The Children's Reading Center

2021-22 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: 9/1/2016

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	88%
2020-21 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%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* 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 Putnam 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

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)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-6	Yes	62%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	37%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		A	A	A

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Putnam 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.

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	Position 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
Thursday 9/1/2016, 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
16

Total number of students enrolled at the school
243

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
3

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
5

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	40	44	34	41	31	36	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	242
Attendance below 90 percent	2	4	5	6	4	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	2	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	10	2	1	3	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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	0	3	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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 9/7/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	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	

2020-21 - 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	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	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				72%	46%	57%	70%	43%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				72%	55%	58%	67%	45%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				60%	54%	53%	74%	40%	48%
Math Achievement				82%	51%	63%	87%	52%	62%
Math Learning Gains				76%	56%	62%	94%	55%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				65%	43%	51%	91%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				62%	41%	53%	79%	46%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	71%	41%	30%	58%	13%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	76%	43%	33%	58%	18%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				
05	2021					
	2019	69%	42%	27%	56%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				
06	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-69%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	74%	46%	28%	62%	12%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	78%	53%	25%	64%	14%
Cohort Comparison		-74%				
05	2021					
	2019	93%	44%	49%	60%	33%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				
06	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-93%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	62%	38%	24%	53%	9%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

N/A

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Science	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
BLK	64			60							
WHT	78	76		90	90		71				
FRL	78	57		78	79		80				
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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	71
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	356
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	62
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	
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	
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	81
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	74
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

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

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

Although not so much in the younger grades, African American children often score lower on the FSA and FCAT. We are trying to alleviate the discrepancy by pulling fluid small groups by need.

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

During the 2019 school year we had 62% of our fifth grade students pass the Science FCAT with a level 3 or higher. We would like to improve on this 62% to 70% proficient in the 2021-2022 school year. We would also like to improve on our Kindergarten practices to improve reading levels. We would like all K students to be a strong DRA level 4 by the end of the school year. Although many children do reach a level 4 or higher, we feel that we can have more K students score on a level 4 DRA or higher.

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

Scores from the Science FCAT were the contributing factor for the need to improve our science scores in fifth grade. We are ramping up our science lab curriculum to cover science topics more deeply throughout K-5. DRA scores of lower than 4 was a deciding factor for our need to improve kindergarten reading scores. Our reading coach will spend extra time in kindergarten and pull small groups herself to help propel these children to a DRA level 4 or higher.

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

Our first grade DRA scores showed much improvement over the year. Children leaving first grade and moving on to second grade are expected to have a DRA level of 18. Most of our children exceeded that expectation and scored a 30.

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

We allocate our Title I funds to teachers to conduct daily small group reading groups with all first and second grade children. This allows ALL children to move forward from their current level of understanding. We were able to make smaller groups by training other employees to work with the highest groups of children.

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

We will continue to work with all children K-6 in order to serve the needs of all of our children.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

We have a couple of trainings a year to make sure we are accelerating all children. These trainings are presented by our academic coaches.

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

Small groups will be conducted in all grade levels in all subjects to continue improvement over the years.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This year we will be focusing on increasing the knowledge learned in science in grades k-6 to increase Science FCAT scores in the future.
Measurable Outcome:	Our plan is to have 70% of our fifth grade students pass the Science FCAT.
Monitoring:	We will assess children often to document their levels of understanding and also to drive our science instruction.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jacqueline England (jengland@my.putnamschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will use information gained from our assessments to drive future instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Student data is a necessity in educating children in order to increase their knowledge.

Action Steps to Implement

We will revisit lesson plans and update lesson plans to be certain children are obtaining the information needed to do well on the Science FCAT. Jacqueline England is responsible for monitoring the science information presented to children K-6.

Person Responsible	Jacqueline England (jengland@my.putnamschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

We have very few disciplinary issues.

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.

Our school uses the district curriculum, Caring School Communities, to help build character in our school. We also use a positive behavior ladder to help children correct behaviors in the classroom before it is too

late. If a child has acceptable behaviors during the school week, they are invited to participate in Fun Friday, which is a time when children can participate in fun activities. We send letters home to our parents often to keep them informed not only of the school's information, but individual information about their child. Rocket Reader days are recognized monthly, when children who meet the criteria can wear other clothes other than their uniform.

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

Several meetings a year are planned with parents 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.