

Volusia County Schools

# Deltona Lakes Elementary 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>5</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Deltona Lakes Elementary School

2022 ADELIA BLVD, Deltona, FL 32725

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

## Demographics

Principal: Ramonita Ortiz

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2016

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<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)	78%
<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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: C (44%) 2020-21: (38%) 2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (48%)
<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>	TS&I

\* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at [www.floridacims.org](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.

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

#### Provide the school's mission statement.

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

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

Create life-long learners prepared for an ever-changing global society.

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

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
Ortiz, Ramonita	Principal	
Griffin, Tonya	Assistant Principal	
Noga, Hope	Assistant Principal	
Brown, Kerrie	Instructional Coach	
Diallo, Jennifer	Instructional Coach	
Zeidwig, Catherine	Instructional Coach	

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2016, Ramonita Ortiz

**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.*

16

**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.*

44

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

55

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

701

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

6

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

7

## 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	105	108	112	130	120	104	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	679
Attendance below 90 percent	17	28	17	21	24	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	18	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	16	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	13	3	8	5	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
	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 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	5	1	1	2	14	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

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	2	3	5	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/23/2022

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	0	5	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	0	5	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

**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	52%			46%			52%	56%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	43%			36%			50%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	28%			43%			47%	46%	53%
Math Achievement	54%			42%			56%	59%	63%
Math Learning Gains	52%			26%			47%	56%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	31%			26%			41%	43%	51%
Science Achievement	47%			50%			53%	57%	53%

**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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	57%	58%	-1%	58%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	48%	54%	-6%	58%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	46%	54%	-8%	56%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	66%	60%	6%	62%	4%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	53%	59%	-6%	64%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				
05	2022					
	2019	46%	54%	-8%	60%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	50%	56%	-6%	53%	-3%
Cohort Comparison						

### 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	26	28	19	28	45	36	34				
ELL	32	32	33	40	42	24	21				
BLK	39	32	9	42	46	27	21				
HSP	47	40	41	50	44	24	38				
MUL	46			69							
WHT	66	49		62	61		62				
FRL	52	43	31	51	52	30	47				

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	22	32	36	18	27	29	22				
ELL	30	46		30	38		27				
BLK	29	26	42	29	32		28				
HSP	42	40	45	37	29	33	42				
MUL	27			30							
WHT	58	38		54	21		70				
FRL	43	37	50	40	28	30	48				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	16	36	37	20	39	44	26				
ELL	28	36	32	37	36	35	48				
BLK	49	52		35	48	45	33				
HSP	48	43	35	54	44	34	51				
MUL	47			60							
WHT	58	56	61	64	50	53	59				
FRL	49	49	50	55	45	45	49				

### 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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	57
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	364
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	35
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	31
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	43
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	58
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	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	60
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	45
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?

Overall ELA & Math proficiency improved.  
 2022-ELA-Increased from 46% to 52% Math-Increased from 42% to 54%  
 Math Learning Gains and Lowest Quartile also showed improvement.

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

According to data, math scores for 5th grade continue to demonstrate a need for improvement. SWD, ELL & AA students also continue to score below district average. Overall, ELA Lowest Quartile dropped significantly from 43% to 28%. Science also showed a 3% decline.

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

New actions would include: New math curriculum Big Ideas, focus on small group remediation/acceleration with differentiation, focus on quality core instruction.  
 Contributing factors include ELA lowest quartile dropping from 43% to 28%. Also, math lowest quartile is at 31% proficiency.

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

Math proficiency overall improved from 42% to 54%. Math Learning Gains increased from 26% to 52%.

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

3rd/4th grade has a strong teaching presence in the area of math. There was focus on math fluency in grades 3-5. IXL was utilized to remediate standards not mastered. Students participated in math fluency programs during lunch and special area as well as math tutoring twice per week.

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

A focus on small group acceleration. Utilizing IXL to challenge students. Continue having lunch learning labs with a focus on math fluency. Before and after school tutoring. PENDA science remediation program for grades 3-5.

**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.**

Professional learning will include the new BEST math series Big Ideas during PLC and faculty meetings. Collaborative planning will take place monthly with a focus on data.

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

Collaborative planning monthly with a focus on differentiation and small group instruction, ELA, Math, Science

Targeted students will be identified and provided additional intervention such as special area & before/after school tutoring.

### **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.

Even though all of our math areas showed improvement, our ESSA subgroups are still below district average. Our Lowest quartile continues to struggle.

Math Proficiency 54%  
Lowest Quartile-31%  
SWD-28%  
ELL-40%  
AA-42%

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

Improve overall math proficiency to 57%  
Improve lowest quartile to 45% proficiency  
Improve SWD to 41% proficiency  
Improve ELL to 45% proficiency  
Improve AA to 45% proficiency

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

Data driven weekly PLC's  
Monthly collaboration for planning and data reviews  
Admin will conduct data chats with teachers  
Teachers will conduct data chats with students.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Ramonita Ortiz (rortiz@volusia.k12.fl.us)

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

B.E.S.T standards instruction

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

Big Ideas will be utilized with students with fidelity.  
Professional Learning will take place with the new Big Ideas series.

**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.

Present math data to the entire faculty and staff to identify the need for implementation of the new math series BEST Standards.

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

Provide professional learning, district workshops and any other content specific workshops in the Focus Area of Math during PLC's and ERPL's with a focus on small group instruction and remediation utilizing standards aligned district resources including the new math curriculum.

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

Data walks will be conducted. Teachers will be provided feedback in a timely manner.

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

Data chats with teachers/students will happen quarterly. Data chats with teachers/admin will happen quarterly.

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

Targeted students will be identified and provided additional intervention such as during special area and before/after school.

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

Teachers will be provided collaborative planning time during the school day and after school monthly.

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

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

**Person Responsible**

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

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation**

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

Overall ELA proficiency 52%  
Overall Lowest Quartile-28% This area was a significant drop from previous year.  
SWD-26%  
ELL-32%  
AA-39%

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

Improve overall ELA proficiency to 57%  
Improve lowest quartile to 41% proficiency  
Improve SWD to 41% proficiency  
Improve ELL to 41% proficiency  
Improve AA to 45% proficiency

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

Data driven weekly PLC's with administration/coaches  
Monthly collaboration for planning and data reviews with administration/coaches  
An analysis of small group lesson plans by administration/coaches with a focus on differentiation.  
Admin will conduct data chats with teachers  
Teachers will conduct data chats with students.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

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

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

ELA Differentiation  
Differentiation: to ensure students educational equity through instruction that matches the students' readiness level and ability.  
Students will receive explicit instruction in small group differentiated by their individual needs.

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

This strategy will ensure educational equity through instruction that matches the students' readiness level and ability.  
Students will receive explicit instruction in small group differentiated by their individual needs.

**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.

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

**Person Responsible**

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

Teachers will be provided an opportunity to observe model classrooms in ELA.

**Person Responsible**

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

Collaborative planning to utilize district aligned resources effectively within the Benchmark Reading curriculum with a focus on small group differentiation.

**Person Responsible**

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

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

**Person Responsible**

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

Provide professional learning, district workshops and any other content specific workshops in the focus area of ELA during PLC's and ERPL's with a focus on small group instruction and remediation utilizing standards aligned district resources.

**Person Responsible**

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

Targeted students will be identified and provided additional intervention such as in special area and before/after school.

**Person Responsible**

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

Data walks will be conducted. Teachers will be provided feedback in a timely manner.

**Person Responsible**

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

Teachers will be provided collaborative planning time during the school day and after school monthly.

**Person Responsible**

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

Data chats with teachers/students will happen quarterly. Data chats with teachers/admin will happen quarterly.

**Person Responsible**

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

**#3. 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 critical need from the data reviewed.**

SWD-ELA-26%, Math-28%, Science-34%  
AA-ELA-39%, Math-42%, Science-21%  
ELL-ELA-32%, Math-40%, Science-21%

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Improve SWD, AA and ELL ELA proficiency to 41%  
Improve SWD & ELL Math proficiency to 41%; Improve AA Math proficiency to 45%.  
Improve SWD, AA and ELL Science proficiency to 41%

**Monitoring:**

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

Data driven weekly PLC's with administration/coaches  
Monthly collaboration for planning and data reviews with administration/coaches  
Admin will conduct data chats with teachers  
Teachers will conduct data chats with students.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

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

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

All teachers will be provided professional learning for students with disabilities. Specific content will be addressed to increase achievement in these subgroups effectively. Collaborative planning between classroom teachers and resources teachers to effectively plan for instruction and intervention.

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

All teachers will be provided professional learning for students with disabilities. Specific content will be addressed to effectively increase achievement in these subgroups. Collaborative planning between classroom teachers and resources teachers to effectively plan for instruction and intervention.

**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.

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

**Person Responsible**

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

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

**Person Responsible**

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

Admin will monitor SWD, AA and ELL ESSA subgroups data quarterly.

**Person Responsible**

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

Provide professional learning, district workshops and any other content specific workshops in the focus area of ELA or Math, specifically addressing SWD, AA, ELL population, during PLC's and ERPL's with a focus on small group instruction and remediation using standards aligned district resource.a

**Person Responsible**

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

Utilize PENDA digital science remediation program with all students in grades 3-5. PENDA will be used before school in the computer lab, during the school day and after school to remediate science skills after Topic checks and VST.

**Person Responsible**

Hope Noga (chnoga@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**

Differentiation: to ensure students educational equity through instruction that matches the students' readiness level and ability.

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

Differentiation: to ensure students educational equity through instruction that matches the students' readiness level and ability.

Students will receive explicit instruction in small group differentiated by their individual needs.

**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)**

Previous year's iready final diganostic in ELA produced the following results:

Kinder-80%, 1st- 48%, 2nd, 56%--% proficient

On the CSPM, our goal in ELA will be as follows: % proficient

Kinder-80%

1st-60%

2nd-60%

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

Based on prior year's FSA data the % proficient will increase.

Overall ELA proficiency will increase from 52% to 55%.

3rd grade ELA proficiency will increase from 59% to 63%

4th grade ELA proficiency will increase from 51% to 56%

5th grade ELA proficiency will increase from 50% to 55%

### **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.

Data driven weekly PLC's with administration/coaches

Monthly collaboration for planning and data reviews with administration/coaches

An analysis of small group lesson plans by administration/coaches with a focus on differentiation.

Admin will conduct data chats with teachers

Teachers will conduct data chats with students.

### **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Ortiz, Ramonita, rortiz@volusia.k12.fl.us

### **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?

Differentiation: to ensure students educational equity through instruction that matches the students' readiness level and ability.

Students will receive explicit instruction in small group differentiated by their individual needs daily.

**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?

Based on walk through observation and data, there is a need for scaffolding and using differentiation with students in ELA small group. Students with disabilities and our lowest quartile need differentiation in ELA to be successful.

**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
Collaborative planning to utilize district aligned resources effectively within the Benchmark Reading curriculum with a focus on small group differentiation.	Brown, Kerrie , ksbrown1@volusia.k12.fl.us
Provide professional learning, district workshops and any other content specific workshops in the focus area of ELA during PLC's and ERPL's with a focus on small group instruction and remediation utilizing standards aligned district resources with differentiation for students.	Ortiz, Ramonita, rortiz@volusia.k12.fl.us
Teachers will be provided an opportunity to observe model classrooms in ELA with the Academic coach.	Brown, Kerrie , ksbrown1@volusia.k12.fl.us

**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 Lakes Elementary will foster positive relationships with our families and community members in various ways. Deltona Lakes is in year 1 of our PBIS initiative. DLE has implemented House System based on the 7 habits of creating leaders. Our House System focuses on positive behavior and expectations. Our House System is shared with families which in turn can promote our positive initiative at home. Monthly celebrations are dedicated to the winning House. Students have opportunities to earn points for their House. In addition to the House system, DLE will host many family engagement activities that will focus specifically on fostering academics. For example, a math night make and take will take place. Also, we will conduct a Science Night to engage families in the science standards. This will allow the parents to learn a skill along with their child and take that skill home to continue to practice. Literacy Week will be a major event culminating with a Literacy Night for parents and students. DLE will offer a Mentoring Program during the school day. DLE will also provide additional intervention/enrichment opportunities during the school day with parent support. Events and classroom activities are communicated in various ways such as our school website, school newsletter and school marquee. Our daily school news is viewable on youtube for our families as well.

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

Ms. Ortiz, Principal, communicates clearly and effectively to parents and has an open-door policy to address questions and concerns. Mrs. Griffin and Mrs. Noga, Assistant Principals, are instrumental in developing relationships with all students and families. All stakeholders at DLE participate in the House System focusing on positive behaviors and expectations. Students and families are greeted daily by an administrator upon arrival. Administrators are visible in classrooms on a daily basis interacting with students and teachers, providing feedback and building relationships. Academic Coaches are deeply involved in professional learning to ensure classroom implementation and support teachers. Academic Coaches are also involved in creating worthwhile academic activities for family nights at DLE.