Deland High School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Deland High School

800 N HILL AVE, Deland, FL 32724

http://www.delandhs.org/

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Volusia County School Board on 10/31/2023.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Degirolmo, Mike	Principal	Principal
McClarty, Kellie	Assistant Principal	Currriculum and Instruction
Vega, Issella	Assistant Principal	Instruction and Assessment
Battaglino, Kathryn	Instructional Coach	Literacy Coach/Technology Leader
Bradham, Mark	Assistant Principal	Safety and Security
Pio, Courtney	Instructional Coach	Mathematics Coach
Nehrig, Lisa	Other	IB/CTE Coordinator
D'Aquino, Kristen	Teacher, K-12	Intervention Teacher
Goddard, Brian	Assistant Principal	ESE
Lucero, Mike	Assistant Principal	Data and Master Scheduling
Judson, Lindsay	Teacher, K-12	Teacher on Assignment/ESE

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and
school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or
community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required
stakeholders.

The development of the DeLand High SIP began at the end of the 2022-2023 school year. Teachers,
parents, students, families, and business partners were surveyed about the culture and climate of
DeLand High School. In additional to a global survey of our stakeholders the school also held school
leadership team meetings over the summer with key contributors to reflect on goals from the 2022-2023
school year, review EOC data and to develop goals for the 2023-2024. School Improvement goals from
2022-2023 included a focus on the B.E.S.T. standards, differentiation for students with disabilities (SWD)
and English language learners (ELL), and building a positive culture and environment. The team
determined based on the data and climate surveys that we will continue to focus on differentiation for the
two ESSA subgroups (SWD and ELL) and building a positive culture and environment. The team
discussed deepening our focus on standards alignment to include all of our courses on campus by
creating a goal on engagement. The goal on engagement will be focused on 4 key components; aligning
the lesson to the standard, aligning the task to the standard, embedding planned questions into
instruction, and verifying student learning through purposeful collaborative structures.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Our SIP plan will be regularly monitored through our school based Stocktake process. Stocktake is our intentional plan and process for reviewing data and creating action plans and specific steps to address learning gaps and barriers to reaching our SIP goals. The Stocktake team will meet bi-weekly informally to track data and goals and formally once at the end of the 1st semester to review to synthesize the data and determine how our plan needs to be revised and what steps we will need to take to meet our goals. The following data will be used to review progress toward our goals during these meetings:
- classroom visits with monitoring form that will track trends across campus
- common planning/PLC
- implementation of professional learning specific to our goals
- quarterly staff feedback
- monthly SLT meetings with teacher leaders
- student input surveys/focus groups

Demographic Data Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School PK, 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	48%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	90%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: I 2018-19: C 2017-18: C

School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	789
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	286
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	665
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	436
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	781
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	546
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	222

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	855

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	220
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	123

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

(Column header row for Grade Level spans K–8)

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	43	44	50	47	46	51	46		
ELA Learning Gains				47			45		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				30			37		
Math Achievement*	34	28	38	32	33	38	27		
Math Learning Gains				46			34		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				47			37		
Science Achievement*	66	68	64	63	30	40	64		
Social Studies Achievement*	56	59	66	59	40	48	63		
Middle School Acceleration					43	44			
Graduation Rate	93	90	89	96	65	61	91		
College and Career Acceleration	58	65	65	77	62	67	47		
ELP Progress	49	44	45	47			61		

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	399
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	95
Graduation Rate	93

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	591
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	92
Graduation Rate	96

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	36	Yes	4	
ELL	36	Yes	3	
AMI				
ASN	71			
BLK	46			
HSP	47			
MUL	63			
PAC				
WHT	67			

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	49			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	38	Yes	3	
ELL	37	Yes	2	
AMI				
ASN	74			
BLK	48			
HSP	48			
MUL	59			
PAC				
WHT	61			
FRL	49			

Accountability Components by Subgroup
Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	43			34			66	56		93	58	49
SWD	20			16			32	34		22	6	
ELL	9			10			26	27		33	7	49
AMI												
ASN	70			29			82			73	5	
BLK	34			19			47	51		36	6	
HSP	26			24			47	48		48	7	44
MUL	39			33			76	71		64	6	

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	54			47			78	62		68	6	
FRL	32			25			54	47		44	7	52

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	47	47	30	32	46	47	63	59		96	77	47
SWD	17	35	27	17	36	43	24	41		93	51	
ELL	6	24	21	14	39	48	23	24		100	56	47
AMI												
ASN	63	70		50	55		88			100	89	
BLK	31	43	33	25	47	51	47	43		93	64	
HSP	35	37	27	23	41	44	54	49		97	68	52
MUL	41	40		41	58		53			100	79	
PAC												
WHT	56	52	31	42	48	50	76	76		95	83	
FRL	35	40	29	26	44	48	54	55		95	69	45

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	46	45	37	27	34	37	64	63		91	47	61
SWD	14	30	33	15	31	34	42	34		91	8	
ELL	5	31	35	6	35	46	23	33		92	6	61
AMI												
ASN	80	71					77			100	88	
BLK	27	44	43	15	32	26	61	46		82	28	
HSP	32	40	30	20	37	44	48	56		93	32	60
MUL	42	45		18	23		57			94	44	
PAC												
WHT	56	47	41	36	32	37	72	71		92	58	
FRL	35	42	34	22	32	35	55	57		88	34	63

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.
The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
10	2023 - Spring	43%	45%	-2%	50%	-7%
09	2023 - Spring	44%	44%	0%	48%	-4%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	22%	32%	-10%	50%	-28%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	36%	39%	-3%	48%	-12%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	64%	65%	-1%	63%	1%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	56%	57%	-1%	63%	-7%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The data component that showed the lowest performance was the Algebra 1 EOC. Overall 30% of students were proficient on the exam. This is a 6% increase from the 2021-2022 school year but is below the state average by 6%. Last year new instructional materials and standards were rolled out and teacher/students were working through shifts in learning new resources and navigating new standards. The heavy lift last year instructionally for the Algebra 1 team was building all new tasks aligned to benchmarks and connected to assessments.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

The data component that showed the greatest decline last year was our college and career acceleration rate. In 2021-2022 our acceleration rate was a 77% in 2022-2023 our rate dropped to 57%, a 20% decrease. This was due to inability to hire a qualified candidate needed to prepare students for the industry certification assessment combined with an effort to help students at risk of not graduating prioritize classes they would need for graduation.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The data component that had the greatest gap compared to the state average was the 10th Grade ELA state assessment (F.A.S.T.). DeLand high students achieved 43% mastery on the assessment which was 7% below the state average. Last year a new state test and platform was released. In addition to a new a state assessment, new district assessments were also released. Teachers and students were working toward calibrating with new district and state assessments as well as learning the new benchmarks. Aligning instruction with the new district assessments, state assessment, and benchmarks was difficult for teachers to navigate.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The data component that showed the most improvement was our Alg 1 EOC data. Overall 30% of students were proficient an increase of 6% points from the prior year. The Algebra team worked purposefully in PLC to align instruction and tasks to the benchmark. They used to classroom data to design review and remediation specific to standards students struggled with and planned with purpose to make those reviews engaging for students.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

In the 2022-2023 school year one potential area of concern is attendance. 751 of students were in attendance less than 90% of the time. 41% of those 751 students were 9th grade students. Another potential area of concern is 14% of DeLand High students had one or more suspensions in the 2022-2023 school year. 77% of those suspensions were 9th and 10th graders.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

Our 4 areas of highest priority for the 2023-2024 school year are:
1. Creating a positive culture and climate for students to improve attendance.
2. Refining instructional practices that create engaging classrooms that are highly focused on the standards and shifting the thinking to students across all subject areas.
3. Differentiating learning for students with disabilities and English Language Learners.
4. Creating opportunities for students to engage in career and college ready programs early in their high school career.

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Based on the analysis of the needs assessment and review of school, district, and state data it was determined that we need to increase student achievement in all core content areas. The data component that had the greatest gap compared to the state average was the 10th Grade ELA state assessment (F.A.S.T.). DeLand high students ELA students achieved 43% mastery on the assessment which was 7% below the state average. Our Algebra 1 EOC data increased 6% percentage points but was still below the state average by 6% percentage points. The US History EOC data decreased this year by 9% percentage points to an overall student proficiency of 57%. Science scores (65% proficiency) though above the state average decreased 1% percentage point from the prior year. In order to increase student proficiency in core content areas we will define highly engaged classrooms as instruction that is:
- aligned to the benchmarks and intended learning targets
- includes tasks that are aligned to the benchmarks and intended learning targets
- incorporates planned questions that monitor student learning
- embeds collaborative structures for students that allows them to process their learning.

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

90% of teachers will provide instruction and tasks aligned to the benchmarks as evidenced by weekly classroom walkthroughs and will result in increased student proficiency.

80% of teachers will utilize planned questions to monitor student learning as evidenced by weekly classroom walkthroughs and will result in increased student engagement and mastery of the benchmarks.

80% of teachers will implement collaborative structures in the classroom allowing students to process their learning as evidenced by weekly classroom walkthroughs and will result in increased student engagement and deeper knowledge of the benchmarks.

Additionally student progress toward the benchmarks will be monitored with district based assessments and students will score at a proficiency of 47% or higher in ELA grade 9, 46% or higher in ELA grade 10, 36% or higher in Algebra 1, 40% or higher in Geometry, 63 or higher in US History, and 67% or higher in Biology.

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

The instructional practice specifically related to engagement will be monitored by the following:
- Instructional Rounds focused on the 4 look fors of engagement (administration, coaches, teacher teams)
- Review of Assessment Data/Data Chats (administration, coaches, teacher teams)
- PLC Meetings

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kellie McClarty (kmcclart@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The evidence based strategies that will be implemented for this area of focus on engagement are:
Benchmark Alignment- Teacher provides explicit instruction aligned to the benchmark and intended learning.

Task Alignment- Teacher provides task aligned to the benchmark and intended learning, Questioning- Teacher asks questions to deepen understanding of the intended learning. Collaborative Structures- Teacher provides students with the opportunities to collaborate.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Implementing these engagement strategies will streamline learning to be focused on what students need to know to get to the depth of the standard and then monitoring that learning through questioning and collaborative structures to understand what student are learning and still need to learn.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Training on the 4 Engagement Look Fors- with Teacher Leaders

Person Responsible: Mike Degirolmo (mjdegiro@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: August 2023

Administrative team provides feedback on implementation of 4 Engagement Look Fors. Monthly in PLC.

Person Responsible: Mike Degirolmo (mjdegiro@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing 2023-2024 School Year

Learning Walks for Teachers to observe 4 Engagement Look Fors.

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

By When: September and October

Professional Learning Sessions on the 4 Engagement Look Fors.

Person Responsible: Kellie McClarty (kmcclart@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: October 18, December 6, January 24, March 13

Implementation check in with teacher leaders, coaches, administrative team.

Person Responsible: Mike Degirolmo (mjdegiro@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: December 2023

4 Engagement Look Fors embedded on Professional Learning Communities Agendas and reviewed during meeting times.

Person Responsible: Kellie McClarty (kmcclart@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing - 2023-2024 School Year

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Based on the analysis of school, district, and state data trends, we identified differentiation as as a focus area that will quickly and directly impact student success. Differentiated instruction will allow students to have the same learning goal but different paths based on their strengths to access the goal. The majority of our student subgroups perform on pace with peers but there were two subgroups that performed lower than the standard average of 41%. Our students with disabilities scored at a proficiency rate of 38% and our English language learning students scored at a proficiency rate of 37% By focusing on differentiating for the learning needs and styles of our students we will close this achievement gap in both categories.

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

80% of teachers will include differentiated strategies in the classroom as evidenced by weekly classroom visits allowing students different paths to the same learning objectives and will result in our students that struggle the most having access to grade level content.

Additionally student progress toward the benchmarks will be monitored with district based assessments and students in our ELL and SWD subgroups will score at a proficiency of 41% or higher on each assessment.

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

The instructional practice specifically related to differentiation will be monitored by the following:
- Instructional Rounds focused on differentiation that has all students working toward the same goal but that varies instruction based on student interest, preferences, strengths, and struggles. (administration, coaches, teacher teams)
- Review of Assessment Data/Data Chats (administration, coaches, teacher teams)
- PLC Meetings

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brian Goddard (bjgoddar@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Differentiation is essential in supporting and challenging students at varying achievement levels. Through differentiated instruction, teachers can better meet each student's needs and create an engaging learning environment that fosters growth.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for selecting this strategy is that we are focused on closing the learning gap for students that are struggling. Differentiation allows for access to the standards through a variety of paths helping create equity for all students.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Align schedules for co-teachers and support facilitators with general education teachers for enhanced and aligned PLC and instructional service planning for more cohesive support for our students with disabilities.

Person Responsible: Brian Goddard (bjgoddar@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: August 2023

Provide differentiated support through support facilitation, co-teaching, PLC data reviews, and professional learning opportunities for staff.

Person Responsible: Brian Goddard (bjgoddar@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing - 2023-2024 School Year

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

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

By When: Ongoing - 2023-2024 School Year

Progress monitor PLC data with a focus on ELL and SWD subgroups.

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

By When: Weekly in PLCs

Support student assessment success initiatives with tutoring, and testing boot camps for students.

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

By When: Ongoing - 2023-2024 School Year

Classroom walk throughs and observations to collect progress monitoring data and evidence of implementation with fidelity.

Person Responsible: Mike Degirolmo (mjdegiro@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing - 2023-2024 School Year

ELL Monitoring: Monthly meeting with ELL teacher, para, and administrator to discuss ELL student progress in academics and in attendance.

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

By When: Ongoing- 2023-2024 School Year.

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Based on the analysis of the needs assessment and review of school based discipline and attendance data In the 2022-2023 school year one potential area of concern is attendance. 751 of students were in attendance less than 90% of the time (26%). 41% of those 751 students were 9th grade students. Another potential area of concern is 14% of DeLand High students had one or more suspensions in the 2022-2023 school year. Last year to address attendance and discipline concerns DeLand High focused on building a positive culture
and environment by building a Positive Behavior Intervention and Support System on our school campus. By building a system of administrative, teacher and student leaders to model, implement, monitor and reward the
desired behaviors on campus, we made progress on our attendance and discipline data. This year we are going to continue to build on this system by integrating some IB world attributes into our current system and continue to grow the program.

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

The data used to measure progress toward our goal will be:
- A quarterly check of students that are in not in attendance 90% of the time and reducing the number of students out of class from 26% to 10%.
-A quarterly check of 9th and 10th grade students that are not in attendance from 41% of all student that are absent to 20%.
- A quarterly check on students that are suspended, and reasons for suspension and reducing the amount of student that are suspended from 14% to 7%.

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

Grade level project graduation teams will meet quarterly with each grade level school counselors, administration and teacher leaders to monitor student data and provide intervention for the students demonstrating attendance or academic issues. Our PBIS team will meet monthly as well to review positive behavioral data and celebrate student, school and teacher successes in reducing negative data and increasing positive data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Mark Bradham (mdbradha@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) is a school-wide system of support
that includes proactive strategies for defining, teaching, and supporting appropriate
student behaviors to positively impact the educational environment.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Taking a systematic, proactive approach to creating a positive culture and climate on campus, will aid in keeping students on track and incentivizing the actions and activity that better them as students and our

campus as a whole. That intentional focus on teaching, recognizing and celebrating the positive, will pose a direct counter to the negative behaviors and serve to improve culture on DeLand High's campus

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

PBIS Team Training

Person Responsible: Brian Goddard (bjgoddar@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: August 2023

PBIS Team aligns Bulldog Way with IB World school character attributes.

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

By When: August-September 2023

Develop and Implement Positive Referral System.

Person Responsible: Mark Bradham (mdbradha@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: August-September

Project Graduation Teams meet with students needing intervention

Person Responsible: Mike Lucero (mjlucero@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Quarterly - Ongoing 2023-2024 School Year

Provide academic intervention and support for at risk tier 2 and 3 students

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

By When: Ongoing 2023-2024 School Year

Monitor discipline and attendance data quarterly

Person Responsible: Mark Bradham (mdbradha@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing 2023-2024 School Year

Recognition and rewards for modeling the Bulldog Way

Person Responsible: Brian Goddard (bjgoddar@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing 2023-2024 School Year

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	$0.00

3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No