Orange City Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Orange City Elementary School

555 E UNIVERSITY AVE, Orange City, FL 32763

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

Demographics

Principal: V IR Ginia Freeman A

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2015

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
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)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: C (41%) 2015-16: C (53%) 2014-15: C (50%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
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.

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.

Table of Contents

Orange City Elementary School

555 E UNIVERSITY AVE, Orange City, FL 32763

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2018-19 Title I School**	**2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	80%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	36%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	C	C	C	C

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 school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

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 (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://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.

All students learn at Orange City School, where CPR – Cooperation, Pride, and Respect – brings us to life and helps us to do our best.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Orange City Elementary... where hard work opens doors to a brighter tomorrow.

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
Bynum, Charles	Principal	Principal
Kania, Kristina	Assistant Principal	Principal Intern
Morrison, Theresa	Instructional Coach	Academic Coach
Bowen, Erin	School Counselor	Guidance Counselor
Desmond, Ashley	Teacher, K-12	Intermediate Teacher
Adams, Rhonda	Teacher, ESE	ESE Support Facilitation Teacher
Sheehan, Phil	Teacher, K-12	Primary Teacher 1st Grade
Turner, Cheryl	Teacher, K-12	Primary Teacher 3rd Grade
Mena, Makenzie	Teacher, K-12	Primary Kindergarten Teacher
Mack, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	Intermediate 4th Grade Teacher
Moncelsi, Renee	Teacher, K-12	2nd Grade Teacher

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	22	17	12	11	12	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	24	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69

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	2	5	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	7	2	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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

28

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/23/2019

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	13	15	14	9	9	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77
One or more suspensions	0	5	2	4	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	24	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69

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	4	9	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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	45%	56%	57%	48%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	40%	56%	58%	44%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	46%	53%	36%	44%	52%
Math Achievement	43%	59%	63%	47%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	43%	56%	62%	43%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	43%	51%	30%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	52%	57%	53%	42%	59%	51%

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	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	22 ()	17 ()	12 ()	11 ()	12 ()	17 ()	91 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	3 (0)	5 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	6 (0)	24 (0)	39 (0)	69 (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	47%	58%	-11%	58%	-11%
	2018	51%	56%	-5%	57%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	42%	54%	-12%	58%	-16%
	2018	48%	54%	-6%	56%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
05	2019	45%	54%	-9%	56%	-11%
	2018	36%	51%	-15%	55%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	45%	60%	-15%	62%	-17%
	2018	53%	58%	-5%	62%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	39%	59%	-20%	64%	-25%
	2018	38%	60%	-22%	62%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-14%				
05	2019	40%	54%	-14%	60%	-20%
	2018	41%	57%	-16%	61%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	49%	56%	-7%	53%	-4%
	2018	54%	56%	-2%	55%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	16	37	35	9	28	32	26				

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
ELL	35	20		40	53						
BLK	19	29		19	21						
HSP	41	45		52	55		44				
WHT	48	38	33	43	43	36	54				
FRL	41	44	39	42	42	36	51				
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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	10	29	27	18	41	33	18				
ELL	30	40	30	35	63	70					
BLK	23	23		27	15						
HSP	40	41	36	46	50	50	63				
MUL	38			38							
WHT	52	47	41	48	44	38	57				
FRL	45	44	40	46	43	31	54				
2017 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	18	24	24	14	16	11	7				
ELL	23	22		41	33						
BLK	27	29		23	21						
HSP	44	31		39	35		36				
MUL	55			27							
WHT	50	49	38	52	46	30	48				
FRL	45	43	36	44	39	27	43				

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	44
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	45
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	349
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	39
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

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%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	22
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	46
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	42
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	42
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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.

The data component that showed the lowest performance was the ELA Lowest 25th Percentile. Compared to last year, the trend is about the same, only 1% lower. One of the contributing factors could be that the tiered interventions were not systematic. The MTSS protocal may not have been followed school wide.

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

The data components that showed the greatest decline were Science Achievement and ELA Learning Gains. Both of these components dropped by 5% from the previous year. One of the factors that could have contributed to the decline in Science Achievement was the adoption of a new science textbook and teachers becoming comfortable and familiar with the series. A contributing factor in the decline for our ELA learning gains is that two of our four 4th grade teachers went on maternity leave, leaving two classrooms with long term substitutes for the second semester.

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

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was Math Achievement, which was 20%. There was a 3% drop from the previous year. Some of the contributing factors include an ELA focus school wide and there was not any math tutoring offered.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was the Math Lowest 25th Percentile. The action our school took in this area was we added a math intervention teacher to work with the lowest quartile on campus.

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

Two potential areas of concern include Attendance below 90% and Level 1 on statewide assessements.

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

1. ELA proficiency
2. SWD Achievement in both ELA and Math
3. Math proficiency
4. Attendance
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

Title	ELA Proficiency
Rationale	As a result of ELA FSA scores, it revealed that our 3rd grade reading proficiency is at 47%, 4th grade is at 42%, and 5th grade is at 45%. Our SLT has decided to focus on ELA proficiency in order to improve overall proficiency for all students.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase school-wide ELA proficiency from 45% to 55%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Charles Bynum (cdbynum@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Standards based, teacher-led small group instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	.47 effect size for small group instruction according to John Hattie.

Action Step

Description	1. Implement small group professional learning connecting the standards to Wonders 2. Provide scheduled intervention time 3. Implement Coaching Cycles 4. Review iReady diagnostic results 5. Continue small group learning walks 6. Practice small group structure 7. Continue PLC
Person Responsible	Kristina Kania (klkania@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	ELA Learning Gains
Rationale	As a result of ELA FSA scores, it revealed that our school's ELA learning gains were 40%. Our SLT has decided to focus on ELA learning gains to improve ELA proficiency for all students. This includes our three targeted ESSA sub groups, ESE, multi-racial, and African American.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase ELA learning gains from 40% to 50%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Charles Bynum (cdbynum@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Differentiated instruction (enrichment and intervention)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	According to John Hattie, there is a .77 effect size for interventions with students with learning needs.
Action Step	
Description	1. Review iReady diagnostics 2. Utilize the MTSS decision tree for tiered interventions 3. Utilize Coaching Cycles 4. Provide Scheduled Intervention/Enrichment time 5. Utilize Wonders leveled readers for differentiated small groups
Person Responsible	Kristina Kania (klkania@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Math Proficiency
Rationale	As a result of math FSA scores, it revealed that our 3rd grade math proficiency is at 45%, 4th grade is at 39%, and 5th grade is at 40%. Our SLT has decided to focus on math proficiency in order to improve overall proficiency for all students.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase school-wide math proficiency from 43% to 53%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Charles Bynum (cdbynum@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teacher led standards based core instruction that includes student collaboration
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	John Hattie's research shows there is an effect size of .82 for classroom discussion.

Action Step	
Description	1. Math walk throughs utilizing IPG 2. Implement number Talks 3. Encourage the utilization of math tools 4. Provide PLC with math intervention teacher 5. Utilize team planning
Person Responsible	Kristina Kania (klkania@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).

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 Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 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.

Orange City Elementary invites the community members and local business owners to attend school events. We intentionally encourage community members and business partners to participate on the School Advisory Council. We invite city officials to speak personally to students and parents and to participate in school celebrations. River Springs Middle School visits annually to speak to rising sixth graders concerning preparation for the middle school transition. Orange City Elementary administration

and support staff effectively communicate the needs of our school community to stake holders and partners. In that way, we are able to secure needed resources to support student achievement. Lois Ellis, family center paraprofessional, helps to coordinate events for families and provide continuous support.

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.

The school offers the following non-violence and anti-drug programs:
• Student Mentoring Program
• D.A.R.E. Program
• Bullying Program
• Devereux Mentoring Program
• Suicide Prevention Program
All students are screened quarterly for behavioral and social-emotional issues through the electronic report card. Through the screening, the school is able to dis-aggregate data to determine if individual students, classrooms, teachers, grade levels or the school would benefit from targeted interventions to address specific behavioral and social emotional areas. Student services personnel (i.e., school psychologist, counselors, school social workers, and behavior specialist) provide direct and indirect evidenced-based support to students identified through the screening measure.
Sanford Harmony is being utilized school wide to ensure all social-emotional needs are met for every student. This includes morning meets ups, conversation starters, and mini lessons on positive interactions.

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

The District, in conjunction with the Head Start agency serving the community, coordinates efforts to promote continuity of services and effective transitions for children and their families. These include:
• Providing the opportunity for ongoing channels of communication with Head Start to facilitate coordination of programs and for shared expectations for children's learning and development as the children transition to elementary school.
• Assisting in the development of a systematic procedure for transferring, with parental consent, Head Start program records, for each participating child to the school in which such child will enroll.
• Collaborating and participating in joint Professional Development, including transition-related training for school staff and Head Start staff when feasible.
• Coordinating the services being provided by Head Start with services in elementary schools.
• Providing to the Head Start agency local public school policies, kindergarten registration and other relevant information to ease the transition of children and families from Head Start.
River Springs Middle School visits annually to speak to rising sixth graders concerning preparation for the
middle school transition. They also come to help them pick classes for the next year and to share information regarding their programs they have at the middle school.

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.

The school based MTSS leadership team identifies school based resources (both materials and personnel) to determine the continuum of academic and behavioral supports available to students at the individual school site. Academic and behavioral data are considered in order to determine priorities and functions of other existing teams (e.g., Problem Solving Teams, Behavior Leadership Teams, and Professional Learning Communities). The Problem Solving process (i.e., Problem Identification, Analysis of Problem, Intervention Implementation and Response to Intervention) is used as the way of work of all teams and not just for individual student concerns. Adherence to the Problem Solving process ensures that individual, class-wide, and school-wide issues are addressed systematically with data; that interventions (supports) are tiered to the targeted problems; and that a plan is in place to monitor progress. The school-based MTSS leadership team meets regularly throughout the school year in order to address the academic and behavioral needs that develop throughout the year, as well as to monitor outcomes of supports and interventions.
Under Title I Part A our school works with outside agencies that provide specific services to targeted children and their families.
Programs supported by Title I at Orange City Elementary include:
*Parent liaison facilitates our parent involvement program
*Reading and math Intervention teachers to provide interventions for students in need.
*Supplemental Tutoring after school
*Supplemental materials and supplies needed to close the achievement gap
*Supplemental funds for ongoing staff development as determined by the results of FSA data
*Parents to Kids workshops to teach literacy skills to parents so they can help their children become better readers.
*Instructional technology to assist with closing the achievement gap.
*Supplemental funds for quarterly professional learning communities

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

Every student is encouraged to articulate a future goal for a career path. Teachers discuss with students on a regular basis and ask questions (i.e.): what do you want to be when you grow up? Classrooms include bulletin boards, student pictures, and career information. Teachers also assist students with creating goals to improve on their academic and behavioral performance. Students and teachers consistently review and discuss student goals to see if they are being met. Goals are discussed at parent teacher conferences.