

Volusia County Schools

Deltona Middle School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	21
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	21
VI. Title I Requirements	23
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	24

Deltona Middle School

250 ENTERPRISE RD, Deltona, FL 32725

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/deltonamiddle/pages/default.aspx>

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 faculty, staff, and community of Deltona Middle School share the responsibility for guiding our students toward academic growth and emotional development essential for continued learning and lifelong success in a culturally diverse society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Deltona Middle School family is dedicated to the maximum growth of our students. By forming a partnership with our community, we create a caring and accepting environment for all. We rise to the challenge as we charge toward a positive tomorrow.

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
Hinson, Stephen	Principal	
Mason, Leontyne	Assistant Principal	
Hendricks, Hannah	Assistant Principal	
Myers, Richard	Assistant Principal	

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.

School-based stakeholders have been invited to be part of the decision-making process to support the development of the SIP. Parents will be invited to provide input via the School Advisory Committee(SAC). Their input was used to prioritize the needs of the school.

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))

Ongoing progress monitoring will be conducted by the SLT through analysis of data from common subject area assessments i.e., classroom summatives, District tests, and State assessments/end-of-course exams. Additionally, district leadership will be invited to our quarterly SIP review meetings; and our Stocktake meetings will provide a deeper dive in the Fall and Spring.

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)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	66%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
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: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: B
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	82	91	107	280
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	71	91	214
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	16	20	61
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	7	4	22
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	93	162	147	402
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	110	125	132	367
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	74	84	194
	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	82	102	120	304

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	7	3	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	13

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	96	90	134	320
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	66	85	96	247
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	36	12	66
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	21	10	40
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	106	159	155	420
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	144	153	150	447
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	76	90	50	216

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	104	126	132	362

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	5	9	2	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	3	14

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	96	90	134	320
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	66	85	96	247
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	36	12	66
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	21	10	40
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	106	159	155	420
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	144	153	150	447
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	76	90	50	216

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	104	126	132	362

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	5	9	2	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	3	14

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*	35	44	49	38	45	50	44		
ELA Learning Gains				41			49		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				33			38		
Math Achievement*	39	48	56	38	31	36	38		
Math Learning Gains				48			39		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				50			37		
Science Achievement*	34	49	49	46	46	53	49		
Social Studies Achievement*	52	67	68	49	49	58	55		
Middle School Acceleration	59	62	73	66	43	49	65		
Graduation Rate					52	49			
College and Career Acceleration					65	70			
ELP Progress	31	31	40	67	69	76	54		

** 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	42
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	250
Total Components for the Federal Index	6

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	476
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	

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	20	Yes	4	2
ELL	29	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN	66			
BLK	36	Yes	2	
HSP	38	Yes	1	
MUL	50			
PAC				
WHT	51			
FRL	39	Yes	1	

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	28	Yes	3	1
ELL	43			
AMI				
ASN	65			
BLK	31	Yes	1	1
HSP	46			
MUL	51			
PAC				
WHT	50			
FRL	45			

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	35			39			34	52	59			31
SWD	9			17			14	28			5	33
ELL	20			26			19	34	42		6	31
AMI												
ASN	54			77							2	
BLK	26			27			27	40	60		5	
HSP	31			34			32	45	56		6	31
MUL	41			52			31	75			4	
PAC												
WHT	42			47			42	60	64		5	
FRL	32			34			30	49	56		6	34

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	38	41	33	38	48	50	46	49	66			67
SWD	14	29	22	15	41	48	28	24				27
ELL	26	36	31	31	52	51	31	29	79			67
AMI												
ASN	65	59		65	71							
BLK	20	25	26	26	48	55	23	43	15			
HSP	35	41	37	35	47	48	43	45	72			59
MUL	51	41		37	46		75	54				
PAC												
WHT	46	45	34	45	49	49	52	56	71			
FRL	35	39	33	33	47	50	41	46	58			68

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	44	49	38	38	39	37	49	55	65			54
SWD	14	30	28	16	29	26	16	22				
ELL	25	40	33	28	31	34	27	39	50			54
AMI												
ASN	65	63		59	50							
BLK	35	50	38	26	35	44	37	43	41			
HSP	37	44	35	34	34	32	42	50	56			57
MUL	53	71		31	33							
PAC												
WHT	53	53	38	46	45	39	61	63	75			
FRL	39	46	36	34	35	35	44	52	57			53

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
07	2023 - Spring	34%	44%	-10%	47%	-13%
08	2023 - Spring	27%	39%	-12%	47%	-20%
06	2023 - Spring	36%	42%	-6%	47%	-11%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	42%	49%	-7%	54%	-12%
07	2023 - Spring	40%	44%	-4%	48%	-8%
08	2023 - Spring	21%	37%	-16%	55%	-34%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	33%	47%	-14%	44%	-11%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	69%	32%	37%	50%	19%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	39%	61%	48%	52%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	52%	65%	-13%	66%	-14%

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.

According to FAST Progress Monitoring 3, ELA Achievement decreased by 6% in 2023 and has continued to decline for two consecutive years. The 8th-grade cohort has underperformed by more than 10% for two consecutive years. In addition, Science Achievement scores have declined over the past three years. As a leadership team, this school year we will make sure that we consistently attend PLCs, and department head meetings, and conduct classroom walkthroughs to support benchmark-aligned instruction.

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

According to FAST Progress Monitoring 3, ELA Achievement decreased by 6% in 2023 and has continued to decline for two consecutive years. The 8th-grade cohort has underperformed by more than 10% for two consecutive years. As a leadership team, we need to ensure that attending PLCs, department head meetings, and conducting classroom walkthroughs to support benchmark-aligned instruction is done with fidelity.

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.

ELA showed the greatest gap when compared to the state average at 15% according to the FAST Progress Monitoring 3. Contributing factors include the use of permanent substitutes/teacher vacancies for the entire year, student attendance, and low reading proficiency.

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

Math showed the greatest increase with a growth of 6% on FAST Progress Monitoring 3. This is attributed to small group and targeted instruction, data-driven tutoring groups, after-school tutoring, Saturday Boot Camp for borderline students identified via data analysis of district and state assessments.

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

EWS report indicated that one area of concern focuses on absenteeism. Data shows that 36% of students have referrals for chronic attendance/absenteeism.

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

1. Improve ELA Progress Monitoring Scores
2. Reduce the rate of chronic absenteeism

Area of Focus

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**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.

EWS data shows that 280 out of 1144 (24%) of the student population was absent 10% or more days. Improving the school culture and environment will increase student engagement and attendance.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our goal is to decrease the rate of student absenteeism from 24% to 19%.

Monitoring:

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

This data will be monitored weekly via the attendance clerk printing attendance reports to be sent home and for submission to the social worker and appropriate entities as required. Monitoring will also take place through teachers, grade-level teams, and counselors reporting irregularities in attendance patterns to administrators as observed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stephen Hinson (schinson@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.)

MTSS and PBIS will be used as intervention strategies to improve student attendance.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

PBIS reinforces desirable student behaviors through positive reinforcement. Students can earn PBIS points in individual classes as well as overall school attendance. Students and teachers OR students and administration/counselors may implement attendance contracts that result in students earning additional PBIS points for improved attendance. MTSS data will be used to target students at risk of becoming chronically absent and to begin receiving intervention services.

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.

Record Keeping and Reporting of Absences- Person(s) responsible: Attendance Clerk, Teachers, and Data Administrator

Person Responsible: Stephen Hinson (schinson@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Weekly

Positive Reinforcement and Reporting- Administrators and Staff

Person Responsible: Stephen Hinson (schinson@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

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.

2021-2022 data indicates that our SWD subgroups show 3 consecutive years below 41% proficiency and 1 year below 32% proficiency. The same data indicates that our Black subgroup shows one year below 41% and 32% proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

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

State student data will reflect a minimum proficiency rate of 41% or more in all school grade components. Additionally, 90% of teachers will provide tasks that are aligned with content area benchmarks as evidenced by classroom walkthroughs.

Monitoring:

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

PM data from district and state assessments will be used to ensure that students are mastering grade-level benchmarks. The administration and leadership will monitor teacher planning to include planned questioning, targeted questioning, collaboration, and benchmark alignment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stephen Hinson (schinson@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.)

Provide explicit instruction aligned with the state benchmark.
 The teacher provides tasks aligned to the benchmark and intended learning.
 Questions to deepen understanding of the intended learning target.
 Provide students with opportunities to collaborate.
 Direct instruction through small groups.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These strategies isolate and address the needs of specific students based on classroom, district, and state assessment data, as well as, teacher observation and classroom performance.

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.

Teacher planning: Person responsible - Academic Coaches and Administration

Person Responsible: Stephen Hinson (schinson@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Weekly

Walk-Throughs: Person responsible - Academic Coaches and Administration

Person Responsible: Stephen Hinson (schinson@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Weekly

Data Reviews: Person Responsible - Academic Coaches, Administration, and District Specialist

Person Responsible: Stephen Hinson (schinson@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly

Coaching Cycles: Person Responsible- Academic Coaches and Administration

Person Responsible: Stephen Hinson (schinson@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Quarterly

Ongoing Professional Learning: Person Responsible - Academic Coaches and Administration

Person Responsible: Stephen Hinson (schinson@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**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.

Over the last two years, ELA achievement has decreased 12%, from 44% proficiency to 32%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

State student data will reflect a minimum proficiency rate of 41% or more in all school grade components. Additionally, 90% of teachers will provide tasks that are aligned with content area benchmarks as evidenced by classroom walkthroughs. Likewise, instructional coaches will plan (80% of the PLC meetings) tasks-aligned instruction with teachers as evidenced through weekly PLC notes.

Monitoring:

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

PM data from district and state assessments will be used to ensure that students are mastering grade-level benchmarks. The administration and leadership will monitor teacher planning to include planned questioning, targeted questioning, collaboration, and benchmark alignment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stephen Hinson (schinson@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.)

Provide explicit instruction aligned with the state benchmark.
The teacher provides tasks aligned to the benchmark and intended learning.
Questions to deepen understanding of the intended learning target.
Provide students with opportunities to collaborate.
Direct instruction through small groups.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These strategies isolate and address the needs of specific students based on classroom, district, and state assessment data, as well as, teacher observation and classroom performance.

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.

Teacher planning: Person responsible - ELA coach and Administration

Person Responsible: Stephen Hinson (schinson@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Weekly

Data Reviews: Person Responsible - Academic Coaches, Administration, and District Specialist

Person Responsible: Stephen Hinson (schinson@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly

Walk-Throughs: Person Responsible - ELA coach and Administration

Person Responsible: Stephen Hinson (schinson@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Weekly

Coaching Cycles: Person Responsible- Academic Coaches and Administration

Person Responsible: Stephen Hinson (schinson@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Quarterly

Ongoing Professional Learning: Person Responsible - Academic Coaches and Administration

Person Responsible: Stephen Hinson (schinson@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

NA

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

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

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 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 Measurable Outcomes**Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes****Monitoring****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 impact student achievement outcomes.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs**Description:**

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. §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?

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

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
-------------	-----------------------------------

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
 List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

Beyond the website, a newsletter will be created for stakeholders outlining the SIP goals and progress quarterly. During the SAC meetings, stakeholders will be given the opportunity to review the SIP goals and provide feedback. Pertinent information will be communicated in the weekly school messenger correspondence.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
 List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Deltona Middle's webpage: <https://deltonams.vcsedu.org/school-information/title-i-information>
 The school will build positive relationships through our SAC meetings and family engagement nights i.e., Open House, Hispanic Heritage, Black History Program, Science Night, Math Night, Literacy Night, etc.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

To strengthen the academic program, the bell schedule has been modified to allow for more instructional time. Additionally, we require PLC and Teaming collaboration for effective planning purposes. We have modified the criteria used to identify students participating in accelerated math and Algebra 1 courses.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

As far as nutrition is concerned, all students qualify for and are encouraged to participate in our free breakfast and lunch programs. At DMS, our school supports violence prevention through the implementation of PBIS and CHAMPs.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students’ skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

n/a

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students’ access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

n/a

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

n/a

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

n/a

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

n/a

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: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$0.00
---	--------	---	--------

2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$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.

Yes