

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

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Middle School 6-8</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>80%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>61%</p>

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	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	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	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

To close the overall achievement gap between the general population and the identified ESSA subgroups.
 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

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: Standards Based Instruction
 Differentiated Instruction and Accommodations for SWDs and ELLs

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

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Legal requirement determined by committee of stakeholders/professionals.

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