

Volusia County Schools

# Ortona Elementary School



## 2019-20 School 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>7</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Ortona Elementary School

1265 N GRANDVIEW AVE, Daytona Beach, FL 32118

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/ortonapages/default.aspx>

## Demographics

**Principal: Shantell Adkins G**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/16/2019

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	83%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	<b>Black/African American Students</b> Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students <b>Students With Disabilities</b> White Students
<b>School Grade</b>	2018-19: C
<b>School Grades History</b>	2017-18: C 2016-17: C 2015-16: C 2014-15: B 2013-14: C
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Dustin Sims</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	NOT IN DA

ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

#### Provide the school's mission statement

Through the cooperation of all, our students shall acquire the knowledge, wisdom and ethics which will enable them to be successful contributors in a democratic society.

#### Provide the school's vision statement

Each child will be supported to unlock or nourish their unique strengths, enabling them to acquire skills and knowledge to become successful life-long learners.

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Adkins, Shantell	Principal	
Campanella, Gina	Other	
Lyons, Debbie	Instructional Coach	
Murphy, Tiffani	Teacher, K-12	
Gheen, Audrey	Instructional Media	

### Early Warning Systems

#### Current Year

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	42	37	26	39	26	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	206
Attendance below 90 percent	2	3	3	6	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	7	9	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

**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	1	1	0	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)**

12

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

Monday 8/26/2019

**Prior Year - As Reported**

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
Attendance below 90 percent															
One or more suspensions															
Course failure in ELA or Math															
Level 1 on statewide assessment															

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
Students with two or more indicators															

**Prior Year - Updated**

**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	
Attendance below 90 percent	6	6	1	7	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	4	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	7	9	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

**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	1	0	3	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**

**School Data**

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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	52%	56%	57%	55%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	50%	56%	58%	49%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	21%	46%	53%	41%	39%	48%
Math Achievement	55%	59%	63%	62%	60%	62%
Math Learning Gains	49%	56%	62%	61%	54%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	43%	51%	41%	40%	47%
Science Achievement	60%	57%	53%	43%	58%	55%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	42 (0)	37 (0)	26 (0)	39 (0)	26 (0)	36 (0)	206 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	2 ( )	3 ( )	3 ( )	6 ( )	2 ( )	5 ( )	21 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ( )	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	3 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ( )	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ( )	0 (0)	0 (0)	7 (0)	9 (0)	11 (0)	27 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

**Grade Level Data**

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: 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
03	2019	46%	58%	-12%	58%	-12%
	2018	54%	56%	-2%	57%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	50%	54%	-4%	58%	-8%
	2018	60%	54%	6%	56%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2019	60%	54%	6%	56%	4%
	2018	44%	51%	-7%	55%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	54%	60%	-6%	62%	-8%
	2018	59%	58%	1%	62%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	53%	59%	-6%	64%	-11%
	2018	61%	60%	1%	62%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2019	47%	54%	-7%	60%	-13%
	2018	50%	57%	-7%	61%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-14%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	55%	56%	-1%	53%	2%
	2018	42%	56%	-14%	55%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison						

**Subgroup Data**

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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	31			42							
ELL	60			70							
BLK	24	35		21	44						
HSP	50			55							
WHT	64	52		67	52		83				



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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
FRL	46	45	21	50	46	54	53				

2018 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	29	50		29	33						
ELL	40			80							
BLK	36	20		36	65		20				
HSP	60			70							
WHT	62	56		72	54		48				
FRL	54	45	33	57	59	47	39				

### ESSA Data

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	49
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	341
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

#### Subgroup Data

##### Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
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	65
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

<b>Asian Students</b>	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	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
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	53
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Native American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Pacific Islander Students</b>	
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
<b>White Students</b>	
Federal Index - White Students	64
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Economically Disadvantaged Students</b>	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	45
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 Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

ELA Lowest Quartile- Contributing factors were curriculum (teachers hesitation to use modules). Intervention/ intervention teachers could benefit from PD on targeted resources and intervention strategies. Students in lowest quartile did not attend after school tutoring, nor was the tutoring program resource rich.

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

Math Learning Gains- Contributing Factors were the lack of knowledge of content/ resources. In the past district personnel in math would come to school and train teachers, this did not happen as often this past school year.

#### **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 Lowest Quartile at 21% had the greatest gap compared to the state average of 53%. Contributing factors were curriculum (teachers hesitation to use modules). Intervention/ intervention teachers could benefit from PD on targeted resources and intervention strategies. Students in lowest quartile did not attend after school tutoring, nor was the tutoring program resource rich.

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

Science increased from 43% proficiency to 60% proficiency, showing the most improvement. Science was an area of focus in the 2018-19 school year and will continue this year. 5th Grade teams embeds the 3rd and 4th grade standards throughout their lessons. Met with district personnel to review district data and plan lessons to connect those standards to the 5th grade standards. Review with students (Kahoots and CPALMS) on 3rd and 4th grade standards. We will continue to work on reviewing and embedding 3rd and 4th grade "Fair Game" standards throughout the year.

#### **Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)**

4th grade has three students who show two or more EWS ( FSA level 1, failing grade(s), and attendance)and 3rd grade has one student who shows two EWS indicators(attendance and FSA level 1).

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

1. Math
2. ELA Lowest Quartile
3. Science
- 4.
- 5.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

<b>#1</b>	
<b>Title</b>	ELA Lowest Quartile
<b>Rationale</b>	As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our ELA proficiency was at 52%, ELA Learning Gains was 50% and the Lowest Quartile performed at 21% which was far below the district and state average. Our SLT has decided to focus on ELA Lowest Quartile in our Lowest Quartile were also our two targeted ESSA Subgroups, ESE and Black, that performed below 41%.
<b>State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Increase ELA Lowest Quartile from 21% to 50%
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Shantell Adkins (sgadkins@volusia.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Teacher led small group instruction with standard based instruction.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Teacher led Small Group Instruction has a .49 effect size according to John Hattie. FL Center for Reading Research (FCCR) and Just Read Florida recommends small group instruction to help differentiate core instruction and provide intervention for struggling students in a timely manner.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Review lowest quartile data to finalize master schedule focused on proper interventions for ESE/ELL support.</li> <li>2. Faciliate PL on Wonders and intervention pieces.</li> <li>3. Administer I-Ready Diagnostic to establish baseline data,</li> <li>4. Conduct weekly PLC's to review school base data.</li> <li>5. Data chats with admin. focused on reviewing student groupings and planning for interventions with coach.</li> <li>6. Conduct montly progress monitoring meetings with ESE, African American, and Intervention Teachers to review data and support services to plan instruction.</li> <li>7. Create coaching cycles to support small group instruction.</li> <li>8. Conduct learning walks during small group instruction</li> <li>9. Monitor small group instruction through ongoing Adminstrative Walkthroughs and Feedback.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Shantell Adkins (sgadkins@volusia.k12.fl.us)

<b>#2</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Science
<b>Rationale</b>	As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our science proficiency was at 60%, which was below the district average. Our SLT has decided to focus on science in order to improve science and overall proficiency for all students. Further analysis revealed that most of the students not proficient in science were also in our two targeted ESSA subgroups, ESE and Black.
<b>State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Increase Science proficiency from 60% to 75%.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Shantell Adkins (sgadkins@volusia.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Standard based instruction in science.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Science programs have .48 effect size, collaborative learning has a .34 effect size, classroom discussion has a .82 effect size, and planning and prediction has a .76 effect size according to John Hattie. Elevate Science, ScienSource, field studies, and hands on learning experiences (labs) will be used to for standard based instruction.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Review science data (VST) to finalize master schedule and proper placement for ESE and African American students.</li> <li>2. Facilitate Science PL (What's My Role) so all teachers in all grade level know what to teach.</li> <li>3. Administer SMT and VST to review current data and needs.</li> <li>4. Data chats with admin. focused on reviewing student groupings and planning for interventions with coach.</li> <li>5. Conduct monthly progress monitoring meetings with ESE, African American, and Intervention Teachers to review data and support services to plan instruction (use special area teachers as needed).</li> <li>6. Create coaching cycles to support small group instruction.</li> <li>7. Conduct learning walks during small group instruction/ hands on experiments.</li> <li>8. Monitor small group instruction through ongoing Administrative Walkthroughs and Feedback.</li> <li>9. Facilitate standard based science field studies.</li> <li>10. Facilitate common experiments and "Way Back Wednesday".</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Shantell Adkins (sgadkins@volusia.k12.fl.us)

<b>#3</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Math Learning Gains
<b>Rationale</b>	As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our math proficiency was at 55%, Math Learning Gains was 49% and the Lowest Quartile performed at 54% which was far below the district and state average. Our SLT has decided to focus on Math Lowest Quartile in our Lowest Quartile were also our two targeted ESSA Subgroups, ESE and Black, that performed below 41%.
<b>State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Increase math learning gains from 49% to 69% and math lowest quartile from 54% to 70%.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Shantell Adkins (sgadkins@volusia.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Teacher led, small group, hands on instruction.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Small Group Instruction has a .49 effect size according to John Hattie. Math Canvanas, Engage NY, and Number talks are recommended for small group instruction to help differentiate core instruction and provide intervention for struggling students in a timely manner.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Review math data to finalize master schedule focused on proper interventions for ESE/African American students support.</li> <li>2. Faciliate PL on Envision Math and intervention pieces.</li> <li>3. Administer I-Ready Diagnostic to establish baseline data.</li> <li>4. Conduct weekly PLC's to review school base data.</li> <li>5. Data chats with admin. focused on reviewing student groupings and planning for interventions with coach.</li> <li>6. Conduct montly progress monitoring meetings with ESE, African American, and Intervention Teachers to review data and support services to plan instruction.</li> <li>7. Create coaching cycles to support small group instruction.</li> <li>8. Conduct learning walks during small group instruction.</li> <li>9. Monitor small group instruction through ongoing Adminstrative Walkthroughs and Feedback.</li> <li>10. Ensure teachers have the proper manipulatives to teach topics from concrete to abstract ideas.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Shantell Adkins (sgadkins@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)**

**After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information)**

n/a

## Part IV: Title I Requirements

### Additional Title I Requirements

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

**Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students**

Curriculum Night for ELA and Math  
School buses to transport families to and from school events  
Parent Liaison

#### PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

**Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services**

Classroom and school-wide incentives for coming to school on time  
Refresher with Sandford Harmony (SEL 15 minute block daily)  
Bumper Stickers/ Dolphin Magent/ Event Tickets

**Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another**

Intervention Teacher  
Before/ After School Tutoring  
Saturday Bootcamp Tutoring  
Field Studies

**Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact**

Book Study- Teach Like a Champ 2.0- Ms. Campanella/ Leadership Team (monthly)  
1/2 day teacher time curriculum days, (once each quarter)- Mr. Adkins  
Data Days for planning and data review- Mr. Adkins/ Ms. Campanella  
Intervention Teacher -Mrs. Leadons (meets with teachers weekly/ meets with Mr. Adkins/ Ms. Campanella bi-weekly)



Title one Inventory is maintained through Mrs. Gheen and Mrs. Strader through an inventory list of all equipment.

We use consumable materials as other resources and Mr. Adkin's is in charge of ordering based on students needs each year. Mr. Shaw keeps that inventory.

**Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations**

Our curriculum is set up and designed to prepare students for college and career readiness. Ortona also partners with Daytona State College and Bethune Cookman College. We have college students come out to our school and work with our students.