

California Department of Education

**Early Literacy Support Block Grant Program
Annual Progress Report Template**

The Early Literacy Support Block (ELSB) Grant program Annual Progress Report allows for participating districts and eligible schools to determine and describe the effectiveness in addressing the required components of the ELSB Grant planning process. **The Annual Report for Year 1 (Planning Year) is due to the California Department of Education on July 30, 2021.** Please complete the following information and email the completed report to ELSBGrant@cde.ca.gov.

Name of District and Eligible Participating School(s):

Community Collaborative Charter School

Report Submitted By (Name/Title): Dr Christine McCormick, Assistant Superintendent

Phone/Email: 916-26-5110, christine.mccormick@gcccharters.org

Period Covered: December 1, 2020 – June 30, 2021

Date Submitted: July 31, 2021

1. Account for the ELSB grant program planning activities that identify both individual and collective contributions in the conducting of a Root Cause Analysis and Needs Assessment.
 - a. Describe the process and timeline of activities conducted in the development of the Root Cause Analysis and Needs Assessment
 - b. Specify the local educational agency (LEA) ELSB lead and primary fiscal contact staff.
 - c. Include the names of participants for each participating school and participant roles (e.g., J Brahms – 1st grade teacher at Mozart Elementary; A. Vivaldi – Principal, Bach Elementary, R. Wagner – Bach Site Literacy Coach, G. Verdi – District Curriculum Coordinator etc.).

- a. The root cause analysis and time line activities were conducted over 8 sessions beginning in January of 2021 and ending in May 2021 in partnership with Pivot and the Sacramento County Office of Education. The CCCS team participated in all 8 sessions alongside the Project Director and Director of Academics

Session 1: January 2021 – Evidence Based Reading Instruction and Assessment part 1
Session 2: February 2021– Evidence Based Reading Instruction and Assessment part 2
Session 3: February 2021– Evidence Based Reading Instruction and Assessment part 3
Session 4: March 2021 – Literacy Root Cause Analysis
Session 5 March 2021 – Literacy Root Cause Analysis debrief and data analysis
Session 6: April 2021- Literacy Needs Assessment
Session 7: April 2021 – Literacy Needs Assessment debrief and data analysis
Session 8: May 2021 – Needs assessment and Root Cause Analysis summary and plan development

- b. LEA Lead: Dr. Christine McCormick, Assistant Superintendent
Fiscal Contact: Omaira Reyna, CBO

LEA/District: Community Collaborative Charter School

LEA/District Contact/Project Director: Christine McCormick

Site(s): Community Collaborative Charter School K-8

Site Administrator(s): Sarah Scheeline/ Jon Campbell

Early Literacy Team Member	Role (Include title and/or grade level)
Sarah Scheeline	Campus Principal
Robert Lynn	Kindergarten Teacher
Susanne Rosas	1st Grade Teacher
Aly Wilson	2nd/3rd Grades Teacher
Russ Fluty	3rd/4th Grades Teacher
Heather Gold	Director of Academics, Gateway Community Charters

2. Validate the results of the Root Cause Analysis and Needs Assessment.

- a. Specify the findings from the examination of both school-level and LEA-level practices or unmet needs, including those relating to school climate, social-emotional learning, and the experience of under-performing pupils and their families, that have contributed to low pupil outcomes for pupils in grade three on the consortium summative assessment in English Language Arts.

We met as an early literacy team to engage in a root cause analysis of our achievement gaps in the area of early literacy. Our Guiding Question for this root cause analysis was, "How do our current practices around word recognition, language fluency, and monitoring fluency contribute to the problem that too few of our students are able to read and comprehend grade-level text?" Our team examined CAASPP, Renaissance Learning, and DIBELS data, brainstormed possible causes for achievement gaps, and focused on our locus of control before moving into the solutions phase of our planning. While our guiding question was about comprehension, we determined that the root cause behind low comprehension outcomes for students is because phonics and decoding skills aren't developed as early as they should be. Our strengths as a team are strong school culture and relationships with students and their families. Our team is highly skilled at integrating social-emotional learning into all subject matter. Our team is ready and willing to implement something completely different as long as they can see that it will improve outcomes. Our areas in need of improvement are our systems for intervention, capacity of our staff to provide effective intervention, and a lack of an assessment system that supports data-based decision making.

After diving deeply into our data and root causes for why our students continue to struggle as readers, we must focus on schoolwide strengthening of tier one instruction and intervention and assessment systems, beginning with phonics intervention. We also determined we need to build our reading culture here at school, so we can hook students as lifelong readers and help them each to determine their personal reading identities. We wrote three SMARTe goals to plan out our action items, how we will measure our actions, and a deadline for when each goal will be complete.

Many needs were identified by our early literacy team during our needs assessment. These needs were reviewed and added to by our whole staff and parents/guardians. The following needs were mentioned and have already been met or will be met by August of this year.

- Common assessments (DIBELS, iReady, Wonders)
- RTI cycles/ assessments/ cycles of inquiry calendar
- Purchase designated ELD and intervention curriculum

- Comprehensive iReady and Wonders training for all teachers
- Teacher release time for data-based decision making and planning of RTI units
- Literacy coach/ intervention specialist

3. Describe the identified strengths and weaknesses of both the eligible school(s) and the LEA regarding literacy instruction in transitional kindergarten through grade 3 (TK –3), inclusive. Identify all relevant diagnostic measures, including, but not limited to, pupil performance data, data on effective and ineffective practices, and equity and performance gaps reviewed during the Root Cause Analysis and Needs Assessment.

As seen in our screening data, our root cause analysis, our needs assessment, and feedback from staff, increased student access to targeted, evidence-based foundational reading skills instruction is an urgent need.

There are many different cultures and languages represented at our school. Our past CAASPP data shows that our male students of color and our EL students have larger gaps than their counterparts.

As evidenced by our root cause analysis and needs assessment, our assessment systems have been incoherent and our ability to use data to change what we do is seen as an urgent need by many stakeholders, especially our instructional team.

Root cause analysis and needs assessment revealed inconsistent tier one phonics instruction.

As seen in our screening data, our root cause analysis, and our needs assessment, a majority of our K–3 students are testing below proficiency in phonemic awareness and phonics.

As seen in our root cause analysis and needs assessment, our capacity to provide effective ELA instruction using Wonders is limited. Our Tier 1 instruction for all students will be strengthened when our team is given the professional learning they need to implement Wonders with fidelity.

As evidenced by our root cause analysis and needs assessment, our integrated ELD supports and instruction through GLAD are strong, but our designated ELD supports and instruction lack systems and use of guaranteed, viable curriculum.

As evidenced by our root cause analysis and needs assessment, our current diagnostic assessments (Renaissance Learning Reading and Math) don't give us data that aligns with CAASPP.

As evidenced by feedback from families and staff, our students with the biggest gaps need more instructional minutes to receive targeted interventions

As evidenced by feedback from our school site council, families struggle to pick up their students after school and we don't have before and afterschool care on site. As evidenced by our needs assessment, an extended school day would create more time for literacy instruction during the regular school day and provide classes that will enrich and extend learning after school.

As evidenced by our needs assessment, chronic absenteeism is often a barrier to students receiving the interventions needed to close achievement gaps, especially, but not limited to, gaps in phonemic awareness.

Our root cause analysis revealed a lack of student reading engagement and that there is a need to strengthen our school-wide literacy culture.

Our district and school universally implement Capturing Kids' Hearts (CKH) and have purchased CKH plus next year, which will provide structure and ongoing support for coherent SEL instruction school-wide. We also implement restorative practices for conflict-resolution and behavior management.

As identified by our needs assessment, our students need to see themselves and where they come from in the books they read.

Trauma-informed practices and supports for pupils and families have been identified as a strength according to our root cause analysis. Our district is currently providing trauma-informed practices training to all employees and will finish training cycle next school year.

We are increasing our counselors hours next year to support the mental health needs of our students.

As evidenced by our needs assessment, we need a master schedule that reflects our priorities. We've designed universal access blocks for tier 3 reading interventions and push-in support from para educators for time to deliver tier two.

As evidenced by our needs assessment, we also need to grow our parent/ guardian capacity to nurture and support literacy at home.

4. Explain how the LEA consulted with stakeholders, including school staff, school leaders, parents, and community members, at each eligible school about the Root Cause Analysis and Needs Assessment and proposed expenditures of the grant funds. If the School Site Council (SSC) was used for this purpose, describe how the school provided public notice of meetings and how meetings were conducted in the manner required by Section 35147 of the *Education Code*.

All school staff and several parents/ guardians were given an invitation and opportunity to discuss root causes for our achievement gaps in the area of early literacy. We asked for families, students and staff to express needs and propose solutions. We will continue to engage all school stakeholders as we build our universal access/ RTI model in the coming years. We will collect feedback from staff through surveys and meetings, which we call "think tanks." We will collect feedback from parents/ guardians and students through surveys, School Site Council, and monthly Coffee and Community events.

5. Justify LEA partnerships with literacy experts from the county office of education for the county in which the LEA is located, a geographic lead agency established, or the Expert Lead in Literacy in the development of the Root Cause Analysis and Needs Assessment and the Literacy Action Plan. If applicable, describe any partnership with a member of an institution of higher education or nonprofit organization with expertise in literacy for this purpose, which may also involve experts in participatory design and meaningful community involvement.

Establishing relationships with literacy experts is essential for our school to develop in depth understanding of literacy best practices to help ensure our students receive improved access to research based best practices. We partnered with the Sacramento County Office of Education and Pivot learning to support our efforts. The Sacramento County Office of Education is a geographic lead in literacy for California.

6. Describe how enrollment, program participation, and stakeholder engagement were leveraged to address the literacy needs of students enrolled in grades TK–3 at participating eligible schools, and include a brief narrative of analytical findings (see chart on page 8).

We are a very small school and all students who are enrolled in grades K-3 will be eligible to participate. Our root cause analysis, showed we are data poor for this particular grade level group. The first component of our work will be to improve our data and analysis systems as well as provide extensive teacher training. The details in section 3 regarding root cause analysis outlines the need and provides the narrative to support the grant implementation.

NOTE: Use the chart below to identify the anticipated number of students enrolled who will be served by ELSB Grant-funded activities and the **primary** stakeholders (teachers, administrators, parents, community members, etc.) who were active participants in the Root Cause Analysis, Needs Assessment, and development of the three-year Literacy Action Plan.

Description	Student Enrollment (List only the number for each grade level, TK–3, by eligible participating school)	Participating Teachers (List only the number for each grade level, TK–3, by eligible participating school)	Participating Administrator(s) (List only role and number of each by district office and eligible participating school.)	Other Stakeholder Input (List all participating stakeholder groups by eligible participating school. For example, SSC, English Learner Advisory Committee [ELAC], school board, etc., and the number of participants for each.)
Example	Mozart Elementary TK = 48 K = 52 1 = 56 2 = 58 3 = 64 Chopin Elementary, etc...	Mozart Elementary TK = 0 K = 1 1 = 1 2 = 1 3 = 1 Chopin Elementary, etc...	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District ELA Curriculum Director = 1 • District Literacy Coaches = 10 • District Budget Technician = 2 • Mozart Admin = 1, etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mozart Elementary J.S. SSC (7), ELAC (4), Title I parent meeting (28), DELAC (7), school board (7) • Chopin Elementary, etc.
Numbers	<i>Mozart = 278</i>	<i>Mozart = 4</i>	<i>Mozart = 1</i>	<i>Mozart =39</i>
Overall Participant Totals	Community Collaborative Charter School K = 9 1 = 8 2 = 19 3 =12	Community Collaborative Charter School K = 1 1 = 1 2 = 1 3 = 1	Site Principal - 1 Director of Academics (district) = 1 Assistant Superintendent = 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CCCS Community and Staff – 4 parents, 7staff • CCCS Staff and administration - 18