 401 | 399 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1180 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 39 | 54 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 127 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 55 | 79 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 173 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 28 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 71 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 48 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 121 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 83 | 92 | 79 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 254 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 115 | 113 | 99 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 327 | |

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 | 92 | 103 | 102 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 297 |

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 | 7 | 18 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/5/2020

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 | 407 | 419 | 373 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1199 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 44 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 113 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 141 | 139 | 120 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 400 | |

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 | 10 | 23 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 |

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 | 6 | 12 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 |
| 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 407 | 419 | 373 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1199 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 44 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 113 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 141 | 139 | 120 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 400 |

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 | 10 | 23 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 |

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 | 6 | 12 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 |
| 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 | 46% | 51% | 54% | 49% | 51% | 52% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 54% | 51% | 54% | 56% | 53% | 54% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 44% | 42% | 47% | 39% | 40% | 44% |
| Math Achievement | 47% | 54% | 58% | 51% | 53% | 56% |
| Math Learning Gains | 48% | 51% | 57% | 59% | 53% | 57% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 41% | 42% | 51% | 38% | 42% | 50% |
| Science Achievement | 55% | 58% | 51% | 56% | 59% | 50% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 61% | 71% | 72% | 67% | 71% | 70% |

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | Total |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----|-----|-------|
| | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| | (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 |
| 06 | 2019 | 46% | 50% | -4% | 54% | -8% |
| | 2018 | 40% | 48% | -8% | 52% | -12% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 6% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 46% | 47% | -1% | 52% | -6% |
| | 2018 | 34% | 47% | -13% | 51% | -17% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 12% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 6% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 44% | 50% | -6% | 56% | -12% |
| | 2018 | 54% | 56% | -2% | 58% | -4% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -10% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 10% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2019 | 40% | 48% | -8% | 55% | -15% |
| | 2018 | 38% | 49% | -11% | 52% | -14% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 52% | 47% | 5% | 54% | -2% |
| | 2018 | 48% | 44% | 4% | 54% | -6% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 4% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 14% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 18% | 29% | -11% | 46% | -28% |
| | 2018 | 33% | 37% | -4% | 45% | -12% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -15% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -30% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2019 | 52% | 57% | -5% | 48% | 4% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2018 | 57% | 60% | -3% | 50% | 7% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| 2018 | | | | | |
| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 59% | 68% | -9% | 71% | -12% |
| 2018 | 48% | 66% | -18% | 71% | -23% |
| Compare | | 11% | | | |
| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| 2018 | | | | | |
| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 68% | 54% | 14% | 61% | 7% |
| 2018 | 90% | 57% | 33% | 62% | 28% |
| Compare | | -22% | | | |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 100% | 55% | 45% | 57% | 43% |
| 2018 | 96% | 55% | 41% | 56% | 40% |
| Compare | | 4% | | | |

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 | 20 | 40 | 34 | 22 | 36 | 29 | 23 | 38 | | | |
| ELL | 30 | 44 | 38 | 30 | 41 | 36 | 26 | 40 | 55 | | |

| 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 |
| ASN | 47 | 58 | | 58 | 47 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 42 | 54 | 55 | 44 | 40 | 27 | 52 | 46 | 81 | | |
| HSP | 41 | 50 | 42 | 42 | 49 | 45 | 45 | 59 | 65 | | |
| MUL | 47 | 52 | | 45 | 43 | | 69 | 57 | 40 | | |
| WHT | 53 | 57 | 46 | 52 | 50 | 46 | 65 | 70 | 70 | | |
| FRL | 43 | 52 | 43 | 44 | 46 | 40 | 52 | 57 | 66 | | |
| 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 | 27 | 42 | 41 | 28 | 47 | 46 | 39 | 29 | 67 | | |
| ELL | 23 | 39 | 38 | 30 | 43 | 44 | 35 | 21 | 91 | | |
| ASN | 63 | 64 | | 63 | 64 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 36 | 40 | 43 | 45 | 49 | 40 | 50 | 62 | 94 | | |
| HSP | 44 | 48 | 46 | 48 | 51 | 45 | 55 | 45 | 81 | | |
| MUL | 41 | 37 | | 62 | 48 | | | 73 | | | |
| WHT | 50 | 48 | 41 | 59 | 60 | 55 | 67 | 55 | 86 | | |
| FRL | 44 | 46 | 41 | 50 | 53 | 46 | 58 | 49 | 87 | | |
| 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 | 18 | 42 | 36 | 19 | 44 | 33 | 22 | 38 | | | |
| ELL | 19 | 39 | 33 | 27 | 47 | 30 | 17 | 34 | | | |
| ASN | 90 | 70 | | 90 | 90 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 43 | 53 | 41 | 42 | 57 | 41 | 38 | 60 | 91 | | |
| HSP | 44 | 53 | 37 | 48 | 57 | 39 | 46 | 64 | 86 | | |
| MUL | 58 | 48 | | 58 | 52 | | | 50 | | | |
| WHT | 55 | 61 | 41 | 56 | 60 | 36 | 69 | 72 | 86 | | |
| FRL | 44 | 54 | 38 | 47 | 55 | 36 | 49 | 63 | 80 | | |

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 | 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 | 58 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 522 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|-----|
| Percent Tested | 99% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 32 |
| 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 | 53 |
| 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 | 49 |
| 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 | 50 |
| 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 | 50 |
| 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 | 50 |
| 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.

SWD-ELA Achievement, SWD-Math Learning Gains (loss of math coach mid year), SWD-Science Achievement (SWD Science support was not Science certified), SWD-Math LQ Learning Gains (loss of math coach mid year), ELL-Math LQ Learning Gains, Acceleration – Math and Ind. Cert. (loss of math coach mid year)

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

LQ Math, Math Achievement, LG Math

Acceleration

No math coach mid year. Accommodations not implemented with fidelity due to lack of understanding.

Change in Math teachers.

Change in Ind Cert teacher

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.

13% below State Math Achievement, 13% more L1 and L2 than state

11% below State ELA Achievement

SWD – 10% below state math achievement

ELL – 11% below state math achievement

Lack of focus on vocabulary instruction and integration of vocab words into daily language. Lack of understanding of the uses of accommodations with fidelity.

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

Increase in civics Achievement by 9%.
Mid-year change in Civics teachers.

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

High number of students with L1 on FSA especially those 6th graders coming from elementary schools.

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

1. Math Achievement including Learning Gains and Lower Quartile
2. ESSA – Student with Disabilities
3. ESSA – English Language Learners
4. Use of academic vocabulary
5. SEL

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus To increase performance in Overall Achievement, Learning Gains and Lower Quartile LG

Description and Rationale: 7% decrease in LG scores from 55 to 48; 7% decrease in LQ LG scores from 48 to 41; ELL LQ LG decrease 10% from 46 to 36; SWD LQ LG decrease 17% from 46 to 29; SWD LG decrease 11% from 47 to 36

Measurable Outcome: Achievement increase from 47 to 54
LG increase from 48 to 54
LQ LG increase from 41 to 54

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kim Feltner (ksfeltne@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Professional Learning on Standards Based instruction

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Standards based instruction helps guide the planning, implementation, and assessment of student learning. The use of standards to streamline instruction ensures that teaching practices deliberately focus on agreed upon learning targets. Expectations for student learning are mapped out with each prescribed standard

Action Steps to Implement

1. Data chats during PLCs to monitor the progress of all students including those in our ESSA Subgroups.

Person Responsible Susan Seidel (sjseidel@volusia.k12.fl.us)

2. Monthly Coaches Meetings to review and monitor PL and instruction happening in the classrooms.

Person Responsible Kim Feltner (ksfeltne@volusia.k12.fl.us)

3. Walk Throughs - Admin and Coaches - to monitor instruction in the classes

Person Responsible Kim Feltner (ksfeltne@volusia.k12.fl.us)

4. Learning Walks - LQ and overall - Schoolwide - to observe strategies used in classrooms to address the ESSA Subgroups

Person Responsible Susan Seidel (sjseidel@volusia.k12.fl.us)

5. Subject Based Learning Walks in model classrooms - to assist teachers in classroom management and engagement strategies

Person Responsible Susan Seidel (sjseidel@volusia.k12.fl.us)

6. LQ Data Chats with Principal and Curriculum AP - to monitor progress of those students in LQ including those in our ESSA Subgroups

| | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Person Responsible | Kim Feltner (ksfeltne@volusia.k12.fl.us) |
|---------------------------|--|

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

| | |
|---|---|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | <p>To close the overall achievement gap between the general population and the identified ESSA subgroups.</p> <p>SWD- Overall 32% which is a decrease of 8% Achievement - ELA - 7% decrease from 27 to 20; Math - 6% decrease from 28 to 22; Science - 16% decrease from 39 to 23. LG - Math - 11% decrease from 47 to 36. LQ LG - ELA - 7% decrease from 41 to 34; Math 17% decrease from 46 to 29 ELL- Overall 40% which is a decrease of 2% Achievement: Math - 1% decrease from 31 to 30; Science - 10% decrease from 36 to 26. LG - Math - 5% decrease from 46 to 41. LQ LG Math – Math – 10% decrease from 46 to 36</p> |
| Measurable Outcome: | Increase overall SWD score from 32 to 42 and ELL score from 40 to 45 |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Kim Feltner (ksfeltne@volusia.k12.fl.us) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | <p>Standards Based Instruction Differentiated Instruction and Accommodations for SWDs and ELLs</p> |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | <p>Standards based instruction helps guide the planning, implementation, and assessment of student learning. The use of standards to streamline instruction ensures that teaching practices deliberately focus on agreed upon learning targets. Expectations for student learning are mapped out with each prescribed standard</p> <p>Legal requirement determined by committee of stakeholders/professionals.</p> |

Action Steps to Implement

1. Accommodations and Collaborative Practices to support those students in our identified ESSA Subgroups

Person Responsible Greg lorio (gmiorio@volusia.k12.fl.us)

2. Meet with SC, SF and CT within PLCs monthly to discuss interventions monitored by admin and coaches

Person Responsible Greg lorio (gmiorio@volusia.k12.fl.us)

3. LQ Data Chats with Principal, Curriculum AP and ESE AP – to monitor progress of those identified as LQ students

Person Responsible Kim Feltner (ksfeltne@volusia.k12.fl.us)

4. Implementation of ESE Separate Class and Research classes

Person Responsible Kim Feltner (ksfeltne@volusia.k12.fl.us)

5. PL provided by District staff

Person Responsible Greg Iorio (gmiorio@volusia.k12.fl.us)

6. Development of Team teaching to provide more in- depth support for students.

Person Responsible Susan Seidel (sjseidel@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Professional Learning for Standards Based Instruction

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Instructional Coaching

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Area of Focus | Teachers will model and reinforce the use of content specific academic language. Academic language will become integral component of daily instruction by both teacher and students. |
| Description and Rationale: | Overall 32% which is a decrease of 8% Achievement - ELA - 7% decrease from 27 to 20; Math - 6%:decrease from 29 to 22; Science - 16% decrease from 39 to 23.;LG - Math - 11% decrease from 47 to 36.LQ LG - ELA - 7% decrease from 41 to 34; Math 17% decrease from 46 to 29 |

Measurable Outcome: Performance on district and state assessments will increase in all tested areas by an average of 5%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Susan Seidel (sjseidel@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Modeling and Use of Academic Language
WIDA (World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment, 2011) describes the use of academic language as “the language required to succeed in school that includes deep understandings of content and communication of that language in the classroom environment. These understandings revolve around specific criteria related to discourse, sentence, and word/phrase levels of language”.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Overall School grade decreased by 2%. From 54 to 52 dropping the grade to a C.

Action Steps to Implement

PLC training and support

Person Responsible Susan Seidel (sjseidel@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Use of district provided consumables. the associated assignments aligned to the content provide additional exposure to the academic language with practice allowing for the relationship and conceptual understanding.

Person Responsible Susan Seidel (sjseidel@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Word walls to reference vocabulary

Person Responsible Tanya Caffieri (tlcaffie@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Pre-teaching vocabulary

Person Responsible Kim Feltner (ksfeltne@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Implement Professional Learning & Modeling of the use of Academic Language

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Social/Emotional Learning – Houses –

Collaborative team building, positive reinforcements, building community, Providing a sense of belonging, teaches tolerance, healthy competition, development of basic responsibilities of core values, enhancing the ‘whole child’

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.

Kagan Strategies – small groups, team building, class building
 Team teaching
 Counselor involvement
 Mutual respect between students and peers
 Coaching to assure all stakeholders are involved
 Extra curricular activities
 Academies

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: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Instructional Coaching | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |