Deltona Middle School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Deltona Middle School

250 ENTERPRISE RD, Deltona, FL 32725

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

Demographics

Principal: Kimberly Feltner S

Start Date for this Principal: 8/23/2021

2019-20 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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	*[Data Not Available]*
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: C (49%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	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.

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

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Acker, Amy	Math Coach	
Caffieri, Tanya	Reading Coach	
Hulette, Denise	Teacher, K-12	Science Dept Chair
Rheinheimer, Julie	Other	Writing Coach
Haynes, Lloyd	Assistant Principal	
Seidel, Susan	Assistant Principal	
Iorio, Greg	Assistant Principal	
Feltner, Kim	Principal	
Reynolds, Samantha	Teacher, ESE	
Pride, Larhonda	Teacher, ESE	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 8/23/2021, Kimberly Feltner S

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

16

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

57

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

67

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,134

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

13

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

17

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	386	365	383	0	0	0	0	1134
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	83	60	0	0	0	0	201
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	23	12	0	0	0	0	51
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	20	15	0	0	0	0	66
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	121	107	110	0	0	0	0	338
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	151	140	133	0	0	0	0	424
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	210	201	274	0	0	0	0	685

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	57	44	0	0	0	0	158

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	21	4	0	0	0	0	37
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	11	1	0	0	0	0	21

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/23/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	380	401	399	0	0	0	0	1180
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	39	54	0	0	0	0	127
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	55	79	0	0	0	0	173
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	28	21	0	0	0	0	71
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	48	45	0	0	0	0	121
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	92	79	0	0	0	0	254
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	115	113	99	0	0	0	0	327

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	92	103	102	0	0	0	0	297

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	18	11	0	0	0	0	36
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	1	0	0	0	0	12

2020-21 - Updated

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	380	401	399	0	0	0	0	1180
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	39	54	0	0	0	0	127
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	55	79	0	0	0	0	173
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	28	21	0	0	0	0	71
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	48	45	0	0	0	0	121
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	92	79	0	0	0	0	254
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	115	113	99	0	0	0	0	327

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	92	103	102	0	0	0	0	297

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	18	11	0	0	0	0	36
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	1	0	0	0	0	12

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).

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
06	2021					
	2019	46%	50%	-4%	54%	-8%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
	2019	46%	47%	-1%	52%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				
08	2021					
	2019	44%	50%	-6%	56%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2021					
	2019	40%	48%	-8%	55%	-15%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	52%	47%	5%	54%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				
08	2021					
	2019	18%	29%	-11%	46%	-28%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
08	2021					
	2019	52%	57%	-5%	48%	4%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2021					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2021					
2019	59%	68%	-9%	71%	-12%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2021					
2019					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2021					
2019	68%	54%	14%	61%	7%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2021					
2019	100%	55%	45%	57%	43%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Grade 6 - math, Science classes - DIAs, SMT; ELA - DIA, SMT, VLT
Grade 7 - math, science, civics - DIA, SMT; ELA - DIA, SMT, VLT
Grade 8 - math, science - DIA, SMT; ELA - DIA, SMT, VLT

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	496/23	536/24	271/12
	Economically Disadvantaged	412/20	442/23	218/13
	Students With Disabilities	131/6	119/4	45/7
	English Language Learners	14913	159/14	79/8
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	495/21	463/10	103/36
	Economically Disadvantaged	409/19	377/10	79/35
	Students With Disabilities	111/11	86/6	6/17
	English Language Learners	138/18	133/8	25/32

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	590/15	582/35	297/20
	Economically Disadvantaged	467/26	469/32	234/18
	Students With Disabilities	110/11	106/15	57/7
	English Language Learners	125/17	132/29	63/17
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	579/15	299/11	78/33
	Economically Disadvantaged	459/14	226/8	47/32
	Students With Disabilities	104/3	28/0	blank/blank
	English Language Learners	125/10	60/7	13/8
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	558/39	570/44	1280/56
	Economically Disadvantaged	444/34	458/40	1026/52
	Students With Disabilities	103/12	101/22	231/25
	English Language Learners	117/24	122/34	272/47

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	551/32	569/27	289/5
	Economically Disadvantaged	429/29	435/25	219/3
	Students With Disabilities	95/11	101/12	51/4
	English Language Learners	105/23	107/10	56/2
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	540/9	214/10	409/12
	Economically Disadvantaged	422/8	151/8	303/11
	Students With Disabilities	99/6	13/23	59/8
	English Language Learners	104/6	24/0	71/10
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	549/58	591/50	640/75
	Economically Disadvantaged	429/54	452/48	482/73
	Students With Disabilities	102/40	107/28	118/60
	English Language Learners	107/41	111/41	124/65

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
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	20	40	34	22	36	29	23	38			
ELL	30	44	38	30	41	36	26	40	55		
ASN	47	58		58	47						
BLK	42	54	55	44	40	27	52	46	81		
HSP	41	50	42	42	49	45	45	59	65		
MUL	47	52		45	43		69	57	40		
WHT	53	57	46	52	50	46	65	70	70		

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
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
FRL	43	52	43	44	46	40	52	57	66		

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	27	42	41	28	47	46	39	29	67		
ELL	23	39	38	30	43	44	35	21	91		
ASN	63	64		63	64						
BLK	36	40	43	45	49	40	50	62	94		
HSP	44	48	46	48	51	45	55	45	81		
MUL	41	37		62	48			73			
WHT	50	48	41	59	60	55	67	55	86		
FRL	44	46	41	50	53	46	58	49	87		

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	58
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	522
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
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	40
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	53
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	49
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	50
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	50
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	57
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	50
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Subgroups – ESE, ELL and African American(AA)
ESE Prof. rates: ELA: 20% LG: 40% LQ; 34%; Math: 22%, LG: 36%, LQ: 29%, Science: 23%, SS: 38%.
ELL Prof. Rates: ELA: 30%, LG: 44%, LQ: 38%, Math: 30%, LG: 41%, LQ: 36%, Sci: 26%, SS: 40%
AA Prof. Rates: ELA: 30%, LG: 54%, LQ: 55%, Math: 44%, LG: 40%, LQ: 27%, Sci: 52%, SS: 46%
Core Content – Math (Ach level, LQ and LG) and LQ ELA

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

Overall 2019 to 2021 Comparison SG Data:
ELA Ach - increase from 44 to 49
ELA LG - increase from 49 to 56
ELA LQ gains - increase from 38 to 50
Math Ach - increase from 38 to 51
Math LG - increase from 39 to 59
Math LQ gains - 37 to 48
Acc - increase from 65 to 75
Civics - 55 to 67
Science - 49 to 60

Subgroups – ESE, ELL and African American(AA)
ESE Prof. rates: ELA: 20% LG: 40% LQ; 34%; Math: 22%, LG: 36%, LQ: 29%, Science: 23%, SS: 38%.
ELL Prof. Rates: ELA: 30%, LG: 44%, LQ: 38%, Math: 30%, LG: 41%, LQ: 36%, Sci: 26%, SS: 40%
AA Prof. Rates: ELA: 30%, LG: 54%, LQ: 55%, Math: 44%, LG: 40%, LQ: 27%, Sci: 52%, SS: 46%
Core Content – Math (Ach level, LQ and LG) and LQ ELA

Discipline data: ,While reviewing our school data, it was noted the highest SESSIR indicator is 'PHA'; Physical Attack. Fighting was another high-level indicator identified on the state SESSIR report and the nature of these offenses have direct correlation to a high level of student aggression as well as overall disruption of the learning environment.

Attendance: Avg. Days Absent for Each Student: 11.67 days out

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

Covid – Quarantined Students and Teachers, Learning Modality, Teacher apprehension due to health concerns
School wide schedule changes
Transient enrollment
Math & ELA teacher vacancy

Overall 2019 to 2021 Comparison SG Data:
ELA Ach - increase from 44 to 49
ELA LG - increase from 49 to 56
ELA LQ gains - increase from 38 to 50
Math Ach - increase from 38 to 51
Math LG - increase from 39 to 59
Math LQ gains - 37 to 48
Acc - increase from 65 to 75
Civics - 55 to 67
Science - 49 to 60

Subgroups – ESE, ELL and African American(AA)
ESE Prof. rates: ELA: 20% {-7%} LG: 40% {-2%}LQ; 34% {-7%}; Math: 22% {-6%}, LG: 36% {-11%}, LQ: 29% {-17%}, Science: 23% {-16%} SS: 38% {+9%}.
ELL Prof. Rates: ELA: 30% {+7%}, LG: 44% {+6}, LQ: 38% {+2%}, Math: 30% {-1%}, LG: 41%{-5%}, LQ: 36% {-10%}, Sci: 26% {-10%}, SS: 40% {+16%}
AA Prof. Rates: ELA: 42% {+6%}, LG: 54% {+14%}, LQ: 55% {+12%}, Math: 44% {-1%}, LG: 40% {-9%}, LQ: 27% {-13%}, Sci: 52% {+2%}, SS: 46% {-16%}

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

A) 8th grade Math Achievement
B) 7th & 8th grade ELA FSA scores maintained level at 18-19
C) Math LQ did not decline for AA
D) Science scores were above the state average

Overall 2019 to 2021 Comparison SG Data:
ELA Ach - increase from 44 to 49
ELA LG - increase from 49 to 56
ELA LQ gains - increase from 38 to 50
Math Ach - increase from 38 to 51
Math LG - increase from 39 to 59
Math LQ gains - 37 to 48
Acc - increase from 65 to 75
Civics - 55 to 67
Science - 49 to 60

Subgroups – ESE, ELL and African American(AA)
ESE Prof. rates: ELA: 20% {-7%} LG: 40% {-2%}LQ; 34% {-7%}; Math: 22% {-6%}, LG: 36% {-11%}, LQ: 29% {-17%}, Science: 23% {-16%} SS: 38% {+9%}.
ELL Prof. Rates: ELA: 30% {+7%}, LG: 44% {+6}, LQ: 38% {+2%}, Math: 30% {-1%}, LG: 41%{-5%}, LQ: 36% {-10%}, Sci: 26% {-10%}, SS: 40% {+16%}
AA Prof. Rates: ELA: 42% {+6%}, LG: 54% {+14%}, LQ: 55% {+12%}, Math: 44% {-1%}, LG: 40% {-9%}, LQ: 27% {-13%}, Sci: 52% {+2%}, SS: 46% {-16%}

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

A) Strategic placement of teachers; PLC with math coach; teaching to standards; FSA tutoring
B) Strong PLC planning; coaching support; FSA tutoring
C) Deep diving into standards instruction; FSA tutoring
D) Science Camp prior to FSA testing; strategic placement of teachers; FSA tutoring

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

PL for Student voice & Student engagement; Data chats; ACE period; Direct discussion about learning target (what are we learning, how are we learning it and how will you know you learned it)

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.

AVID strategies (Focused Note Taking, Socratic Seminars,
Nuts and Bolts training for Team teaching
Teacher Clarity Book Study
Data Diving

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

Strategic placement of teachers: Ensuring certification areas, reviewing School grade & student data to determine overall teacher effectiveness and determine teachers needing additional supports.
Team teaching: Using a team teach approach for the core content with shared rosters allows teachers to know their students, collaborate on common standards & cross curricular activities.
Professional Learning on Lesson Planning: The district focus of LT/SC is a foundational component of lesson planning. We are utilizing Title 1 funding to support team and collaborative lesson planning aligned to standards and supported by academic coaches to ensure relevance & engagement opportunities.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Step 3: Include a rationale for your Area of Focus that includes the alignment to the strategic goal and explains how it was identified as critical need from the data reviewed. A. Math – As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that (based on school grade data) Math (LQ, LG, and Ach) all decreased from the previous recorded data. Component 18-19 20-21 Math – Ach 47% 38% Math – LG 48% 39% Math – LQ 41% 37% All groups and grade levels are considered low in comparison to district and state data. B. ELA (B.E.S.T.) – The introduction & full implementation of the BEST standards will be a learning curve for all ELA teachers and the potential impact of the unfamiliar curriculum with a decrease in overall proficiency in 2021 will need to be carefully monitored & supported. Component 18-19 20-21 ELA – Ach 46% 44% ELA – LG 54% 49% ELA – LQ 44% 38%
Measureable Outcome:	A. Math - Increase overall Math proficiency from average 38% to 45% for all groups. B. ELA (B.E.S.T.) – Increase overall ELA proficiency LQ from average 38% to 44%.
Monitoring:	Math and ELA (B.E.S.T) – This area of focus will be monitored through frequent classroom observations using a walkthrough tool with specific Math look-fors and ELA look-fors, and data chats via PLCs to determine instructional adjustments needed to impact student growth. Also, coaching cycles based on teacher need as demonstrated through weekly classroom observations and student performance data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Susan Seidel (sjseidel@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our evidence-based strategy is Teacher Clarity. We will monitor it through frequent walkthroughs by school-based administrators, coaches, and the district support team. Grade level teams and/or individual teacher will receive feedback to guide them in planning and instruction for input on students' learning and determining next steps.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teacher Clarity has an effect size of 0.75 (Hattie, 2009). The average affect size is 0.40, which is equal to approximately one year of learning. At 0.75, it is likely that the impact on student is significantly greater than average when teacher clarify is implemented with fidelity. We will use this strategy by focusing on: • Having appropriately high expectations (learning targets) • Share their notions of success criteria with their students (success criteria)

• Ensure that there is constructive alignment between the lesson, the task, and the assignment
• Ensure that the delivery of the lesson is relevant, accurate, and comprehensible to student
• Focusing on including student voice and collaboration in lesson planning and assignments

B.E.S.T. Standards document will also be used to help provide clarification of standards and teaching strategies.

Action Steps to Implement

Share with the entire faculty and staff via ERPL sessions, Teacher Clarity book study, PLCs, and faculty meetings.

Person Responsible Kim Feltner (ksfeltne@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Provide ongoing professional learning in teacher clarity during training and through book study.

Person Responsible Kim Feltner (ksfeltne@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Use of Focus Boards in every classroom that includes Learning Targets, Success Criteria, and CHAMPS to ensure students know what they are learning and their expectations. Also, monitoring the consistent use and frequent reference to the Focus Board in the classroom.

Person Responsible Tanya Caffieri (tlcaffie@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct collaborative planning that includes planning for alignment between the standard, the lesson, and the task. PLCs will also focus on identifying learning targets, discuss ideas for instruction (including gradual release, focus on including student voice, and collaborative learning). PLCs will also review student data to determine students who need additional instruction or intervention/support to be successful.

Person Responsible Susan Seidel (sjseidel@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This Area of Focus aligns to Strategic Plan Goal 2: Reduce the number of discipline events that result in loss of instructional minutes. Reducing the amount of discipline events will increase instructional minutes which will positively impact learning gains. An assessment of our Needs Assessment and Analysis revealed that we had a total of 2,528 disciplinary events which resulted in 652 removals from class.
Measureable Outcome:	Reduce the number of discipline event that result in a loss of instructional minutes by 25%. As a result, we will see increased learning gains in ELA and Math.
Monitoring:	As an effort to increase learning gains for all students and decrease discipline events, school personnel will utilize various strategies to monitor and respond to student behavior with less punitive measures. By implementing team teaching for all grade levels, standards-aligned tasks will be reinforced as teacher teams simultaneously discuss how they navigate the behaviors of shared students in the learning environment. Our goal is to foster a PLC where our teachers effectively collaborate to create a unified culture for learning and student engagement across core subject areas. Implementing this intervention method in core areas will allow teachers to engage in a comparative analysis of the correlation between the behavioral and academic needs of all our students. Teachers will have a hand in making sure their students are present for most instructional minutes. Additionally, coaches and the admin team will introduce classroom management strategies (CHAMPS) to all teachers. They will visit classrooms to help monitor, model, and reinforce classroom management expectations. CHAMPS serves as a positive and proactive approach to setting clear behavioral expectations schoolwide. Being able to set a guideline for behavior will give teachers, instructional leaders, and students a comparative framework for ongoing progress monitoring of desirable classroom behaviors. In turn, more students will remain in their core classrooms because they have been taught school-wide behavioral expectations.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kim Feltner (ksfeltne@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Classroom management training, DOJ training, Restorative Practices training, integration of SEL strategies. Teachers & Admin will: - stand at door to monitor students at beginning and end of school and/or during class changes - develop clear expectations with students and other strategies to solve a conflict without the initial reaction to be one of physical aggression - monitor students closely when transitioning in the hallways - participate in PL for SEL strategies provided during PLC time.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	An assessment of our 2020-2021 discipline data revealed an increased number in discipline events that resulted in a loss of instructional minutes. As a school building, we will utilize CHAMPS as a foundation for classroom management structures. Additionally, our faculty and staff will adhere to the settlement that has been reached concerning the need to put fair practices in

place for all students to maintain their right to learn in an inclusive environment. Furthermore, a school-based team will assist teachers in implementing alternative measures for disciplinary actions using Restorative Practices in lieu of punitive measures. Likewise, the incorporation of SEL strategies will serve as a basis for establishing and maintaining positive relationships between and among students and staff.

Action Steps to Implement

Teacher training on discipline monitoring and DOJ requirements during Pre-planning sessions.

Person Responsible   Lloyd Haynes (lghaynes@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Teacher training on classroom management strategies and different options before referral processes.
Teachers and staff will:
- Continue to provide teachers with support in the use of CHAMPS classroom mgt. strategies
- Ensure SEL restorative practices are implemented as soon as student issues arise
- Work with teachers during TEAMS data sessions to review student data, including referrals & 'Time Out' breaks to peer content teachers
- Align campus practices with 'Nuts & Bolts' professional learning to enhance teacher/student understanding & relationships
- Continue the 'Check & Connect' mentor program as well as implement the 'Be a Hero' mentoring program

Person Responsible   Tanya Caffieri (tlcaffie@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Provide teachers with discipline action plan.
Teachers & Admin will:
- stand at door to monitor students at beginning and end of school and/or during class changes
- develop clear expectations with students and other strategies to solve a conflict without the initial reaction to be one of physical aggression
- monitor students closely when transitioning in the hallways
- participate in PL during PLCs for discipline procedures.

Person Responsible   Lloyd Haynes (lghaynes@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Teacher Clarity remains a professional learning focus which according to research has a .75 Effect size impacting student achievement. Building teacher capacity and strengthening core teaching strategies will increase student achievement opportunity. Introducing professional learning for AVID strategies in conjunction with the Teacher Clarity focus is designed to create an immersive student driven environment with professional growth opportunities. Component 17-18 18-19 20-21 % of pos. pts 54 52 46 ELA Ach 46 46 44 ELA LG 47 54 49 ELA LQ 43 44 38 MATH ACH 52 47 38 MATH LG 55 48 39 MATH LQ 48 41 37 MS ACCEL 86 68 65 SCI ACH 61 55 49 SS ACH 52 61 55
Measureable Outcome:	If we have aligned professional learning with targeted instructional coaching, the overall professional pedagogy will be demonstrated in increased student achievement in the identified areas. Review of Cognia and 5Essentials survey. Our school grade will increase from a C to a B for the 21-22 school year. ELA Ach - increase from 44 to 49 ELA LG - increase from 49 to 56 ELA LQ gains - increase from 38 to 50 Math Ach - increase from 38 to 51 Math LG - increase from 39 to 59 Math LQ gains - increase from 37 to 48 Acc - increase from 65 to 75 Civics - increase from 55 to 67 Science - increase from 49 to 60
Monitoring:	School and District Based Walk throughs, Coaching cycles based on need using standardized walk-through tool, Implementation and Evaluation Guide after each Professional Learning opportunity, evaluation of student data monthly Persons responsible for monitoring: Instructional Coaches/Feltner/Seidel
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Susan Seidel (sjseidel@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our evidence-based strategy is Teacher Clarity and implementation of AVID strategies. We will monitor it through frequent walkthroughs by school-based administration, coaches, and the district support team. Grade level teams and individual teachers will receive feedback to guide them in planning and instructing for input on students' learning and determining next steps.
Rationale for	Teacher Clarity has an effect size of 0.75). The average affect size is 0.40, which is equal to approximately one year of learning.

Evidence-based Strategy:	AVID is a schoolwide initiative that uses Socratic methods, with emphasis on writing, critical teamwork and study groups that specifically target the needs of the students. Based upon a study evaluating AVID effectiveness, "Schools prosper from the implementation of AVID programs. AVID had affected the performance profile of the school by leveraging success of disaggregated subgroups of students, particularly African American and Latino students, as well as students from lower income families . Of the more than 20,000 AVID graduates nationwide, 93% have gone on to college."students that participated in AVID were 20% more likely to participate in 4-year colleges and universities with the overall AVID college participation rate at 93%. .

Action Steps to Implement

Implementation of AVID professional learning sessions

Person Responsible	Kim Feltner (ksfeltne@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Collaborative grade level, content focused & TEAMS weekly PLC's: Lesson Planning Design, Common Assessments & Data Reviews

Person Responsible	Susan Seidel (sjseidel@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Share with faculty school-based data reviewed and rationale for implementation of Teacher Clarity and AVID strategies on campus

Person Responsible	Kim Feltner (ksfeltne@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Overarching 'Teaching Clarity' Professional Learning w/ book study opportunity during ERPL and continued conversations during Team meetings and content area PLCs

Person Responsible	Susan Seidel (sjseidel@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Continue reiteration of Learning Target/Success Criteria relevance & use of information in classrooms by visual cues for students as well as embedding information into lesson to enhance student recognition of the 'Why' and understanding proficiency expectation

Person Responsible	Tanya Caffieri (tlcaffie@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

While reviewing our school data, it was noted the highest SESSIR indicator is 'PHA'; Physical Attack. Fighting was another high-level indicator identified on the state SESSIR report and the nature of these offenses have direct correlation to a high level of student aggression as well as overall disruption of the learning environment.

In response, Deltona Middle will:
- Continue to provide teachers with support in the use of CHAMPS classroom mgt. strategies
- Ensure SEL restorative practices are implemented as soon as student issues arise
- Work with teachers during TEAMS data sessions to review student data, including referrals & 'Time Out' breaks to peer content teachers
- Align campus practices with 'Nuts & Bolts' professional learning to enhance teacher/student understanding & relationships
- Continue the 'Check & Connect' mentor program as well as implement the 'Be a Hero' mentoring program

Teachers & Admin will:
- stand at door to monitor students at beginning and end of school and/or during class changes
- develop clear expectations with students and other strategies to solve a conflict without the initial reaction to be one of physical aggression
- monitor students closely when transitioning in the hallways

Data chats will take place monthly during Teams meetings to discuss the above implementation plan based on the evaluation of the data. Individual teacher data will be reviewed as well to identify if additional classroom mgt. supports required.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Creating new relationships and strengthening current relationships are foundational in the development of a positive school culture. Deltona Middle operates with transparency and trust. We maintain an open door policy and informational sharing philosophy allowing for all stakeholders to have a voice impacting change.

Opportunities providing collaborative discussions are offered through surveys, Live Team Event sessions, face to face meetings, social media announcements and campus events which are open to the community.

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

Admin Team
Dean of Student Relations
School Counselors
PASS instructor
Working as a team, this group will utilize restorative practices for peer mediation.