Deltona Lakes Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Deltona Lakes Elementary School

2022 ADELIA BLVD, Deltona, FL 32725

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

Demographics

Principal: Chad Miller A

Start Date for this Principal: 8/20/2015

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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 Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (48%)
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

Deltona Lakes Elementary School

2022 ADELIA BLVD, Deltona, FL 32725

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	78%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	66%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	C

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

Create life-long learners prepared for an ever-changing global 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
Ortiz, Ramonita	Principal	Principal Data Analysis, Professional Learning, PLC's, Curriculum implementation
Griffin, Tonya	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal Discipline, Data Analysis, PLC's, Professional Learning, Curriculum implementation
Noga, Hope	Teacher, K-12	Discipline, School Improvement, Data Analysis, PLC's
Brown, Kerrie	Instructional Coach	Academic Coach- Professional Learning, PLC's, Coaching and Feedback, Coaching Cycles, Curriculum
Zeidwig, Catherine	Instructional Coach	Academic Coach Professional Learning, PLC's, Coaching and Feedback, Coaching Cycles, Curriculum
Diallo, Jennifer	Instructional Coach	Academic Coach Professional Learning, PLC's, Coaching and Feedback, Coaching Cycles, Curriculum
Rowley, Tara	Teacher, K-12	Teacher 4th grade teacher, Data Anaysis
Jones, Amanda	Teacher, K-12	5th grade teacher, Data Anaysis
O'Quinn, Amy	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal ESE Support Discipline, Professional Learning, PLC's, Data Analysis, Curriculum implementation

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 8/20/2015, Chad Miller A

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
13

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.*
50

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
68

Total number of students enrolled at the school
650

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
3

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
3

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	88	112	120	113	90	123	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	646
Attendance below 90 percent	14	23	19	16	13	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	109
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	14	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	1	24	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	8	4	12	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30

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	1	0	5	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	2	2	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/20/2021

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	68	99	86	80	95	114	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	542
Attendance below 90 percent	6	18	15	11	10	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
One or more suspensions	0	5	2	3	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	4	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	68	99	86	80	95	114	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	542
Attendance below 90 percent	6	18	15	11	10	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
One or more suspensions	0	5	2	3	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	4	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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				52%	56%	57%	52%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				50%	56%	58%	50%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				47%	46%	53%	45%	39%	48%
Math Achievement				56%	59%	63%	56%	60%	62%
Math Learning Gains				47%	56%	62%	47%	54%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				41%	43%	51%	31%	40%	47%
Science Achievement				53%	57%	53%	57%	58%	55%

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
03	2021					
	2019	57%	58%	-1%	58%	-1%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	48%	54%	-6%	58%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				
05	2021					
	2019	46%	54%	-8%	56%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	66%	60%	6%	62%	4%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	53%	59%	-6%	64%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				
05	2021					
	2019	46%	54%	-8%	60%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	50%	56%	-6%	53%	-3%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

iready ELA and Math

Grade 1			
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	20%	36%	63%
	Economically Disadvantaged	16%	31%	59%
	Students With Disabilities	33%	25%	42%
	English Language Learners	33%	12%	25%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	27%	29%	60%
	Economically Disadvantaged	30%	24%	54%
	Students With Disabilities	36%	25%	42%
	English Language Learners	25%	0%	41%

Grade 2			
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	25%	40%	47%
	Economically Disadvantaged	22%	36%	39%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	8%	14%
	English Language Learners	8%	7%	27%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	20%	26%	45%
	Economically Disadvantaged	14%	19%	38%
	Students With Disabilities	5%	0%	10%
	English Language Learners	8%	7%	31%

Grade 3			
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	45%	60%	70%
	Economically Disadvantaged	43%	59%	69%
	Students With Disabilities	19%	38%	50%
	English Language Learners	14%	45%	48%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	14%	34%	61%
	Economically Disadvantaged	12%	33%	59%
	Students With Disabilities	10%	10%	48%
	English Language Learners	14%	18%	48%

Grade 4			
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	31%	39%	47%
	Economically Disadvantaged	30%	36%	45%
	Students With Disabilities	9%	13%	19%
	English Language Learners	23%	31%	46%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	14%	37%	56%
	Economically Disadvantaged	13%	34%	54%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	22%	15%
	English Language Learners	14%	24%	38%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	26%	26%	28%
	Economically Disadvantaged	23%	23%	26%
	Students With Disabilities	6%	8%	5%
	English Language Learners	0%	5%	5%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	17%	27%	43%
	Economically Disadvantaged	15%	24%	42%
	Students With Disabilities	3%	5%	13%
	English Language Learners	6%	5%	24%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	34%	48%	62%
	Economically Disadvantaged	32%	47%	63%
	Students With Disabilities	16%	19%	28%
	English Language Learners	17%	41%	45%

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	22	32	36	18	27	29	22				
ELL	30	46		30	38		27				
BLK	29	26	42	29	32		28				
HSP	42	40	45	37	29	33	42				
MUL	27			30							
WHT	58	38		54	21		70				
FRL	43	37	50	40	28	30	48				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	16	36	37	20	39	44	26				
ELL	28	36	32	37	36	35	48				
BLK	49	52		35	48	45	33				

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
HSP	48	43	35	54	44	34	51				
MUL	47			60							
WHT	58	56	61	64	50	53	59				
FRL	49	49	50	55	45	45	49				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	11	33	32	18	35	23	23				
ELL	39	48	64	44	50	36	54				
BLK	37	33	21	35	27	21	29				
HSP	54	54	63	53	50	27	58				
MUL	64			73							
WHT	54	53	38	68	52	44	67				
FRL	50	51	45	54	47	33	53				

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	40
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	48
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	317
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
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	37
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

English Language Learners	
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	31
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	39
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	29
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	48
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	41
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?

Math Achievement showed a decline in grades 3, 4, & 5.
ESSA subgroup of Students with Disabilities declined in Math Achievement, Math Learning Gains and Math Lowest Quartile.

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

Math Achievement, Math Learning Gains and Math Lowest Quartile.
Specifically Math Achievement of Students with Disabilities--18%, Math Learning Gains--27%, Math Lowest Quartile--29%

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

Contributing factors include: LIVE students, Transition from LIVE back to Brick and Mortar, Multiple teachers, and lack of using district-aligned materials.
Addressing Improvement: Finite Support Facilitation Schedule, special Area tutoring/enrichment support, and use of ONLY district-aligned materials and resources with fidelity.

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

ELA-4th Grade
ELA Achievement increased from 16% to 22%.
ESOL students off the ESSA subgroup.

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

Strong 4th grade teachers
This year the following was implemented mentoring students, goal setting, IXL competitions, and additional intervention during special area.

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

Professional Learning in the new Core Curriculum with emphasis in whole group and small group instruction. Data chats for students and teachers. Additional Intervention/enrichment during special area. Implementation of an afterschool Math Club. Continue and expand DLE's mentoring program.

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.

ELA and Math professional Learning. Follow up at PLC's. Data chats with administration. PLC's will be curriculum and data focused for ELA and Math.

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

Ongoing PLC weekly throughout the year. Intentional Learning Walks with timely feedback. Data chats with students and teachers. Data walks conducted throughout the year. Teachers will be provided opportunities to visit model classrooms for observation. Academic Coaches and TOA will be part-time intervention teachers focusing on the LQ students.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Grades 3, 4 and 5 decreased in Math. Overall math achievement 42%, Math Learning Gains-26%, Math Lowest Quartile-26%.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase overall math achievement to 50%. Increase Math Learning Gains--45%, Increase Math Lowest Quartile--45%.
Monitoring:	The Area of Focus will be monitored by classroom observations, using walkthrough tools with specific 'look fors' in Math. Administration and Academic Coaches will monitor iready and district assessment data frequently and provide teacher feedback in a timely manner. The data monitoring and walkthroughs will happen monthly. Persons Responsible: Principal-R. Ortiz, AP-T. Griffin, AP-N. O'Quinn, TOA-H. Noga, Coaches-K.Brown, J. Diallo, C. Zeidwig.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ramonita Ortiz (rortiz@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Collaborative Planning is the evidence-based strategy being utilized for this Area of Focus. Collaborative planning will take place among grade level teams. Each team will also have an Academic Coach present to help plan and guide instructional best practices. Collaborative planning will take place during the school day during designated planning days and/or after school planning times. Ms. Ortiz, principal, will monitor collaborative planning in the area of Math.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Collaborative planning is the evidence-based strategy being utilized for this area of focus. Hattie's research describes planning as an explicit focus on planning and use of time. Teachers will collaboratively plan to utilize district-aligned resources effectively in the area of math. Ms. Ortiz, the principal will monitor collaborative planning in the area of math. This strategy will be monitored by the School Based Leadership team through frequent walkthroughs and feedback will be given to teachers. Also, administration will be present during Collaborative planning days to offer support and plan for best practices.

Action Steps to Implement

Present the Math data to the entire faculty and staff to identify the need for implementation of Focus Area of Math.

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

Provide professional learning in the Focus Area of Math during PLC's and ERPL's with a focus of small group instruction and remediation utilizing standards aligned district resources.

Person Responsible Kerrie Brown (ksbrown1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Data walks will be conducted utilizing the district tool. Teachers will be provided feedback in timely manner.

Person Responsible Catherine Zeidwig (ckzeidwi@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Data chats with Teachers/Student will happen quarterly. Data chats with Teachers/Administration will happen quarterly.

Person Responsible	Tonya Griffin (tngriffi@volusia.k12.fl.us)

The Lowest Quartile students will be identified and provided additional intervention.

Person Responsible	Hope Noga (chnoga@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will be provided the opportunity to observe model classrooms in the area of math.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Diallo (jmdiallo@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ELA achievement is 46%. ELA Learning Gains is 36% ELA Lowest Quartile is 43%
Measurable Outcome:	Increase overall ELA achievement 50%. Increase ELA Learning Gains to 50%. Increase ELA Lowest Quartile to 50%.
Monitoring:	The Area of Focus will be monitored by classroom observations, using walkthrough tools with specific 'look fors' in ELA. Administration and Academic Coaches will monitor iready and district assessment data frequently and provide teacher feedback in a timely manner. The data monitoring and walk throughs will occur monthly. Persons Responsible: Principal-R. Ortiz, AP-T. Griffin, AP-N. O'Quinn, TOA-H. Noga, Coaches-K.Brown, J. Diallo, C. Zeidwig.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ramonita Ortiz (rortiz@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Small Group Instruction is the evidence-based strategy being utilized for this Area of Focus. Small Group Instruction will take place daily during the ELA block. PLC's will be utilized to support teachers in implementing effective small group instruction with Benchmark materials. During collaborative planning days special attention will be given to small group instruction. Mrs. Griffin and Mrs. O'Quinn will monitor implementation of small group instruction in the area of ELA daily with fidelity.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Small Group Instruction is the evidence-based strategy being utilized for this area of focus. Hattie's research indicates small group has an effect size of .47. Teachers will implement small group instruction daily within the ELA block utilizing Benchmark materials. Mrs. Griffin and Mrs. O'Quinn will monitor small group instruction in the focus area of ELA. This strategy will be monitored by the school based leadership team through frequent walk throughs and teacher observations.

Action Steps to Implement

Ensure teachers are following the master schedule instructional blocks including core, small group, intervention, and acceleration instruction.

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

Teachers will be provided the opportunity to observe model classrooms in the area of ELA.

Person Responsible	Kerrie Brown (ksbrown1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Collaborative planning to utilize district aligned resources effectively within the Benchmark Reading Curriculum.

Person Responsible	Catherine Zeidwig (ckzeidwi@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Present the ELA data to the entire faculty and staff to identify the need for implementation of Focus Area of ELA.

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

The Lowest Quartile students will be identified and provided additional intervention.

Person Responsible   Hope Noga (chnoga@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Data walks will be conducted utilizing the district tool. Teachers will be provided feedback in timely manner.

Person Responsible   Jennifer Diallo (jmdiallo@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Provide professional learning in the Focus Area of ELA during PLC's and ERPL's with a focus of small group instruction and remediation utilizing standards aligned district resources.

Person Responsible   Kerrie Brown (ksbrown1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Data chats with Teachers/Student will happen quarterly. Data chats with Teachers/Administration will happen quarterly.

Person Responsible   Tonya Griffin (tngriffi@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	SWD-ELA-22%, Math-18%, Science-22% AA-ELA-29%, Math-29%, Science-28%
Measurable Outcome:	SWD-ELA-41%, Math-41%, Science 41% AA-ELA-41%, Math-41%, Science-41%
Monitoring:	The Area of Focus will be monitored by classroom observations, using walkthrough tools with specific 'look fors' in Math. Administration and Academic Coaches will monitor iready and district assessment data frequently and provide teacher feedback in a timely manner. The data monitoring and walk throughs will occur monthly. Persons Responsible: Principal-R. Ortiz, AP-T. Griffin, AP-N. O'Quinn, TOA-H. Noga, Coaches-K.Brown, J. Diallo, C. Zeidwig.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Amy O'Quinn (anoquinn@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Professional Learning and Collaborative Planning. The ESE team will collaborate with gen ed teachers through PLC's and grade level planning on teacher duty days to support interventions for students with learning needs. To improve achievement teachers will provide students with tools and strategies to organize themselves as well as new material; techniques to use while reading, writing, and doing math; and systematic steps to follow when working through a learning task or reflecting upon their own learning. Hattie's research focuses on studies which found that "all children benefited from this support; both those with and those without intellectual disabilities."
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	All teachers will be provided professional learning for students with disabilities. Specific content will be addressed to effectively increase achievement in this subgroup. Interventions for students with learning needs has an effect size of .77 (Hattie). Collaborative planning between classroom and resource teachers to effectively plan for instruction and intervention.

Action Steps to Implement

Monitoring of compliance documentation of providing services through Specially Designed Instruction.

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

Monitoring of small group instruction with fidelity to ensure all SWD students recieve required minutes of services correct accommodations.

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

Administration will monitor SWD and African American ESSA group data quarterly.

Person Responsible	Tonya Griffin (tngriffi@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Provide professional learning in the Focus Area of ELA, specifically addressing SWD population, during PLC's and ERPL's with a focus of small group instruction and remediation utilizing standards aligned district resources.

Person Responsible	Amy O'Quinn (anoquinn@volusia.k12.fl.us)

No description entered

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the 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.

DLE's has 12 out of school suspensions for the 20-21 school year which was down the previous school year as indicated by the data. DLE will implement PBIS strategies to reduce referrals. DLE will implement an incident tracking forms for classroom teachers to utilize. Admin will monitor discipline referrals bi weekly.

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.

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

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

Ms. Oritz, Principal, communicates clearly and effectively to parents and has an open-door policy to address questions and concerns. Mrs. Griffin and Mrs. O'Quinn, Assistant Principals, as well as Mrs. Noga, Teacher on Assignment, are instrumental in developing relationships with all students and families. Students and families are greeted daily by an administrator upon arrival. Administrators are visible in classrooms on a daily basis interacting with students and teachers, providing feedback and building relationships. Academic Coaches are deeply involved in professional learning to ensure classroom implementation and support teachers. Academic Coaches are also involved in creating worthwhile academic activities for family nights at DLE.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				$5,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
		140-Substitute Teachers	1811 - Deltona Lakes Elementary Schl	Other		$5,000.00
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA**				**$5,000.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
		140-Substitute Teachers	1811 - Deltona Lakes Elementary Schl	Other		$5,000.00
3	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities**				**$5,000.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
		140-Substitute Teachers	1811 - Deltona Lakes Elementary Schl	Other		$5,000.00
					Total:	**$15,000.00**