Deltona High School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Deltona High School

100 WOLF PACK RUN, Deltona, FL 32725

http://dhswolves.com/

Demographics

Principal: Michael Micallef

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
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)	98%
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: B (59%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: C (50%)
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 High School

100 WOLF PACK RUN, Deltona, FL 32725

http://dhswolves.com/

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 9-12	Yes	69%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	62%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	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 mission of Deltona High School is presented in Mr. Micallef's "The Big 4". The Big 4 are pillars illustrating the mission of all stakeholders at Deltona HS: informed data-driven decision making, providing equity through standards-aligned instruction, ensuring all students graduate in 4 years or less, and ensuring all students leave Deltona HS college and/or career ready.

Provide the school's vision statement.

"In an environment established with high expectations, tradition, and deep community ties, the staff of Deltona High School will foster relationships as we continue to persevere towards academic excellence."

As stated in all of Volusia County Schools:
"Through the individual commitment of all, our students will graduate with the knowledge, skills, and values necessary to be successful contributors to our democratic 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
Micallef, Michael	Principal	The Principal oversees all roles, responsibilities, and daily operations of the school.
Lapnow, Christina	Assistant Principal	Dr. Lapnow is the Data AP and oversees the master schedule, school counseling, and the ELA department.
KELLEHER, SUSAN	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Kelleher is the ESE AP and oversees all SWD, ELL, 504 needs of the school as well as student transportation.
Zarbo, Alisha	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Zarbo is the Curriculum AP and oversees the Science department, SIP/SAC, student and teacher technology, instructional expectations, and professional development on campus.
Baker, Jason	Instructional Coach	Instructional Coach who oversees the EOC tested areas of Biology and US History, while supporting both departments.
Meadows, Brandy	Administrative Support	Testing Coordinator and CTE Facilitator who assists with administrative tasks on campus daily.
Franks, Eugene	Dean	Mr. Franks is the Dean of Student Discipline and assists in various administrative tasks throughout campus on a daily basis.
Carson, Julia	Administrative Support	Cambridge/AICE Facilitator who assists with daily administrative tasks throughout campus.
Palmer, Adrienne	Graduation Coach	Reading Teacher and Graduation Assurance as well as other administrative tasks as assigned throughout the school day.
Chase, Michael	Teacher, K-12	Classroom teacher, who teaches all upper level math courses on campus (both Advanced Placement and Cambridge).
McElhaney, Samantha	Teacher, Career/ Technical	CTE teacher who assists with administrative tasks as assigned.
Robinson, Cameron	Assistant Principal	Mr. Robinson is the Discipline AP and also oversees the Social Studies department while ensuring athletics, activities, and facilities throughout campus.
Estelhomme, Donnette	School Counselor	School Counseling Director
Monk, Ashley	Math Coach	Instructional Coach who directly oversees the area of Math, while specifically supporting EOC Geometry teachers.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Hendricks, Sydney	Math Coach	Instructional Coach who directly oversees the area of Math, while specifically supporting EOC Algebra teachers.
Henderson, Heather	Instructional Coach	Instructional Coach who directly oversees the area of ELA, while specifically supporting 9th and 10th grade ELA teachers as well as Reading teachers.
D'Aversa, Amanda	Teacher, K-12	AVID Coordinator

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/1/2020, Michael Micallef

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
96

Total number of students enrolled at the school
1,713

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
10

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
23

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	401	344	300	242	1287
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	13	9	9	53
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	31	23	6	116
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	44	44	18	129
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	31	48	12	131
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96	94	61	35	286
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	75	47	25	230
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	48	23	3	129

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	95	90	73	23	281

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	21	29	14	7	71
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	19	13	11	55

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/5/2021

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	414	377	337	252	1380
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	57	45	19	150
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	38	46	30	144
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103	107	68	38	316
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89	84	54	27	254

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	81	97	67	28	273

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	24	41	24	2	91
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	26	18	7	67

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	414	377	337	252	1380
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	57	45	19	150
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	38	46	30	144
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103	107	68	38	316
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89	84	54	27	254

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	81	97	67	28	273

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	24	41	24	2	91
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	26	18	7	67

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				54%	52%	56%	44%	51%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				51%	49%	51%	52%	47%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42%	37%	42%	47%	37%	44%
Math Achievement				49%	48%	51%	44%	49%	51%
Math Learning Gains				60%	49%	48%	56%	50%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				52%	38%	45%	53%	44%	45%
Science Achievement				75%	76%	68%	70%	71%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				78%	69%	73%	70%	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	58%	51%	7%	55%	3%
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	44%	50%	-6%	53%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				

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	73%	72%	1%	67%	6%
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	76%	63%	13%	70%	6%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	23%	54%	-31%	61%	-38%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	58%	55%	3%	57%	1%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

VCS REA (Research, Evaluation, and Accountability) Office provided the below data based on state testing during the 2020-2021 school year.

In addition, Deltona HS will utilize DIA data, VLT data, and topic check data to progress monitor throughout the school year in ELA (9/10), Math (Alg/Geo), Biology, and US History to ensure proficiency. Appropriately identifying intervention and remediation plans for struggling students will be discussed in weekly PLC data chats.

Grade 9				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	556 / 46	626 / 47	332 /37
	Economically Disadvantaged	408 / 43	462 / 45	245 / 33
	Students With Disabilities	92 / 23	102 / 26	54 / 20
	English Language Learners	36 / 36	52 / 35	23 / 30
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	436 / 7	573 / 11	370 / 5
	Economically Disadvantaged	346 / 7	442 / 11	283 / 5
	Students With Disabilities	102 / 0	110 / 5	70 / 4
	English Language Learners	49 / 4	59 / 5	43 / 2
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	31 / 48	19 / 21	27 / 22
	Economically Disadvantaged	22 / 41	16 / 13	19 / 11
	Students With Disabilities	7 / 0	5 / 0	5 / 0
	English Language Learners	1 / 0	2 / 0	4 / 0
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			2 / 0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 10				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	438 / 39	281 / 30	513 / 53
	Economically Disadvantaged	301 / 35	202 / 29	360 / 49
	Students With Disabilities	67 / 19	45 / 0	82 / 26
	English Language Learners	34 / 21	25 / 0	48 / 27
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	81 / 1	172 / 4	83 / 0
	Economically Disadvantaged	60 / 0	125 / 2	60 / 0
	Students With Disabilities	10 / 0	21 / 0	11 / 0
	English Language Learners	6 / 0	12 / 8	5 / 0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	425 / 45	299 / 29	303 / 38
	Economically Disadvantaged	330 / 42	235 / 29	235 / 36
	Students With Disabilities	124 / 33	91 / 24	95 / 28
	English Language Learners	63 / 32	46 / 20	48 / 25
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	15 / 57	23 / 52	14 / 29
	Economically Disadvantaged	15 / 67	20 / 55	10 / 30
	Students With Disabilities	3 / 0	5 / 40	
	English Language Learners		1 / 0	

Grade 11				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	137 / 55	132 / 73	
	Economically Disadvantaged	101 / 53	97 / 72	
	Students With Disabilities	35 / 57	39 / 62	
	English Language Learners	27 / 30	13 / 69	
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	70 / 1	149 / 1	65 / 5
	Economically Disadvantaged	56 / 0	125 / 0	54 / 2
	Students With Disabilities	29 / 0	61 / 0	20 / 0
	English Language Learners	18 / 6	39 / 27	17 / 12
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	71 / 37	51 / 31	50 / 38
	Economically Disadvantaged	62 / 35	45 / 29	44 / 34
	Students With Disabilities	27 / 37	22 / 36	21 / 33
	English Language Learners	26 / 38	18 / 22	19 / 37
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	216 / 59	306 / 57	239 / 35
	Economically Disadvantaged	145 / 52	208 / 50	164 / 34
	Students With Disabilities	42 / 36	72 / 44	49 / 29
	English Language Learners	34 / 38	44 / 45	39 / 18

Grade 12				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	109 / 78	106 / 76	
	Economically Disadvantaged	87 / 82	81 / 77	
	Students With Disabilities	26 / 73	23 / 78	
	English Language Learners	15 / 80	12 / 67	
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	6 / 0	20 / 0	8 / 0
	Economically Disadvantaged	6 / 0	18 / 0	6 / 0
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 0	5 / 0	3 / 0
	English Language Learners	1 / 0	6 / 0	2 / 0
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	7 / 57	9 / 78	6 / 67
	Economically Disadvantaged	5 / 40	6 / 67	4 / 75
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

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	10	28	31	16	33	35	41	50		85	64
ELL	14	36	31	10	29	33	54	48		97	82
BLK	42	42	43	26	31	28	53	59		93	72
HSP	41	46	46	25	33	32	68	60		96	77
MUL	30	46	58	18	31		71				

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
WHT	59	51	35	31	33	37	67	83		92	71
FRL	43	45	41	25	30	32	63	62		93	73

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	23	40	39	29	49	33	39	61		73	16
ELL	23	38	30	27	50	36	45	48		52	31
ASN	92	54									
BLK	41	44	47	30	48	43	64	69		79	40
HSP	49	49	41	44	55	44	71	71		77	40
MUL	36	38		48	57		93				
WHT	64	57	38	62	66	76	81	88		90	54
FRL	47	48	40	46	59	48	72	76		79	39

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	19	38	35	26	55	52	38	43		76	19
ELL	11	48	54	29	42	43	35	48		52	57
BLK	31	48	45	31	60	65	64	52		65	35
HSP	38	54	47	40	48	29	58	61		74	47
MUL	41	45		53	70					86	33
WHT	53	51	48	53	61	67	80	84		82	56
FRL	39	51	45	40	54	54	65	64		74	45

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	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	57
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	592
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	94%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
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	45
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	49
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	53
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	42
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	56
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	51
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?

ELA and Math proficiency are two areas in which the school has repeatedly needed improvement. These areas of improvement have been the focal point for previous SIP's and will continue to be a driving force. A focus on ESSA sub-groups (specifically SWD and ELL) will continue to ensure compliance with fidelity which will in turn increase student achievement. US History and Biology continue to be areas of strength for Deltona HS.

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

Math and ELA proficiency; specifically Algebra and 9th grade ELA. ESSA ELL sub-group proficiency across all areas.

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

Ensuring that the proper teachers are placed where there will be the most impact on student achievement. As a Title 1 school, we are rich in Academic Coaches to guide the EOC tested areas, while ensuring proper data analysis and supports within the classroom setting on a daily basis.

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

Acceleration and Graduation Rate (lagging data) are the two areas where we saw tremendous growth.

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

Targeted acceleration monitoring by the CTE facilitator, College & Career Counselor and Data AP, weekly meetings with the acceleration team, after school and weekend "boot camps" for students to brush up on skills prior to taking an ICE, placing all students into an acceleration course, celebrating student success when earning an industry certification.

Graduation "tracker" was developed and was a shared document between the Senior School Counselor, Data AP, Data Clerk, Admin team, and Principal. This device served as the talking point during most meetings, while tracking gpa, acceleration opportunity, credits, etc. The graduation "tracker" is a more in depth tool that Project 10 and is updated weekly (minimally).

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

Implementation (with fidelity) the use of 4 instructional coaches (ELA, ALG, GEOM, BIO/USH) who will lead weekly PLC meetings and deep dive into the district assessment data at various points during the year. Support Facilitators will engage in weekly meetings with their core courses to ensure compliance for SWD while also looking at data for students on their case load. Open dialogue amongst all instructional staff is needed in order to move the needle and meet with proficiency.

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.

"Teacher Clarity" will be a focus for school-wide professional development on campus. A teacher clarity book study is planned, which will be led by the Instructional Coaches. Continually reflecting on district assessment data throughout the school year will lead to conversations ensuring the proper teachers are in the proper classrooms, and making changes as needed. New teacher support will be more in-depth and on-going through-out the school year.

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

Title 1 funding provides additional instructional coaches, which will better support the EOC tested areas, year-round. Use of a Parent Liaison (through Title 1 funding) to collaborate with parents and help them understand the importance of filing F/R applications to ensure personal financial savings as well as the additional resources available on campus to support student achievement. The administrative team will become active participants within weekly PLC's supporting their identified EOC area, engaging in data analysis and difficult conversations, while modeling effective teaching methods and strategies to improve student achievement.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	After reflection of the 2020-2021 school grade component data, trend data, ESSA data, and comparative district/state data, the school recorded a significant drop (21%) in Math achievement scores. During the 2018-2019 school year, 49% of students enrolled in Algebra or Geometry met with proficiency on the EOC. During the 2021-2022 school year the proficiency dropped to 28% overall.
Measurable Outcome:	The SLT has established that 50% proficiency is attainable if the proper teachers are in front of students, standards-aligned instruction is occurring on a daily basis and the additional supports of 2 math academic coaches are utilized (1 coach for ALG and 1 coach for GEOM). A 22% improvement from last year will be needed to reach 50% proficiency.
Monitoring:	A collaborative effort between the District Staff, School administrative team, Instructional Coaches, Teachers, and Students: Data analysis for all district assessments, early intervention, small group instruction for SWD and ELL students needing additional support in the classroom setting, common planning, on pace with curriculum map, and weekly PLC meetings. Administrative and district learning walks, teacher-specific feedback, district assessments, and progress monitoring will be additional supports utilized in the monitoring phase.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michael Micallef (mrmicall1@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teacher Clarity to include: common planning for all ALG and GEOM teachers, intensive PLC data-focused weekly meetings, standards aligned lesson planning, online learning enrichment opportunities
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Professional development on the continual implementation of Teacher Clarity (The Deltona Way). Common planning for ALG and GEOM teachers with regularly scheduled PLC meetings will allow for effective lesson planning and creation of common assessments. PLC's will focus on student data, promote standards aligned instruction, and utilize multiple data sources. Online learning tools (for enrichment or intervention) will continue to be utilized and available for all students to ensure proficiency.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Core and Support Facilitation teachers will actively engage in weekly PLC meetings where pacing of curriculum, common assessments, and student data will be discussed.
2. Academic coaches will push-in to ALG and GEOM classes daily to support standards-aligned instruction and provide support where needed.
3. Teachers, Academic Coaches, and Administrators will pull student data and analyze results to drive instruction and/or prepare for intervention as needed.
4. Professional development for all teachers on "Teacher Clarity" to ensure effective common academic language, alpha/numeric use of the academic standards, implementation of a daily bell ringer, posting of the learning target and success criteria using academic language and student-friendly language, and posting of the daily agenda.
5. Regular engagement with the district specialists to support the academic coaches, teachers, and school administration to ensure proper data analysis and next steps for ensuring proficiency.
6. Utilization of online learning platforms for all students.

Person Responsible	Michael Micallef (mrmicall1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	After reflection of the 2020-2021 school grade component data, trend data, ESSA data, and comparative district/state data, the school received a 6% drop in ELA 9/10 achievement scores. During the 2018-2019 school year, 54% of students enrolled in ELA 9/10 met with proficiency on the EOC. During the 2021-2022 school year the proficiency dropped to 48% overall.
Measurable Outcome:	The SLT has established that 55% proficiency is attainable if the proper teachers are in front of students, standards-aligned instruction is occurring on a daily basis and the additional support of a "new to DHS" literacy coach is utilized. A 7% improvement from last year will be needed to reach 55% proficiency.
Monitoring:	A collaborative effort between the District Staff, school administrative team, Instructional Coaches, Teachers, and Students: Data analysis for all district assessments, early intervention, small group instruction for SWD and ELL students needing additional support in the classroom setting, common planning, on pace with curriculum map, and weekly PLC meetings. Administrative and district learning walks, teacher-specific feedback, district assessments, and progress monitoring will be additional supports utilized in the monitoring phase.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Christina Lapnow (cllapnow@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teacher Clarity to include: common planning for all Literacy (ELA 9/10 and ELL 9/10) teachers, intensive PLC data-focused weekly meetings, standards aligned lesson planning, online learning enrichment opportunities.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Professional development on the continual implementation of Teacher Clarity (The Deltona Way). Common planning for ELA 9/10 and ELL 9/10 teachers with regularly scheduled PLC meetings will allow for effective lesson planning and creation of common assessments. PLC's will focus on student data, promote standards aligned instruction, and utilize multiple data sources. Online learning tools (for enrichment or intervention) will continue to be utilized and available for all students to ensure proficiency.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Core and Support Facilitation teachers will actively engage in weekly PLC meetings where pacing of curriculum, common assessments, and student data will be discussed.
2. Academic coaches will push-in to ELA 9/10 and ELL 9/10 classes daily to support standards-aligned instruction and provide support where needed.
3. Teachers, Academic Coaches, and Administrators will pull student data and analyze results to drive instruction and/or prepare for intervention.
4. Professional development for all teachers on "Teacher Clarity" to ensure effective common academic language, alpha/numeric use of the academic standards, implementation of a daily bell ringer, posting of the learning target and success criteria using academic language and student-friendly language, and posting of the daily agenda.
5. Regular engagement with the district specialists to support the academic coaches, teachers, and school administration to ensure proper data analysis and next steps for ensuring proficiency.
6. Utilization of online learning platforms for all students.

Person Responsible   Christina Lapnow (cllapnow@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	A school-wide effort to increase proficiency for our ELL and SWD subgroups, as ESSA data from the 2020-2021 school year indicated that these were areas of growth (specifically in ELL). The team has decided that in addition to ELL supports, we should also place an emphasis on our SWD subgroup as they too can quickly drop if additional supports are not in place and monitored. Based on current data, only 38% of ELL students met with proficiency and only 41% of SWD met with proficiency.
Measurable Outcome:	The SLT has established that 50% proficiency is attainable if the proper teachers are in front of students, standards-aligned instruction is occurring on a daily basis and the additional supports of academic coaches are utilized in addition to Support Facilitators and ELL Paraprofessionals. A 12% improvement in ELL students and a 9% improvement in SWD students is needed to achieve the 50% goal. Although this goal is specifically identified for students currently identified as ELL and SWD, a school-wide effort is in place to ensure the same supports for students with suspected disabilities as well as students with any language deficiency.
Monitoring:	A collaborative effort between the District Staff, the School administrative team, Instructional Coaches, Paraprofessionals, Teachers, and Students: Data analysis for all district assessments, early intervention, small group instruction for SWD and ELL students needing additional support in the classroom setting, common planning, on pace with curriculum map, and weekly PLC meetings. Administrative and district learning walks, teacher-specific feedback, district assessments, and progress monitoring will be additional supports utilized in the ESSA sub-groups monitoring phase.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	SUSAN KELLEHER (slkelleh@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teacher Clarity to include: common planning with Core/SWD/ELL teachers, intensive PLC data-focused weekly meetings, standards aligned lesson planning, online learning enrichment opportunities.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Professional development on the continual implementation of Teacher Clarity (The Deltona Way). Common planning for Core/SWD/ELL teachers with regularly scheduled PLC meetings will allow for effective lesson planning and creation of common assessments. PLC's will focus on student data, promote standards aligned instruction, and utilize multiple data sources. Online learning tools (for enrichment or intervention) will continue to be utilized and available for all students to ensure proficiency.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Core/SWD/ELL teachers will actively engage in weekly PLC meetings where pacing of curriculum, common assessments, and student data will be discussed (including SWD/ELL accommodations).
2. Academic coaches will push-in to classes daily to support standards-aligned instruction and provide support.
3. Teachers, Academic Coaches, and Administrators will pull student data and analyze results to drive instruction and/or prepare for intervention.
4. PD on "Teacher Clarity" to ensure effective common academic language, alpha/numeric use of academic standards, implementation of daily bell ringer, posting of learning target and success criteria using academic language and student-friendly language, and posting of daily agenda.
5. PD on effective SWD/ELL instructional strategies.
6. Regular engagement with district specialists to support academic coaches, teachers, and school administration to ensure proper data analysis and next steps for ensuring proficiency.

7. Utilization of online learning platforms for all students.
8. Ensuring self-advocacy for SWD/ELL students and their allowable accommodations.

Person Responsible   SUSAN KELLEHER (slkelleh@volusia.k12.fl.us)

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.

Based on 2019 data, being ranked #396/505 high schools across the State of Florida, Deltona HS is in the HIGH category overall. DHS ranks 5th out of 10 Volusia County high schools. Campus Disruptions (fighting), Tobacco, and Drug Use/Possession are areas in which we recorded high incidence. DHS also tallied a high suspension rate compared to other schools across the state and district. To ensure a safer school for the 2021-2022 school year, DHS must ensure proper supervision on campus at all times, including before school, during class change, at lunch, and after school. By staff members being present at their supervision posts, often times it will deter inappropriate things from occurring on any given campus. Hosting grade level meetings, where the discipline office lays out their expectations for student success, and also enforcing the expectations with fidelity across campus will lead to less incidences. Building a rapport with students and setting the tone for how they are to act as young adults is imperative to building a climate and culture that puts learning at the forefront and ensures the safety of all individuals on campus. Effective use of the School Guardian and SRD will enhance the security of the campus.

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 HS will focus on the mission at hand, under the leadership of Mr. Micallef, "The Big 4" pillars of academic success, and will enforce the mission of "The Deltona Way". Teachers will be visible on campus at the classroom doors during class change, welcoming students. Posters will be displayed throughout campus of "The Big 4" and "The Deltona Way" in addition to school culture signage strategically placed throughout campus. DHS will continue it's social media presence (Twitter and Facebook) and post/share all happenings on the campus (encouraging re-tweeting, sharing, etc as necessary). The school website will be all-inclusive and update stakeholders regularly, including specific grad elevel information, safety and

security general information, the bell schedule, recorded events as they occur on campus, parent nights, Title 1 updates, F/R lunch applications, etc. Input from all stakeholders will occur through optional faculty/ staff "input meetings", student leadership groups, SAC, business partners, Town Hall events, Title 1 meetings, etc. Community partnerships and business partner recognition programs will continue through the school banner project (also known as the Howland Blvd project). Parent Nights will be scheduled throughout the year for Cambridge, Career Academies, Open House, and Athletics. Quarterly recognition awards for students to include Wolf, Athlete, Citizen, and Scholar. Monthly faculty/staff recognition awards to include: New Wolf, Classroom, Teacher, and Staff. Alma Mater Friday's (singing the alma mater over the PA during the morning announcements) and School Spirit Attire Friday's will continue as we try to build upon tradition and focus on our mission. #VansFriday will be a continued tradition. Safety and Security, College & Career Readiness, Graduation in 4 years or less, and Commitment to data-driven decisions are all focus areas in the success of the school.

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

Mike Micallef, Principal - Day to Day operations of the school
Susan Kelleher, Assistant Principal - supporting the SWD, ELL, 504 students and staff
Christina Lapnow, Assistant Principal - supporting the ELA team
Cameron Robinson, Assistant Principal - supporting the US History team
Alisha Zarbo, Assistant Principal - supporting the Biology team
Gene Franks, Dean - supporting the safety and security of campus
Brandy Meadows, CTE Facilitator/Testing Coordinator
Julia Carson, Cambridge Facilitator - supporting the high-achieving students
Adrienne Palmer, Teacher & Graduation Assurance - supporting the Seniors towards graduation
Gary Meadows, Athletic Director - supporting the student athletes
TBD, Activities Director - supporting the clubs and groups and student activities
Bethany Smith, Media Specialist - supporting the student and teacher technology needs
Heather Henderson, Literacy Coach - supporting the ELA team
Sydney Hendricks, Math Coach - supporting the ALG team
Ashley Monk, Math Coach - supporting the GEOM team
Jason Baker, Biology/US History Coach - supporting the BIO and USH teams
Amanda D'Aversa, AVID Coordinator - supporting college & career readiness
Donnette Estelhomme, School Counseling Director - supporting all students mental and physical wellbeing
Amanda Forsythe, Clerk - supporting the school staff and families
Marci Hair, Parent Liaison - supporting the parents/guardians
Jeremiah Holmes, Campus Advisor - supporting student safety and security
Hjalmar Suarez, Campus Advisor - supporting student safety and security
Aaron Hayes, Campus Advisor - supporting student safety & security
Glenda Bowman, Campus Advisor - supporting student safety and security
Teacher of the Year (Past and Present) - supporting faculty members
Ruben Colon, School Board Member - D5 - supporting the needs of the entire school
School Advisory Council (SAC) - supporting the decision-making on campus
Alumni - supporting the past, present, and future of the school

All teachers (instructional and non-instructional), paraprofessionals, support staff, custodial, School Way Cafe, etc are instrumental figures in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school on a daily basis.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00