

Putnam County School District

# The Children's Reading Center



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>15</b>

# The Children's Reading Center

7901 SAINT JOHNS AVE, Palatka, FL 32177

www.putnamschools.org/o/crcs

## Demographics

Principal: Jacqueline England

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2016

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-6
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	88%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (70%) 2017-18: A (80%) 2016-17: A (77%) 2015-16: C (52%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Putnam County School Board on 11/3/2020.

## 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.

## Table of Contents

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>15</b>

## The Children's Reading Center

7901 SAINT JOHNS AVE, Palatka, FL 32177

[www.putnamschools.org/o/crcs](http://www.putnamschools.org/o/crcs)

### School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-6	Yes	63%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	34%

### School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	A	A

### School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Putnam County School Board on 11/3/2020.

### 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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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.

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2016, Jacqueline England

**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.*

3

**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.*

3

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

14

#### Demographic Data

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-6

<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	88%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (70%) 2017-18: A (80%) 2016-17: A (77%) 2015-16: C (52%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## 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	41	40	42	39	41	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	242
Attendance below 90 percent	1	2	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math 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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

**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	6	3	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Tuesday 6/16/2020

**Prior Year - 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	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

**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	

**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	
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

**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	

**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	
	(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.

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					
	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	

ESSA Federal Index	
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%	0
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%	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
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	60
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	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	73

Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial 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	76
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	68
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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.**

Due to COVID 19 we will continue to look at our fifth grade science achievement scores which fell from 78% in 2018 to 62% in 2019. 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 in 2019.

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

In 2019 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?

We are concerned about retentions in our lower grades. This, however, is possibly due to COVID 19 and many summer birthdays.

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

1. Science FCAT
2. Retentions

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

#### #1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

##### Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

##### Measurable Outcome:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

##### Evidence-based Strategy:

##### Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

##### Action Steps to Implement

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*

#### #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

##### Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

We have 14 retentions this year. Most are due to summer birthdays, which makes some of our children very young and immature.

##### Measurable Outcome:

We would like to decrease our retentions by at least 50% for the next school year.

##### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jacqueline England (jengland@my.putnamschools.org)

##### Evidence-based Strategy:

Coaches will work with K-2 teachers to develop strategies to move all children forward allowing them to promote to the next grade.

##### Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Our rationale is that if teachers understand how to use strategies in the classroom with children, the children will become better educated.

##### Action Steps to Implement

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*

### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

**Our retentions are a main focus for us this year. Another priority is our FCAT Science scores. We will work with children in the classroom and in science lab with hands-on experiences in order to increase knowledge, therefore, increasing FCAT scores.**

## 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 ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

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 are 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.

### Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

## Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00