The Children's Reading Center

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

The Children's Reading Center

7901 SAINT JOHNS AVE, Palatka, FL 32177

www.putnamschools.org/o/crccs

Demographics

Principal: Jacqueline England

Start Date for this Principal: 9/17/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-6
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)	88%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (70%) 2017-18: A (80%) 2016-17: A (77%) 2015-16: C (52%) 2014-15: B (61%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Putnam County School Board on 11/5/2019.

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

The Children's Reading Center

7901 SAINT JOHNS AVE, Palatka, FL 32177

www.putnamschools.org/o/crccs

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 KG-6	Yes	76%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	35%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Putnam County School Board on 11/5/2019.

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.

Our school mission is that all adults work together to promote high levels of learning for all students in a caring, respectful, and disciplined environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is that all children learn to their highest potential in a caring, disciplined environment that has high expectations for all children, in order for them to become productive citizens of our society.

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
England, Jacqueline	Principal	My duties include leadership for the entire school, ESE coordinator, curriculum and instruction.

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	38	38	43	38	45	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	244
Attendance below 90 percent	0	9	3	4	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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	5	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
	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	
	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	
	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	
	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	0	2	1	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	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

14

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/17/2019

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	72%	46%	57%	75%	43%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	72%	55%	58%	71%	50%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	60%	54%	53%	84%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	82%	51%	63%	89%	52%	61%
Math Learning Gains	76%	56%	62%	82%	56%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	65%	43%	51%	74%	42%	51%
Science Achievement	62%	41%	53%	61%	37%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Number of students enrolled	38 (0)	38 (0)	43 (0)	38 (0)	45 (0)	42 (0)	0 (0)	244 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ()	9 ()	3 ()	4 ()	7 ()	4 ()	0 ()	27 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	8 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	9 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	5 (0)	8 (0)	2 (0)	0 (0)	15 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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	71%	41%	30%	58%	13%	
	2018	60%	40%	20%	57%	3%	
Same Grade Comparison		11%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	76%	43%	33%	58%	18%	
	2018	68%	38%	30%	56%	12%	
Same Grade Comparison		8%					
Cohort Comparison		16%					
05	2019	69%	42%	27%	56%	13%	
	2018	80%	39%	41%	55%	25%	
Same Grade Comparison		-11%					
Cohort Comparison		1%					
06	2019						

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-80%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	74%	46%	28%	62%	12%
	2018	70%	48%	22%	62%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	78%	53%	25%	64%	14%
	2018	93%	50%	43%	62%	31%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
05	2019	93%	44%	49%	60%	33%
	2018	100%	48%	52%	61%	39%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-100%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	62%	38%	24%	53%	9%
	2018	78%	42%	36%	55%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		-16%				
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	28	40	42	52	65						
BLK	53	59		60	68	60					
MUL	73			73							
WHT	78	76	73	90	80		56				
FRL	73	71	54	79	69	69	58				

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	32	57		73	93						
BLK	55	70	90	73	95	91	50				
WHT	76	65		92	92	91	88				
FRL	60	62	73	81	93	88	65				
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	50	67		75	75						
BLK	63	74		81	74		45				
WHT	82	69		93	92		69				
FRL	70	66	77	85	71	75	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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	70
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	489
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	45
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	60
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	73
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	76
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	68
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.

Our fifth grade science achievement fell from 78% in 2018 to 62% in 2019. In all tested areas this fifth grade cohort scored lower than the year before. The 2019 group was an average group of fifth graders; whereas, the year before the group was much higher academically overall.

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

Our greatest decline was on the FCAT science. The children went from 78% passing in 2018 to 62% passing in 2019. The children were lower academically than the 2018 children.

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.

All data components were higher than the state averages.

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

Our third grade ELA showed the most improvement moving from 60% passing in 2018 to 71% passing in 2019. We took no new actions to achieve this goal.

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

We are concerned with our attendance below 90%.

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

1. Science FCAT
2. Attendance
3.
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Our attendance is a main focus for us this year.
Rationale	Our data shows that 27 of our children missed over 90% of school in the 2018-2019 school year.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	We would like to decrease our number of absences over 90% from 11% to 8%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jacqueline England (jengland@my.putnamschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	We have written into our Parent/Student/Teacher compact that excessive absences will result in possible invitation back to the student's home school.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Our rationale is if our children are not in school, they cannot learn. They miss valuable instruction which leads to lower assessment scores.
Action Step	
Description	1. Added attendance policy to our Parent/Student/Teacher compact. 2. Letter sent informing parents of excessive absences and tardies. 3. Conference with principal about excessive absences and tardies. 4. If absences continue, possible invitation to return to student's home school. 5.
Person Responsible	Jacqueline England (jengland@my.putnamschools.org)

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.

Monthly meetings with parents are planned to involve them in an organized, ongoing, and timely manner in the planning, review and improvement of our school academic and Title I programs including involvement in the decision regarding how funds for parental involvement will be used. The school also provides support for parental involvement activities, which include a Title I Program; Math/Literacy Night; PIDAC participation; and Project Praise. We have an open door policy.

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.

Our school uses the curriculum Caring School Communities supplied by the county. This program address many sensitive topics, including bullying. Teachers also educate children in the classrooms in regards to some mental health issues and bullying. We are also provided counselors through the county to service individual children.

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

Our incoming kindergartners are given numerous assessments to evaluate what knowledge they already possess. These evaluations include letter ID, sounds, counting 1-10, 1-1 correspondence, number ID 0-10, and concepts of print. Each of these skills are reevaluated approximately every two weeks. We use all of our progress monitoring to drive instruction. When our children transition from fifth grade to sixth, we deliver all files to the middle school of their choice. We also keep open communication between us and the middle school guidance counselors. Also, our fifth graders are always invited to tour the sixth grade center in the spring of each year.

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 U.S. Department of Education released proposed regulations to implement the requirements related to Federal spending in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as recently revised by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) which states, Federal funds must supplement and may not supplant state and local funds. Each school year, the District's Chief Financial Officer assures state and local funds are distributed to an equal level by preparing a report showing comparability across all schools for the allocation of instructional staff. Staff allocations are based on a formula applied consistently so that all schools that are comparable receive allocations in a comparable manner. The report is audited by the state yearly to assure the district meets this mandate. The funding formula is based on Florida Public Schools Full-time Equivalent (FTE) data. For the past several years, grades kindergarten, first, second, and third grades have been allocated 1 teacher per 17 students. Grades fourth and fifth are allocated 1 teacher per 21 students. Though the specific ratio may change year to year, this formula provides teachers for these grade levels at slightly below the ratio required to meet Florida's class size regulations. Additionally, the school leadership team conducts a district unified Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA) towards the end of each school year. The CNA reports on how resources including personnel, instruction, and curriculum are aligned to identified needs. Student programming outcomes are monitored in the CNA. Federal funding projects are monitored for auditing purposes by the Office of Federal Programs. Audit boxes for each program are maintained and aligned to pertinent work papers and Federal and State guidance.

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

Our students are exposed to many different careers through our curriculum. Our school library and classroom libraries include information on many careers. In addition, we invite field based experts to visit classrooms to provide career exposure to students.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Our attendance is a main focus for us this year.	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00