

Volusia County Schools

Deland High School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	22
Positive Culture & Environment	29
Budget to Support Goals	29

Deland High School

800 N HILL AVE, Deland, FL 32724

<http://www.delandhs.org/>

Demographics

Principal: Michael Deg IR Olmo

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School PK, 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	90%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: B (58%)
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	

* 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	12
Planning for Improvement	22
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	29

Deland High School

800 N HILL AVE, Deland, FL 32724

<http://www.delandhs.org/>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School PK, 9-12	No	57%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	46%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		I	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.

The mission of DeLand High School is to provide a safe, learning environment which produces citizens who are prepared to face the challenges of an increasingly complex society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of the DeLand High family is that every student will become a high school graduate. We are committed to presenting a caring environment for learning, one that involves participatory decision making by students, parents, faculty, staff, and community leaders. DeLand High will provide opportunities for all students to realize their potential through involvement in the total school community. We realize it is our responsibility to challenge students to achieve and to encourage ethical behavior so as to produce responsible, productive members of society.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Banker, Sabrina	SAC Member	Math teacher
Battaglino, Kathryn	Instructional Coach	Literacy Coach & Digital Learning Teacher Leader
Bismore, Roger	Teacher, K-12	CTE Teacher; Educational Leadership Intern
Brown, Ken	Dean	Teacher on Assignment (school safety and security and discipline)
Carr, Melissa	Principal	School Principal
D'Aquino, Kristen	Teacher, K-12	AVID Coordinator
Degiroldmo, Mike	Assistant Principal	ESE Asst. Principal
Fuller, Tiffany	Assistant Principal	Curriculum Asst. Principal
Lucero, Mike	Assistant Principal	Data Asst. Principal
Lueth, Marylea	Teacher, ESE	ESE Dept. Chair
Lundell, Melissa	Teacher, Career/Technical	CTE Facilitator
Mitchell, Jennifer	SAC Member	SEL Team Lead
Nehrig, Lisa	Other	College & Career Specialist; IB Program Coordinator
Nunez, Julia	School Counselor	Counseling Director
Pio, Courtney	Math Coach	Math Coach
Sibio, Kimberly	Other	Testing Coordinator
Troutman, Lashawn	Assistant Principal	Asst. Principal (Safety, Security and Facilities)
Vega, Issella	Assistant Principal	Asst. Principal
Wilson, Scott	Dropout Prevention Coordinator	e-Learning teacher

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 7/1/2017, Michael Deg IR Olmo

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

67

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

76

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

148

Total number of students enrolled at the school

2,851

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

16

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

28

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	0	0	0	969	733	641	508	2851
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	187	167	152	135	641
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	146	192	112	48	498
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	156	145	75	47	423
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	293	225	135	101	754
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	297	168	105	52	622
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80	32	9	5	126
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	223	223	134	81	661

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	174	100	39	2	315
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81	61	27	9	178

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/24/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

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

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103	70	25	34	232
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	50	20	25	168

2020-21 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	770	642	484	511	2407
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	223	197	127	171	718
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	123	51	18	12	204
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	405	299	176	149	1029
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	382	293	157	158	990
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	285	165	104	81	635
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	224	113	56	64	457

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	423	307	171	161	1062

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	38	17	23	143
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	24	12	23	105

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				47%	52%	56%	48%	51%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				44%	49%	51%	45%	47%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				31%	37%	42%	37%	37%	44%
Math Achievement				32%	48%	51%	42%	49%	51%
Math Learning Gains				37%	49%	48%	46%	50%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				31%	38%	45%	35%	44%	45%
Science Achievement				73%	76%	68%	66%	71%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				59%	69%	73%	66%	66%	71%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
09	2021					
	2019	45%	51%	-6%	55%	-10%
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	48%	50%	-2%	53%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	71%	72%	-1%	67%	4%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	57%	63%	-6%	70%	-13%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	19%	54%	-35%	61%	-42%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	37%	55%	-18%	57%	-20%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

The English Language Arts progress monitoring data is comprised of DIA (district interim assessments) given three times a year per grade level and VLT (Volusia Literacy Test) given twice a year. The Mathematics progress monitoring data that comprises the data are the six Algebra DIAs and five Geometry DIAs. The Biology progress monitoring is comprised of seven Biology DIAs given over the course of the year, and the Social Studies progress monitoring is comprised of eight US History DIAs given over the course of the school year.

Grade 9				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	790 / 41	950 / 41	360 / 21
	Economically Disadvantaged	473 / 32	581 / 32	212 / 18
	Students With Disabilities	146 / 19	175 / 22	65 / 12
	English Language Learners	66 / 12	83 / 16	26 / 4
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	598 / 3	710 / 8	585 / 3
	Economically Disadvantaged	411 / 2	474 / 5	388 / 2
	Students With Disabilities	155 / 2	159 / 5	137 / 1
	English Language Learners	74 / 0	80 / 1	77 / 1
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	990 / 59	652 / 43	653 / 57
	Economically Disadvantaged	518 / 46	336 / 36	333 / 47
	Students With Disabilities	103 / 36	65 / 26	68 / 35
	English Language Learners	35 / 11	20 / 10	19 / 11
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	6 / 17	7 / 0	6 / 17
	Economically Disadvantaged	6 / 17	6 / 0	4 / 0
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 10				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	636 / 32	438 / 37	757 / 54
	Economically Disadvantaged	347 / 27	244 / 32	419 / 47
	Students With Disabilities	83 / 13	60 / 8	111 / 34
	English Language Learners	47 / 11	37 / 19	49 / 29
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	148 / 4	284 / 6	137 / 2
	Economically Disadvantaged	104 / 4	190 / 5	91 / 2
	Students With Disabilities	24 / 0	44 / 5	21 / 0
	English Language Learners	24 / 0	42 / 2	21 / 0
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	537 / 39	374 / 19	372 / 36
	Economically Disadvantaged	408 / 30	289 / 18	280 / 36
	Students With Disabilities	131 / 15	84 / 13	84 / 23
	English Language Learners	87 / 18	58 / 9	57 / 23
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	65 / 38	73 / 27	49 / 61
	Economically Disadvantaged	51 / 35	57 / 19	38 / 63
	Students With Disabilities	6 / 0	7 / 0	2 / 50
	English Language Learners	9 / 0	11 / 0	10 / 60

Grade 11				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	189 / 63	87 / 67	9 / 44
	Economically Disadvantaged	120 / 61	58 / 67	9 / 44
	Students With Disabilities	53 / 58	29 / 45	4 / 50
	English Language Learners	15 / 53	2 / 100	1 / 0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	26 / 0	48 / 4	21 / 0
	Economically Disadvantaged	21 / 0	35 / 6	15 / 0
	Students With Disabilities	5 / 0	8 / 0	4 / 0
	English Language Learners	4 / 0	9 / 10	3 / 0
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	23 / 26	13 / 0	10 / 10
	Economically Disadvantaged	21 / 29	12 / 0	10 / 10
	Students With Disabilities	7 / 14	6 / 0	3 / 0
	English Language Learners	2 / 0	1 / 0	2 / 0
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	397 / 45	514 / 36	381 / 57
	Economically Disadvantaged	231 / 40	305 / 27	220 / 55
	Students With Disabilities	84 / 17	108 / 16	76 / 37
	English Language Learners	16 / 25	20 / 15	16 / 38

Grade 12				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	137 / 79	155 / 76	3 / 0
	Economically Disadvantaged	82 / 76	96 / 67	3 / 0
	Students With Disabilities	25 / 72	33 / 79	
	English Language Learners	19 / 58	17 / 53	
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	10 / 0	13 / 8	9 / 0
	Economically Disadvantaged	7 / 0	10 / 0	6 / 0
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners	5 / 0	8 / 0	3 / 0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	11 / 0	5 / 0	
	Economically Disadvantaged	11 / 0	5 / 0	
	Students With Disabilities	5 / 0	1 / 0	
	English Language Learners	3 / 0	1 / 0	
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	27 / 63	27 / 33	20 / 65
	Economically Disadvantaged	24 / 63	21 / 29	13 / 69
	Students With Disabilities	6 / 50	6 / 17	5 / 20
	English Language Learners	4 / 50	4 / 0	4 / 50

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	14	30	33	15	31	34	42	34		91	8
ELL	5	31	35	6	35	46	23	33		92	6
ASN	80	71					77			100	88
BLK	27	44	43	15	32	26	61	46		82	28
HSP	32	40	30	20	37	44	48	56		93	32

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
MUL	42	45		18	23		57			94	44
WHT	56	47	41	36	32	37	72	71		92	58
FRL	35	42	34	22	32	35	55	57		88	34
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	15	27	24	11	20	20	33	19		84	14
ELL	14	27	27	13	21	21	45	22		59	8
ASN	76	61		63	38		89			100	69
BLK	30	39	28	21	33	25	54	42		80	25
HSP	36	41	34	21	30	30	63	50		71	46
MUL	49	46		14	32		78	56		77	40
WHT	55	46	32	42	43	37	79	71		85	55
FRL	36	40	31	26	34	31	64	52		74	35
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	14	36	34	22	43	35	20	42		52	14
ELL	13	38	34	25	47	50	38	39		67	29
ASN	63	61		71	75		85				
BLK	28	38	35	27	27	19	40	39		66	31
HSP	39	43	30	36	46	35	53	61		65	37
MUL	49	44		48	47		84	92		77	65
WHT	56	48	40	48	48	40	77	73		81	64
FRL	39	42	34	39	46	37	57	60		63	40

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	61
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	552
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	88%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	34
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	83
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	40
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	45
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	46
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	54
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	45
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

One of the positive trends that was noted through the state assessment data (FSAs) was a consistent growth in our lowest quartile across both math and ELA with six percentage points increase in each subject respectively. Another positive trend was growth in our ESSA subgroups. Our students with disabilities showed growth in all but one area and in that area, they maintained from the previous year. Increase for students with disabilities ranged from 2% learning gains increase in ELA to 12% increase in Math Learning Gains and 15% increase in Social Studies Achievement. Our African American subgroup also demonstrated notable growth moving their learning gains and lowest quartile achievement past the Federal Index minimum threshold to 44% and 43% respectively in ELA, a 5% and 15% increase from the previous year. This subgroup also saw growth in their lowest quartile for both ELA and math, as well as growth in Science and Social Studies achievement. Further notes of improvement were seen in the graduation rate of 91%, a nine percentage point increase.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Components that demonstrated a need for growth and improvement include Math achievement as our lowest performing subject area. Collectively achievement in math is at 27% with learning gains and the lowest quartile showing 34% and 37% respectively. That position is further supported by district progress monitoring data, showing only three to five percent proficiency in district math DIAs. The other area of high focus are our ESSA subgroups. While notable improvements and points of growth were noted with both, for many indicators, the achievement numbers are below the Federal Index, and the goal is to move past that point for all students.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

The push for high school math in the middle grades has created a larger achievement gap for high school math as has been noted in past data analysis. To that end, we have talked, trained and equipped our math departments with resources to better address and support the now changed demographic of high school students who sit for Algebra or Geometry. Evidence of progress is noted in the growth metrics for our lowest quartile and ESSA subgroups, however, the scope and demand of math content knowledge as required on the EOC for students who've demonstrated consistent

challenges with math skills, concepts and fluency is an ongoing area of focus, attention and support to supplement and close the divide and gap that is occurring with the new push for middle grades high school math. Strengthening our response to intervention protocols and responding more systematically when students struggle are one way we intend to improve, additionally, providing more targeted supports like tutoring and boot camps for more direct support.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

The greatest improvement collectively was seen in our lowest quartile data, with six percentage points increase for both ELA and Math. Additionally, our ESSA subgroups showed marked improvement with students with disabilities maintaining or showing growth in all areas, especially Social Studies achievement raising 15% and the lowest quartile showing growth in both ELA and math, 9 and 14 percentage points respectively. The African American subgroup showed notable growth moving their learning gains and lowest quartile achievement past the Federal Index minimum threshold to 44% and 43% respectively in ELA, a 5% and 15% increase from the previous year. This growth pattern is also evidenced in district interim progress monitoring data, with the ELA DIA data for African American students showing only four percentage points behind the district average (56.3%) and only 3 percentage points behind the school average (55.3%) of percent correct (52.2% in ninth grade and 49.9% in tenth grade- still above the 41% proficiency threshold). This subgroup also saw growth in their lowest quartile for both ELA and math, as well as growth in Social Studies and Science achievement (at 61% achievement was one point from A-level achievement). In all other comparable measures, the progress monitoring data from the district reports demonstrated greater needs for improvement, though state performance far surpassed those indicators for improvement (Ex: Biology SMT = 33.7% versus Biology FSA= 64%, and Social Science DIA= 35% versus US History EOC= 63%) showing gains from the last progress monitoring assessments.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

For the last few years we've been making a very concerted effort to dive down into the data to identify and develop support plans for students had been largely underserved and underrepresented. That meant re-educating our staff on the varied and changed demographics of our student population. That meant instituting systems and procedures that helped students matriculate and discouraged dropping out. That meant having challenging conversations with staff, stakeholder groups, and sometimes students to address gaps in achievement as we progress monitored. This also included equity and diversity training for all stakeholders to better equip us to communicate with, build relationships with and subsequently educate all students. This also meant closer ongoing monitoring of these subgroups throughout the school year. PLCs became more versed in using the new data storehouse (School City) to monitor performance data beyond whole group or class averages. Instructional coaches and administrators began requesting data for subgroups, bringing greater attention to disparities earlier in the year, and closer in class monitoring as a result, which helped to escalate interventions before the learning was too far passed. The heightened awareness and greater proficiency with the data tool, empowered classroom teachers to be more responsive and eventually more proactive in addressing subgroup gaps in performance, thus helping to solidify learning throughout the school year.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Strategies that need to be implemented to help accelerate learning include tighter alignment to and development of our intervention system and response when students exhibit signs that they are having struggles. That looks like access to tutoring. That includes test preparation programs, resources and boot camp. This will also include utilizing and fortifying existing intervention systems like the Project Graduation team.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Professional development to support some of these acceleration strategies include content area training to reinforce the instructional support and content knowledge/standards necessary for improvements in student learning. It will also include strategies related to differentiation, interventions, technology, and equity and access trainings.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Some of the additional services that will be implemented this year include resources to support the tutoring and intervention program, professional learning resources to support instruction and the infusion of 1:1 technology.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the needs assessment and data review, math achievement was the lowest performing area, particularly in regards to EOC data. This area was also an area of underachievement for our ESSA subgroups that fell below the federal index. As a result, we selected instructional practice as the area of focus, targeting math instruction as an area we wanted to address to increase student achievement across all students.

Measurable Outcome: Increase Math EOC achievement from 27% to 41%.

Monitoring: This area will be monitored through walk throughs of classrooms, PLCs as well as through data collection and analysis from district assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tiffany Fuller (tnfuller@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Standards-aligned instruction

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Since achievement levels in math are below the Federal Index and have been an area of focus, tier 1 instruction remains the priority focus to ensure that all students receive solid core instructional practice in each lesson with vetted and established curricular supports (like but not limited to Khan Academy, Desmos, Math Nation and Edgenuity), and ensuring activities, instruction and the assessment of the same are aligned to the depth of the standards, particularly as we finish these standards and transition to new standards and a new assessment.

Action Steps to Implement

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

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

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

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

Progress monitoring and response to data

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

Classroom observations and walk throughs

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

Incorporate stations that offer content variety, differentiation, individualized and varied practice with the content and standards

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

Incorporate tutoring and boot camp sessions to reinforce and review content and help students prepare for varied assessment demands

Person Responsible Issella Vega (ivega@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**Area of****Focus****Description and****Rationale:**

We selected our ESSA Subgroups as the area of focus after review of our state assessment data and analysis of all subgroups and populations because three of our ESSA subgroups had consistent data points below the 41% federal index.

Measurable Outcome:

Increase achievement for each subgroup's achievement to 41%.

Monitoring:

This area will be monitored through data analysis of internal and state assessments when reviewing subgroup performance.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Issella Vega (ivega@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

The evidence-based strategy being implemented for this area of focus is differentiated instruction, to provide varied pathways and approaches for students to access and learn content and then demonstrate that learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

The rationale for selecting this strategy came from recognizing the need for variation in instructional and support approaches for these varied group of students. Gaps in achievement ranging from language barrier to disability and beyond cannot be remedied in one monolithic approach. By focusing on differentiation approaches for learning process, product and content, teachers will be better able to engage learners in culturally responsive, relevant and authentic ways that support student learning, their connection to school, and post high school preparedness, ultimately driving up student learning gains and achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

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

Person Responsible

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

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

Person Responsible

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

Provide support through ESOL para and coordinator to support student improvement across campus

Person Responsible

Issella Vega (ivega@volusia.k12.fl.us)

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

Person Responsible

Kathryn Battaglini (klbattag@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Progress monitor PLC data with an emphasis on ESSA subgroup data

Person Responsible

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

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

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

Provide student tutoring and testing boot camps

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

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

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

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This area of focus was selected after reviewing state summative data as well as internal school data recognizing disparity data among our subgroups in achievement, EWS data markers and discipline. For that reason, we decided to focus on Culture and Climate to provide a more supportive school environment that's conducive to meeting the needs of all students by strategically working to remove barriers and maximize student's educational potential.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase the number and demographic composition of students graduating college and career ready by 5%
Monitoring:	This area will be monitored through data analysis of enrollment and demographic composition in college and career ready courses as well as performance data of the same, as well as quarterly monitoring of discipline and EWS data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Melissa Carr (mcarr@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The intentional and purposeful use of enrichment programs to elevate students' learning and school experience and prepare them for post-high school success.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Enrichment programs yield a .55 effect size based on John Hattie's meta research. As a school that offers an Advanced Placement program, AVID, Career Academies and Industry Certification courses as well as an International Baccalaureate Diploma Program, the research is rife that students graduating from high school with these courses have higher graduation rates, better attendance rates, have increased rates of college graduation and increased employment in the career sector. By focusing on expanding opportunities to and support within this program, we will not only enrich these programs with more diverse students, but enrich student's school experience and post-high school preparedness. This includes more expansive promotional campaigns that inform parents and stakeholders of the opportunities and advantages for students in these programs, as well as increased access to tutoring and support mechanisms for students needing support in advanced work or test preparation, and student-led initiatives to promote peer retention.

Action Steps to Implement

Market and monitor student enrollment in advanced courses and career programs

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

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

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

Tutoring and Academic Support for advanced courses and industry certifications

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

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

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

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

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

Professional Learning on Equitable and Restorative Practices

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

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

According to the Safe Schools for Alex dashboard, DeLand High School has a moderate school incident ranking. Officially ranking at number 209 out of 505 high schools represented on the dashboard. At the incident level, DeLand High School has a lower incident rate per 100 students compared to the state average. DeLand has 2.54 incidents per 100 students, compared to the state's high school average of 3.3 incidents per 100 students. Regarding primary and secondary concerns, DeLand High School has comparable concern areas to the state's top areas of concern. For instance, both DeLand and the state identify violent incidents as a primary area of concern. Whether fighting, battery or physical attack, both have violence as a priority matter with regard to incident types. As a result, suspension rates at DeLand High School are considered high on the Alex dashboard, as suspensions lead our disciplinary response when a violent event occurs. To better reduce not just the high suspension rates but also the leading causes of violent events that cause the suspensions, we are employing alternative measures and programs to work on better addressing the root of the problem (student conflicts, student problem solving; communication gaps that lead to physical altercation; relationship building, etc.) like our PASS program (Positive Alternatives to School Suspension), incorporating restorative practices on campus, instituting reentry meetings for students returning from suspensions or alternative placements to establish a support system, own responsibility and repair prior harm. To that end, while suspension rates are high according to the dashboard, the rates have steadily decreased over the last five years. The secondary concern noted within the dashboard data was tobacco related and vaping issues. While the dashboard categorizes those events in the low threshold, they are the second largest issue after physical violence. As we continue to work on those issues, we are employing strategies that educate students on the dangers and addiction of nicotine based products and the harmful effects of smoking. We also have employed partnerships with the local police department where students can get to know officers in a positive and supportive way.

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.

School-based administrators, leadership team members and other stakeholders collaborate frequently to develop policies and procedures for all students and staff members to follow, in all settings throughout the campus. The main goal is to promote positive interactions between all stakeholders. Identified procedures are designed to encourage positive behavior and to build a school community based upon safety and responsibility. This also includes ongoing training in restorative practices, equity training and encouraging access to caring adults through positive classroom interactions, school counselor support and smiling faces on campus. Student clubs and organizations are varied to appeal to multiple interest and provide a place of belonging for students.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

A number of key stakeholders play a critical role in promoting a positive culture and environment on campus. That list includes or begins with school administration who set the tone for positive interactions with teachers, families, students and stakeholders. It also includes our clerical staff who often provide the first point of contact for students and families calling or entering campus. Our counseling team is a unit of positivity providing both emotional and academic support for students. Counselors work hard to build relationships with the students on their case load and provide a supportive place for students who need them. We have an SEL team that supports positive peer to peer relationships and interactions as well as mentoring opportunities. Teachers lead the way in promoting this culture by greeting students at the door each day and welcoming them to class in a positive way, and student leadership organizations have been charged to speak to someone new each day, consistently looking to make connections so all students feel included, seen and welcomed.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$4,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22

			1453 - Deland High School	School Improvement Funds		\$4,000.00
			Notes: This will go to support professional learning for teachers to receive training in curricular and instructional practices to support student learning. This funding will also fund support for tutoring and intervention sessions outside of the school day.			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups				\$4,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
			1453 - Deland High School	School Improvement Funds		\$4,000.00
			Notes: This will go to support professional learning for educators to receive training in differentiated instructional practices necessary to support and advance student learning, as well as help fund supplemental and intervention resources, tutoring and intervention sessions that provide extended practice and support outside of the school day so students can demonstrate increased achievement.			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Equity & Diversity				\$2,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
			1453 - Deland High School	School Improvement Funds		\$2,000.00
			Notes: This will go to support professional learning and support services for equitable and inclusive practices. This will help support trainings, support materials and resources to build and celebrate a more equitable culture and environment for all students.			
Total:						\$10,000.00