

Volusia County Schools

# Deltona High School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Deltona High School

100 WOLF PACK RUN, Deltona, FL 32725

<http://dhsolves.com/>

## Demographics

**Principal: Michael Micallef**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	98%
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: B (60%) 2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: B (56%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Deltona High School

100 WOLF PACK RUN, Deltona, FL 32725

<http://dhsolves.com/>

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">High School 9-12</p>	<p><b>2021-22 Title I School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p><b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">98%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">65%</p>

## School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
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**

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Micallef, Michael	Principal	The Principal oversees all roles, responsibilities, and daily operations of the school.
Zarbo, Alisha	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Zarbo is the Curriculum AP and oversees the Science department, SIP/SAC, Title 1 federal funding, instructional expectations, and professional development on campus.
Lapnow, Christina	Assistant Principal	Dr. Lapnow is the Data AP and oversees the master schedule, school counseling, and the ELA department.
Franks, Eugene	Assistant Principal	Mr. Franks is the Discipline/Facilities AP who oversees the Social Studies department, works closely with the Activities Director, and is the primary contact for MTSS.
Meadows, Brandy	Administrative Support	Brandy is the school's Testing Coordinator who assists with various administrative duties on campus daily.
Baker, Jason	Instructional Coach	Jason oversees the EOC tested area of Biology while also supporting the entire Science department with instructional design, classroom management, and professional development.
Henderson, Heather	Instructional Coach	Heather oversees the EOC tested areas of ELA/Literacy while also supporting the entire Literacy department with instructional design, classroom management, and professional development.
Hendricks, Sydney	Math Coach	Sydney oversees the EOC tested area of Algebra while also supporting the entire Math department with instructional design, classroom management, and professional development.
McElhaney, Samantha	Teacher, Career/ Technical	Samantha is a CTE teacher who assists with various administrative tasks as assigned on campus.
D'Aversa, Amanda	Teacher, K-12	Amanda is the AVID Coordinator on campus.
Mitchell, Karen	Assistant Principal	Ms. Mitchell is the ESE AP and oversees all SWD, ELL, 504 needs of the school as well as student transportation.
Wallace, Rebecca	Math Coach	Rebecca oversees the EOC tested area of Geometry while also supporting the entire Math department with instructional design, classroom management, and professional development.



Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Smith, Keith	Instructional Coach	Keith oversees the EOC tested area of US History while also supporting the entire Social Studies department with instructional design, classroom management, and professional development.
Mollo, Jennifer	Administrative Support	Cambridge/AICE Facilitator who assists with daily administrative tasks throughout campus.
Strople, Elizabeth	Dean	Ms. Strople is the Dean of Student Discipline and assists in various administrative tasks throughout campus on a daily basis. She also serves as our MTSS point of contact and chairperson.
Vosburg, Lauren	School Counselor	School Counselor who oversees the College & Career program on campus.
Smith, Bethany	Instructional Media	Bethany runs the day to day operations of our Learning Commons, while also assisting with our New Teacher program, Faculty/Staff/ Student celebrations, and professional development on campus.
Schmidt, Robert &quot;Mike&quot;	Administrative Support	Assist school counseling and administration as needed with various tasks during the day; including 1 on 1 sessions with students.
Carlisle, Cecile	Teacher, Career/ Technical	CTE teacher pursuing Educational Leadership degree.
Brennan, Joseph	Teacher, K-12	Current Teacher of the Year.
Hair, Marci	Parent Engagement Liaison	Marci serves as our Title 1 Parent Liaison helping our leadership team in various capacities throughout campus, while also being our direct link for parent and student engagement events during the year.

**Demographic Information**

**Principal start date**

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Michael Micallef

**Number of teachers with a 2022 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 2022 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**

103

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

1,754

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

12

**Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.**

22

**Demographic Data**

**Early Warning Systems**

**Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	467	465	428	393	1753
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	131	132	80	135	478
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114	82	55	44	295
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	20	18	31	97
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	27	30	20	132
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	190	145	107	92	534
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	190	114	80	70	454
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	24	16	13	68

**Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	166	123	84	89	462

**Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":**

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	41	63	21	0	125
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	33	18	5	82

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Wednesday 7/27/2022

**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	401	344	300	242	1287
Attendance below 90 percent	0	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	0	56	31	23	6	116
Course failure in ELA	0	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	0	40	31	48	12	131
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	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	0	83	75	47	25	230
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	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	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	0	21	29	14	7	71
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	19	13	11	55

**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	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

**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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	49%	46%	51%				54%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	55%						51%	49%	51%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	51%						42%	37%	42%
Math Achievement	39%	33%	38%				49%	48%	51%
Math Learning Gains	46%						60%	49%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47%						52%	38%	45%
Science Achievement	70%	30%	40%				75%	76%	68%
Social Studies Achievement	60%	40%	48%				78%	69%	73%

**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

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
2022					
2019	73%	72%	1%	67%	6%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	76%	63%	13%	70%	6%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	23%	54%	-31%	61%	-38%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	58%	55%	3%	57%	1%

## Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	15	42	43	37	43	39	44	31		94	72
ELL	22	49	59	25	39	35	45	27		97	93
BLK	47	60	55	34	42	40	65	53		95	97
HSP	46	54	49	32	42	37	66	52		97	86
MUL	35	54	62	63	75		65	67		92	92
WHT	53	55	48	46	51	61	77	72		98	94
FRL	44	54	52	37	45	47	65	55		96	89
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				
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

## ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	47
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	651

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98%
<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	45
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	49
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Native American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Asian Students</b>	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	59
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	55
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	67
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	66
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	58
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### 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. Additionally, support is needed for Social Studies after this years data release of school grades. These areas of improvement have been the focal point for previous SIP's and will continue to be a driving force, with the addition of Social Studies for the 22-23 school year. A focus on ESSA sub-groups (specifically SWD and ELL) will continue to ensure compliance with fidelity which will in turn increase student achievement. Biology, Acceleration and Graduation Rate continue to be areas of strength for Deltona HS.

**What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?**

Math (Algebra and Geometry), ELA (9th and 10th), and US History proficiency. The SWD and ELL subgroups will continue to have added supports to ensure proficiency and learning gains although it is above the 40% state threshold.

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

Although we led the district in various components of school accountability, we certainly deem that improvement is needed when EOC tested areas are meeting with only 39% (Math) and 49% (ELA)



proficiency. There is no reason why we should not be able to meet with at least 60% proficiency in the Math and ELA areas with additional district support, school-based academic coaches, and targeted intervention and remediation plans for each student. 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 or fill-in when there are teacher shortages, while ensuring proper data analysis and supports within the classroom setting on a daily basis. A factor that led to our decline in US History was a single teacher who was "teaching to the test" during DIAs and when it came time for the EOC, the students in that teachers sections were not as prepared or knowledgeable; as they could not be "taught the test". Specific conversations were had with that teacher throughout the 21-22 school year when it was noticed during data analysis that the specific teacher was far exceeding the school and district proficiency most of the time, along with district conversation and data analysis, which in turn identified what was perceived throughout the year: teaching to the district assessments. Continued academic coaching and data analysis of each interim assessment is critical to improvement (proficiency).

**What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?**

Acceleration and Graduation Rate (lagging data) are the two areas where we saw significant growth and where we will continue our focus of our students leaving DHS College & Career ready.

**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).

StockTake was a pilot program at our school for the 21-22 school year. All discussions during StockTake were centered around our SIP goals where multiple stakeholders came to the table with various school and district supports providing input.

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

Implementation (with fidelity) the use of 5 instructional coaches (ELA, ALG, GEOM, BIO, and USH) who will lead weekly PLC meetings and deep dive into the district assessment data at various points during the year, while also serving as classroom teachers during the teacher shortage we are experiencing. Support Facilitators will engage in weekly meetings with their core courses to ensure compliance for SWD while also looking at data and sharing strategies for students on their case load. Open dialogue amongst all instructional staff is needed in order to move the needle and meet the proficiency goals.

**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 continued focus for school-wide professional development on campus. A teacher clarity book study will continue, which will be led by the Instructional Coaches and various teacher leaders on campus. 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. Faculty meetings will focus on celebrations and will incorporate a classroom technology/ management/instructional practice where teachers will have voice and choice in their attended topics. An in-depth PD plan has been developed allowing teachers voice and choice and encouraging teacher leaders on campus to come forward and present on their areas of expertise. Topics for our school-based PD include: "On the Road to Engagement", "Ditching the Dictionary", "Shifting the Academic Struggle", "Cultivating Classroom Questioning", "What Would Disney Do (Classroom Management)", "Power Up - Teaching with Technology", "Falling in Love with Student Talk", "Batter Up - Out of the Park Testing Prep", etc.

**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 parent engagement 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. The StockTake process will dive deep into discussions focused on our SIP areas of focus which are aligned to the district's strategic plan.

**Areas of Focus**

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**

**Area of Focus**  
**Description and Rationale:**  
**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

After reflection of the 2021-2022 school grade component data, trend data, ESSA data, and comparative district/state data, the school recorded an increase in Math achievement scores (from 28% to 39% - an 11% growth). During the 2018-2019 school year, 49% of students enrolled in Algebra or Geometry met with proficiency on the EOC, so we are slowly returning to pre-COVID data and performance.

**Measurable Outcome:**  
**State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**

The SLT has established that 50% proficiency in Algebra and 55% proficiency in Geometry is attainable if the proper teachers are in front of students, standards-aligned instruction and progress monitoring 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). An 11% improvement from last year will be needed to reach 50% and 55% proficiency respectively.

**Monitoring:**  
**Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**

A collaborative effort between the District Staff, School Administrative Team, Instructional Coaches, Teachers, Students and Families:  
 Data analysis for all district assessments, early intervention through progress monitoring, small group instruction for SWD and ELL students (including 15 migrant students) needing additional support in the classroom setting, common planning, maintaining pace with curriculum maps, and weekly data-driven 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:**  
**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

Teacher Clarity to include: common planning for all ALG and GEOM teachers, intensive PLC data-focused weekly meetings, standards aligned lesson planning, and online learning enrichment opportunities utilizing KHAN Academy.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**  
**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the**

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 and learning strategies to support all students. 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.

**resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

ALG team will engage in weekly PLC Meetings where the Academic Coach will facilitate teachers and administration through understanding the new benchmarks and standards-aligned instructional materials using teacher clarity.

**Person Responsible** Sydney Hendricks (smhendri@volusia.k12.fl.us)

GEOM team will engage in weekly PLC Meetings where the Academic Coach will facilitate teachers and administration through understanding the new benchmarks and standards-aligned instructional materials using teacher clarity.

**Person Responsible** Rebecca Wallace (rawallac@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Utilize student data (diagnostic, formative, and summative) to drive standards-aligned instruction and prepare intervention strategies and techniques while creating goals through individual student data chats.

**Person Responsible** Sydney Hendricks (smhendri@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Incorporate content-specific reading and comprehension strategies, including vocabulary, to enhance instruction and provide all students with necessary supports and access to terminology related to the subject area.

**Person Responsible** Heather Henderson (hhhender@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Implementation of AVID strategies (note-taking, time on-task, WICOR, and test-taking) to foster individual student academic success in both ALG and GEOM.

**Person Responsible** Amanda D'Aversa (aldavers@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA****Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

After reflection of the 2021-2022 school grade component data, trend data, ESSA data, and comparative district/state data, the school recorded a 1% increase in ELA 9/10 achievement (proficiency) scores (from 48% to 49% - a 1 % growth). During the 2018-2019 school year, 54% of students enrolled in ELA 9/10 met with proficiency on the EOC (pre-COVID data). During the 2021-2022 school year the proficiency dropped to 48% overall.

**Measurable****Outcome:**

**State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**

The SLT has established that 55% proficiency is attainable for both ELA-9 and ELA-10 if the proper teachers are in front of students, standards-aligned instruction is occurring on a daily basis and the added support of a literacy coach is utilized. A 6% improvement from last year will be needed to reach 55% proficiency.

**Monitoring:**

**Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**

A collaborative effort between the District Staff, School Administrative Team, Instructional Coach, Teachers, Students and Families:

Data analysis for all district assessments, early intervention, small group instruction for SWD and ELL students (including 15 migrant 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:**

**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

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, and online learning enrichment opportunities through KHAN Academy.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria**

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 performance 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.

**used for selecting this strategy.**

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Implementation of AVID strategies (note-taking, time on-task, WICOR, and test-taking) to foster individual student academic success in both ELA-9 and ELA-10.

**Person Responsible** Amanda D'Aversa (aldavers@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Incorporate content-specific reading and comprehension strategies, including vocabulary, to enhance instruction and provide all students with necessary supports and access to terminology related to the subject area.

**Person Responsible** Heather Henderson (hhhender@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Core and Support Facilitation teachers attend weekly data-driven PLC meetings to aid in instructional design and strategies to support student achievement.

**Person Responsible** Heather Henderson (hhhender@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Literacy Coach to "push-in" to 9th and 10th grade classrooms daily to support standards-aligned instruction and provide feedback.

**Person Responsible** Heather Henderson (hhhender@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Individual data chats with students to help students understand where they are and where they need to be, based on academic performance data.

**Person Responsible** Heather Henderson (hhhender@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies****Area of Focus****Description and****Rationale:**

**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

After reflection of the 2020-2021 school grade component data, trend data, ESSA data, and comparative district/state data, the school recorded an 8% drop in proficiency on the US History EOC. During the 2018-2019 school year, 78% of students enrolled in US History met with proficiency on the EOC (pre-COVID). During the 2021-2022 school year the proficiency dropped to 60% overall.

**Measurable****Outcome:**

**State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**

The SLT has established that 72% 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 US History Academic Coach is utilized. A 12% improvement from last year will be needed to reach 72% proficiency for the 22-23 school year.

**Monitoring:**

**Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**

A collaborative effort between the District Staff, School Administrative Team, Instructional Coach, Teachers, Students and Families:

Data analysis for all district assessments, early intervention, small group instruction for SWD and ELL students (including 15 migrant 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:**

Eugene Franks (erfranks@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

Teacher Clarity to include: common planning for all US History teachers, intensive PLC data-focused weekly meetings, standards aligned lesson planning, online learning enrichment opportunities through KHAN Academy.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria**

Professional development on the continual implementation of Teacher Clarity (The Deltona Way). Common planning for US History 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 through KHAN Academy.

**used for selecting this strategy.**

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Core and Support Facilitation will actively engage in weekly PLC meetings with the Administrative Team.

**Person Responsible** Keith Smith (ksmith1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Academic Coach will push-in to US History classrooms daily to support standards-aligned instructional design and provide strategies to support student academic performance. Administrator to push-in bi-weekly.

**Person Responsible** Keith Smith (ksmith1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

PD and Implementation of AVID strategies (note-taking, time on-task, WICOR, use of primary source documents, and test-taking) to foster individual student academic success in both ELA-9 and ELA-10.

**Person Responsible** Amanda D'Aversa (aldavers@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Individual student data analysis to drive remediation/intervention instruction by Teachers, Academic Coach and Administration.

**Person Responsible** Keith Smith (ksmith1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**RAISE**

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale**

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

**Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA**



N/A

**Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA**

N/A

**Measurable Outcomes:**

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

**Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)**

N/A

**Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)**

N/A

**Monitoring:**

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

N/A

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

**Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

N/A

**Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

N/A

**Action Steps to Implement:**

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
-------------	-----------------------------------

N/A

**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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

**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 level 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 school culture and environment.**

Mike Micallef, Principal - Day to Day operations of the school  
 Karen Mitchell, Assistant Principal - supporting the SWD, ELL, 504 students and staff  
 Christina Lapnow, Assistant Principal - supporting the ELA team  
 Gene Franks, Assistant Principal - supporting the US History team  
 Alisha Zarbo, Assistant Principal - supporting the Biology team  
 Liz Strople, Dean - supporting the safety and security of campus  
 Brandy Meadows, Testing Coordinator  
 Jennifer Mollo, Cambridge Facilitator - supporting the high-achieving students  
 Mike Schmidt - supporting students as the SEL TOA  
 Kevin Jackson, Athletic Director - supporting the student athletes  
 Jennifer Protinick, 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 and Math team  
 Rebecca Wallace, Math Coach - supporting the GEOM and Math team  
 Jason Baker, Biology Coach - supporting the BIO and Science teams  
 Keith Smith, US History Coach - supporting the US History teams  
 Amanda D'Aversa, AVID Coordinator - supporting college & career readiness  
 Lauren Vosburg, School Counseling - supporting all students mental and physical wellbeing  
 Krissy Catalano, 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 Crew, School Way Cafe, etc are instrumental figures in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school on a daily basis.