

The School District of Palm Beach County

Beacon Cove Intermediate School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 12 |
| Planning for Improvement | 18 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 22 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 23 |

Beacon Cove Intermediate School

150 SCHOOLHOUSE RD, Jupiter, FL 33458

<https://bci.palmbeachschools.org>

Demographics

Principal: Pamela Buckman

Start Date for this Principal: 9/7/2020

| | |
|--|---|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School 3-5 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2019-20 Title I School | No |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 31% |
| 2019-20 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 Asian Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: A (82%) 2017-18: A (77%) 2016-17: A (73%) 2015-16: A (74%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Southeast |
| Regional Executive Director | LaShawn Russ-Porterfield |
| 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 is pending approval by the Palm Beach 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

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 12 |
| Planning for Improvement | 18 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 23 |

Beacon Cove Intermediate School

150 SCHOOLHOUSE RD, Jupiter, FL 33458

<https://bci.palmbeachschools.org>

School Demographics

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School 3-5</p> | <p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p>No</p> | <p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>19%</p> |
| <p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p> | <p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p> | <p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>31%</p> |

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Palm Beach 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.

Beacon Cove Intermediate is committed to providing a world-class education with excellence and equity to empower each student to reach his or her highest potential with the most effective staff to foster the knowledge, skills, and ethics required for responsible citizenship and productive careers.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Beacon Cove Intermediate envisions a dynamic collaborative multi-cultural community where education and lifelong learning are valued and supported, and all learners reach their highest potential and succeed in the global economy.

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 |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Buckman, Pamela | Principal | Monitor effectiveness and progress toward SIP goals. Approve School Improvement Funds, ensuring that SAC members approve/select programs or projects. Mrs. Bolte will conduct observations to monitor strategies for fidelity. |
| Braswell, Judith | Assistant Principal | Ensure that the SIP goals are aligned to the strategic plan. As AP, Mrs. Braswell will conduct observations to monitor strategies for fidelity. Utilizing data, Mrs. Braswell will make adjustments to the SIP as needed. |
| Poslaiko, Michelle | Teacher, K-12 | Grade 4 Team Leader. Provides grade level leadership and perspective to the Leadership Team. Mrs. Poslaiko will provide information about core instruction and participate in data collection. |
| Frinkle, Jennifer | Teacher, ESE | As Marzano Liaison, Mrs. Frinkle will provide technical support for new and returning teachers in iObservation. Mrs. Frinkle will direct teachers to available resources and training both school-based and district-based. |
| Champion, Caren "Champ" | Teacher, K-12 | Participate in student data collection, the integration of core instructional activities/materials into Tier 3 instruction and collaboration with general education teachers through such activities as co-teaching. |
| Hutchinson, Vicki | Teacher, K-12 | Math Team Leader, provides a leadership role and perspective in supporting mathematics in Grades 3 through 5. |
| Dillon, Bonnie | SAC Member | Ensure SAC members contribute to creating/approving SIP Plan. Assist with revision and submission of By-Laws and membership compliance. |
| Embick, Diana | Teacher, ESE | Bring information and insight from the ESE perspective and support from the Fine Arts Team. Ms. Embick is the ELA ESE teacher and Fine Arts Grade Chair. |
| Childress, Christine | Teacher, K-12 | School Advisory Chair and teacher leader. Ms Childress shares the goals, strategies and action plans from the School Improvement Plan and monitors the progress. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 9/7/2020, Pamela Buckman

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.*

16

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.*

21

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

51

Demographic Data

| | |
|--|---|
| 2020-21 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School 3-5 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2019-20 Title I School | No |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 31% |
| 2019-20 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 Asian Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: A (82%) 2017-18: A (77%) 2016-17: A (73%) 2015-16: A (74%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Southeast |
| Regional Executive Director | LaShawn Russ-Porterfield |
| 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 . | |

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 | 179 | 198 | 220 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 597 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 27 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 25 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| FY20 ELA Winter Diag Levels 1 & 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 31 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 116 |
| FY20 Math Winter Diag Levels 1 & 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 11 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75 |

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 | 8 | 17 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 |

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 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/20/2020

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 243 | 234 | 296 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 773 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 16 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 59 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 42 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 133 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 12 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 |

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 | 18 | 14 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55 |

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 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 243 | 234 | 296 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 773 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 16 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 59 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 42 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 133 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 12 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 |

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 | 18 | 14 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55 |

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 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| 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 | 86% | 58% | 57% | 79% | 53% | 55% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 72% | 63% | 58% | 65% | 59% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 67% | 56% | 53% | 57% | 55% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | 91% | 68% | 63% | 87% | 62% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | 86% | 68% | 62% | 73% | 62% | 61% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 88% | 59% | 51% | 69% | 53% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 83% | 51% | 53% | 78% | 51% | 51% |

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | Total |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----|-----|-------|
| | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| | (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 | 83% | 54% | 29% | 58% | 25% |
| | 2018 | 78% | 56% | 22% | 57% | 21% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 87% | 62% | 25% | 58% | 29% |
| | 2018 | 86% | 58% | 28% | 56% | 30% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 9% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 84% | 59% | 25% | 56% | 28% |
| | 2018 | 81% | 59% | 22% | 55% | 26% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -2% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 88% | 65% | 23% | 62% | 26% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2018 | 83% | 63% | 20% | 62% | 21% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 91% | 67% | 24% | 64% | 27% |
| | 2018 | 91% | 63% | 28% | 62% | 29% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 8% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 92% | 65% | 27% | 60% | 32% |
| | 2018 | 89% | 66% | 23% | 61% | 28% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 1% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 82% | 51% | 31% | 53% | 29% |
| | 2018 | 82% | 56% | 26% | 55% | 27% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 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 | 60 | 60 | 46 | 75 | 89 | 87 | 68 | | | | |
| ELL | 86 | 77 | | 100 | 86 | | | | | | |
| ASN | 88 | 67 | | 98 | 88 | | 81 | | | | |
| BLK | 67 | 70 | | 73 | 90 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 84 | 66 | 54 | 90 | 79 | 86 | 88 | | | | |
| MUL | 77 | 59 | | 84 | 82 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 87 | 75 | 68 | 92 | 87 | 91 | 83 | | | | |
| FRL | 82 | 73 | 71 | 87 | 85 | 84 | 84 | | | | |
| 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 | 57 | 60 | 57 | 67 | 68 | 56 | 46 | | | | |
| ELL | 67 | | | 83 | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 89 | 84 | | 95 | 72 | | 87 | | | | |
| BLK | 53 | 69 | | 71 | 69 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 86 | 79 | 88 | 85 | 77 | 81 | 94 | | | | |
| MUL | 82 | 68 | | 85 | 68 | | 85 | | | | |
| WHT | 83 | 72 | 59 | 90 | 76 | 74 | 82 | | | | |

| 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 |
| FRL | 75 | 70 | 61 | 81 | 69 | 67 | 78 | | | | |
| 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 | 52 | 56 | 52 | 67 | 61 | 66 | 38 | | | | |
| ELL | 63 | 50 | | 100 | 58 | | | | | | |
| ASN | 86 | 65 | | 98 | 77 | | 83 | | | | |
| BLK | 43 | | | 36 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 72 | 61 | 48 | 87 | 67 | 71 | 74 | | | | |
| MUL | 81 | 53 | | 85 | 71 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 81 | 66 | 59 | 88 | 75 | 71 | 79 | | | | |
| FRL | 70 | 61 | 53 | 78 | 68 | 64 | 65 | | | | |

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 | 83 |
| 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 | 90 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 663 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

| | |
|---|----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 69 |
| 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 | 88 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| 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 | 84 |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 75 |
| 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 | 78 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 76 |
| 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 | 83 |
| 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 | 81 |
| 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.

When looking at the subgroup data across the board FY19, our ELA Low 25 had the lowest achievement in ELA with a 67%. Teachers were beginning to use small group instruction for remediation. Although teachers were gaining in their knowledge and usage of strategies, the contributing factor was the lack of consistency with small group instruction. Although we have been continuously increasing proficiency from 2017 at 57%, 2018 at 64% and 2019 at 67%, this low performance rate has been a trend for our low 25 subgroup.

Based on the most recent district diagnostic data reports, 82.4% of our third grade students are predicted to score proficient on the Reading FSA. Although that does not meet the 88% proficiency goal, this data is 1.5 percentage points higher than the FY19 predicted scores. Beacon Cove's Fourth Grade ELA students are showing an impressive 6.7 percent gain from the FY19 Diagnostic to FY 20 Diagnostics. Our Fourth grade SWD subgroup shows a 20.5% gain from diagnostic to diagnostic, and a 16.9% gain from FY19 FSA to FY20 Diagnostic. There is also significant growth in our Fourth Grade ELA scores for the Hispanic subgroup - 11.7% from diagnostic to diagnostic and 16.6% in FSA to Diagnostic. This should significantly impact our Learning Gains for which we are looking for a 3 % increase.

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

When looking at our school data within ELA we had a decline from 74% to 72% within the ELA Learning Gains. The goal for FY21 is to increase this component to 77%. The contributing factors to this decline are due to lack of rigor, quality resources, and engaging instruction.

During FY20, we focused on Professional Engagement: Teachers were provided professional development and/or mentoring opportunities to ensure rigorous, small group instruction is taking place within the classroom. This professional development was a focus in 2019 and will continue to be a priority throughout the FY 21. Monitoring of these key components has taken place through classroom walkthroughs, monitoring conversations within PLCs and teacher data chats. This monitoring has shown an increase in delivery of rigorous instruction, differentiated instruction and meaningful small groups - attributed to an increase in teacher knowledge and techniques.

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.

Within the ELA Achievement Component, our school scored 29 points higher than the state and 28 points higher than the district. In the analysis of the data, no gaps were present. Our school's trend has shown a higher achievement rate that the district and the state for the past two years.

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

The lowest 25 percentile in math showed the most improvement with a 15 point gain, going from 73% in FY18 to 88% in FY19. Strategic planning of rigorous standard based instruction within our PLCs and small group instruction are the contributing factors for this gain.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

When looking at the Early Warning Systems, Level 1 on Statewide Assessments as well as ELA and Math Course Failure are our two potential areas of concern.

Based on this data trend our focus will be to diminish course failure and increase learning gains and achievement. Our data trends show that a focus on literacy that includes remediation of standards, foundational skills, while scaffolding instruction that meets the full intent and rigor of standards in all content areas. We will specifically focus on ensuring students receive strategic, targeted support through various modes of instruction, including technology, small group, tutorials, data chats and student monitoring. If we are unsuccessful in addressing skill deficits and standard acquisition, then students will not be on track towards their future success in a timely manner.

Administrators will be assigned to support the students and build relationships with them to motivate and ensure their student achievement and success.

In FY20, through the school year, Beacon Cove Administration has worked closely with the Professional Development Team to assure that high quality, professional development that was identified in the SIP has been scheduled through Professional Learning Community(PLCs) meetings, during Professional Development days and during informal and formal collaborative meetings with key stakeholder. This is reflected in our PD agendas and is monitored by administration through review of required follow up.

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

Our priorities are:

1. 3rd Grade- ELA decrease the levels of 1 and 2
2. Increase proficiency in ELA of Low 25 Percentile
3. Increase Learning Gains

Increasing students learning gains in Literacy allows for our students to develop the skills necessary towards future success. It is the foundation towards a higher education and better opportunities. Children who have developed strong reading skills perform better in school and have a healthier self-image. They become lifelong learners and sought-after employees. Lacking basic reading and writing skills is a tremendous disadvantage. Literacy not only enriches an individual's life, but it creates opportunities for people to develop skills that will help them provide for themselves and a better future.

Increasing students learning gains in Math helps us think analytically and have better reasoning abilities. Analytical thinking refers to the ability to think critically about the world around us. Analytical and reasoning skills are essential because they help us solve problems and look for solutions, thus allowing our students the opportunity to become well-rounded, productive citizens by providing them with vital skills necessary for day to day.

Standards Based Instruction will continue to be a primary focus during instruction planning sessions, professional learning communities and data chats with teachers and students. Resources and strategies will be aligned to grade level standards and scaffolds will be put in place to support students who are not yet performing at their grade level. Our in-school, during the school day/after school support programs will ensure student participation and success. All teachers, including elective teachers will collaborate to ensure program success. Schedules are adjusted to ensure

student participation was guaranteed. In FY20 the SIP focused on five areas of Action Planning that align evidence-based strategies which we will continue.

a. Infusing Technology in Instruction and the Utilization of Intervention Programs with fidelity: Students have consistently utilized technology throughout the school year to support remediation and enhance their skills. Programs and interventions such as Mindplay, I-Ready, SMART boards, Destiny Library and SussessMaker are examples. Teachers have shared their knowledge with peers and acted as mentors to support meaningful use of technology and intervention programs. Teachers received PD on Technology used for Intervention and Instruction. A special emphasis has been placed on utilizing technology to increase Rigor of Instruction.

b. Professional Development and Monitoring to Increase Rigor of Instruction: teachers have met on a consistent rotation during PLCs to review standards, analyze data which demonstrates standards mastery, determined next steps with the instruction of standards and revise as necessary. Teachers have monitored and managed lesson plans during collaborative times and shared insights and knowledge with a focus on rigorous instruction & differentiation.

c. Delivery of Differentiated and Small Group Instruction: Teachers have met to plan by: designing lessons based on students needs, grouping students by shared topic and/or ability, assessing students' learning in formative assessments, reflecting and adjusting lesson content to meet students' needs. Fine Arts teachers have provided support to third grade classroom teachers with small group and differentiated instruction. This has been focused through self-contained third grade teachers.

Collegial Sharing: Beacon Cove has participated in collegial sharing with Lighthouse Elementary. This has been beneficial for both schools. Lighthouse came to Beacon Cove to do walk-throughs in grade 3 and planning.

d. Standards-Based Planning: Teachers have met during PDs for planning opportunities of high quality, standards-based lessons. Administration has participated in planning meetings to ensure lessons demonstrate standards-based planning & has reviewed lesson plans prior to observations.

e. Tutorials/Remediation Opportunities will be planned and prepared depending on assessment outcomes.

f. Positive Behavior Support - Climate: The PBS Team has met monthly to discuss, plan and monitor the school-wide positive behavior plan.

4. Decrease the number of students with below 90% attendance

Our focus is to increase student engagement so students become active learners in their own academic journey as they learn by doing and putting strategies into practice. It is our hope that students take ownership and foster independence through their engagement in their daily lessons. This focus will be ongoing and PD will be provided during staff meetings and on professional development days. Leadership will be assigned to support the students and build relationships with them to motivate and ensure their attendance.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

To ensure effective and relevant instruction towards student achievement in ELA and Math in alignment with the District's Strategic Plan; LTO #1 Increase Reading on Grade Level by Third Grade

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Although Beacon Cove saw an increase in proficient students in English Language Arts in SY19, specifically in third grade with an increase from 77% proficient to 83 percent proficient, we still want to increase the number of proficient students, not only in third grade, but at each grade level. Our low 25% of students have also shown an increase over the previous three years from 57% to 64% to 67% proficiency, looking at other subcategories, we need to increase those number even higher. There was a decrease in Learning Gains in FY 19 from 74% to 72%. We would like to see that percentage increase to 75%.

Utilizing FY20 Data - there was an increase in student growth, particularly in the area of Reading Comprehension - Literature and Informational Text. Overall, the I Ready data shows that struggling readers (predicted level 1 and 2 students based on FY20 Winter Diagnostics) continued to struggle in those two areas (Lit and Info Text), showing minimal growth (less than one grade level to one grade level of growth), while more proficient readers (predicted level 3 -5 on FY20 Winter Diagnostics) showed consistent growth (one grade level or higher). We will continue to collect and analyze data from I Ready, District Diagnostics, formal and informal assessment. We seek to insure the most reliable data by creating secure testing environments.

Measurable Outcome:

Our measurable goals for FY21 are to increase third grade ELA proficiency by 5%. This would show an increase from 83% to 88%. While doing so, we are focused on increasing the percent of proficiency for our lowest 25% of ELA students in grades 4 and 5 by 3% to 70% proficient and in increasing our Learning Gains by 3%, having 75% of our students making learning gains.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Pamela Buckman (pamela.buckman@palmbeachschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Students will engage in remediation and enrichment through digital and blended learning opportunities, using District Approved adaptive technology to support/reteach/enrichment at their level (iReady and Successmaker).
2. Teachers will participate in professional learning communities that focuses on the implementation Differentiated Instruction in order to increasing the rigor of standards based instruction while meeting the needs of individual students.
3. Differentiated small group instruction will be utilized in all ELA, Math, and Science classrooms. Through differentiation we are ensuring we support all learners at their ability. We are ensuring a variety of task, products, and processes.
4. Teachers will create and deliver lessons, activities and assessments that are standards-based, monitored by reading and math team leaders.
5. Before and after school tutorial/remediation will use targeted instruction to support student growth in areas of deficiency, monitored by grant manager and administration

Rationale for Evidence-

1. Intervention programs and adaptive technology support teacher instruction in the classroom, assisting with differentiating, reinforcing and providing remediation. The ability to personalize instruction to meet individual needs will result in increased scores.
2. Professional Learning Opportunities give teachers a better understanding of research-

based strategies that increase student achievement. It supports strategies that challenge students to become critical thinkers and problem solvers it also provides teachers and teams with the opportunity to progress monitor the achievement of all students and make decisions on next steps.

**based
Strategy:**

3. Differentiated instruction is effective because the teaching is then focused precisely on what the student(s) need to learn. Evidence has demonstrated that ongoing observation of students, combined with systematic assessment enables teachers to support and enhance student learning by an increase in the number of students with successful outcomes.

4. Standards-based teaching ensures better accountability of what is taught in the classrooms. The practice of aligning learning to standards also helps ensure that a higher level of learning is attained, guides teachers in the process of assessment and helps keep them on track.

5. Before and After school Tutorials/Remediation will provide additional opportunities for remediation/ enrichment for students to receive additional support.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Infusing Technology in Instruction and utilization of Intervention Programs with fidelity A. Students will consistently utilize technology throughout the school year to support remediation and enhancement of their skills. B. Teachers will receive professional development during PD days, at workshops and with peers on various technology programs and strategies. C. Teachers will increase their knowledge and use of technology to enhance instruction and assist in data analysis. D. Teachers will utilize district-approved intervention programs with fidelity to assist in meeting the needs of all students. E. Teachers will share their knowledge with peers and act as mentors to support meaningful use of technology and intervention programs throughout the school. (PD Team)

2. Professional Learning Opportunities to increase Rigor of Instruction A. Teachers will meet on a consistent rotation during professional learning communities to review standards, analyze data demonstrating standards mastery, determine next steps with the instruction of standards and revise as necessary. B. Teachers will monitor and manage plans during collaborative times and share insights and knowledge. C. Teachers will be provided professional development and/or mentoring to ensure small group instruction is taking place within the classroom. This professional development will continue to increase their knowledge and techniques for delivering small group instruction. (Buckman and Braswell)

3. Delivery of Differentiated instruction A. Teachers will collaboratively plan and deliver differentiated lessons in the classroom. They will plan by: designing lessons based on students' needs, grouping students by shared topic and/or ability, assessing students' learning in formative assessments, reflecting and adjusting lesson content to meet students' needs. B. Administration will monitor and provide feedback to teachers on differentiated lessons and small group instruction. C. Fine Arts teachers will provide support to select classroom teachers with small group and differentiated instruction. (J. Braswell)

4. Standards-Based Teaching A. Teachers will meet during professional learning opportunities to plan high quality, standards-based lessons. B. Administration will review lesson plans throughout the school year to ensure lessons demonstrate standards-based planning. (Admin and Grade Chairs)

5. Tutorials/Remediation Opportunities A. Funding sources will be secured to support quality before and after school tutorial programs that directly address the needs of struggling students. B. Programs will be monitored and analyzed for effectiveness and results will be reported out to SAC and funding sources. (J. Frinkle)

Person Responsible Pamela Buckman (pamela.buckman@palmbeachschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Pillars of Effective Instruction: Students are immersed in rigorous task encompassing the full intent of the Florida State Standards and content required by Florida State Statute 1003.42 continuing to develop a single school culture and appreciation of multicultural diversity in alignment to S.B. 2.09 with a focus on reading and writing across all content areas. Our students focus on content and curriculum related to:

The History of the Holocaust

The History of Black and African Americans

The Contributions of Latino and Hispanics

The Contributions of Women

The Sacrifices of Veterans and Medal of Honor recipients within US History.

Our school integrates Single School Culture by sharing our Universal Guidelines for Success and communicating these expectations to parents via student protocols, and monitoring SwPBS through data. In alignment, to school board 2.09 and Florida State statute 1003.42 our school highlights multicultural diversity within the curriculum and the arts. Our students participate in activities and studies including, but not limited to, art expos of different cultures and in music our students study music of different eras and countries and in media our library selection is filled with books related to the variety of cultures through in class learning and through the various clubs offered at our school. In alignment with school board policy 2.09, Allamanda teachers are participating in mandated PD focusing on cultural equity. This will offer them numerous avenues to carry into their lessons: music, art, and reading.

We instill citizenship through our Safety Patrols, this group consist of only 5th grade students who are responsible, respectful, and set a good example for all the students. Their main job is to maintain the safety of our students. They begin their day on post at 7:30AM by assisting students throughout our campus. At the end of the day, they are back on post ensuring that the students get home safely! Safety Patrols who prove to be responsible and respectful also have the opportunity to travel to Washington D.C. for the annual field trip. This trip is only open to safety patrols and consists of a 4-day tour of Williamsburg/Jamestown, and Washington D.C. It is truly an honor for students to serve as patrols in this club, and we are very proud of all of our patrols who are such positive role models!

The school leadership team meets monthly to identify district and state mandates, analyze pertinent data and trends in order to make recommendations for instruction, curriculum, additional support, and resources to the school. The problem-solving process is used during the meetings to identify potential barriers or needs and to create an action plan to address those needs. Currently, the team is working to understand and implement the Pillars of Instruction. Staff meets collaboratively in PLCs, SBT, and conferences to discuss and monitor student progress. Collaboration across grade levels, content areas, and feeder patterns occur each year.

Strategic Initiative #1: Define pillars of effective instruction to increase the academic achievement of all students.

Strategic Initiative #2: Embed cultural competence, equity and access within the instructional practices

This SEL approach has become the focus of our SwPBS committee to be sure that we have school-wide norms and practices that are consistent from classroom to classroom. We also provide monthly parenting workshops to teach the parents what we are implementing at school and how they can implement this SEL practice in the home.

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.

IV. Positive Culture & Environment

Why is this important for Beacon Cove Intermediate?

Faculty/Staff: It is imperative that every member of the faculty and staff (instruction and non-instructional) feel that they are a valued part of the school community. Staff members who feel valued are more engaged and supportive in regards to meeting the needs of students, both anemically and emotionally. It creates an environment where people are not afraid to be risk takers and in turn fosters communication and respects.

Students: Building strong relations with students is vital to increasing student achievement. Students know that someone cares about them and they have someone to turn to when needed. It improves conversations as they relate to adult to child and child to child. When students are a part of a school community, it makes them want to be in school and helps to motivate them in the learning process.

Engaging families: Research shows that a higher level of parental involvement leads to increased student achievement at all levels, and involved families impact student attendance, performance, social skills, and post-secondary training.

How this will look at Beacon Cove:

School-wide Positive Behavior is used to encourage students' academic and behavioral success. To celebrate success, the students will receive Get REAL acknowledgements (special certificate and assembly), certificates, individual reward tickets, and incentives. In addition, students will be highlighted on the morning news/announcements, monthly newsletter.

To highlight teachers' contributions to students' success, the School-wide Positive Behavior Team will provide incentives to teachers throughout the year for going above and beyond. Thin includes but is not limited to staff shouts on the news, bulletin board, and staff meetings.

Character-development program (required K-12) with curriculum to address: patriotism; responsibility; citizenship; kindness; respect for authority, life, liberty, and personal property; honesty; charity; self-control; racial, ethnic, and religious tolerance; and cooperation. These Character traits will be embedded into school wide language as well as the parent newsletter. Character counts awards will be given each trimester.

The Admin, Guidance Counselor and BHP will work to establish mentoring programs for students that focus on academics and the social emotional need of the child. Students will have an opportunity to be a part of selecting a mentor with whom they have o would like to have a connection.

Counseling/Behavior Health Professional will meet with the administration weekly to discuss students of concern/ progress monitor. A google form has been created for staff and parents to utilize for support.

- SEL-morning meeting has been brought into the school. Teachers were provided training during preschool to understand these components and ongoing support will be provided.
- Parent communication plans; website, email, social media, parent link, & parent newsletter (monthly), etc.
- Parent Nights- content nights, state assessment nights, etc.
- SAC
- Parent Teacher Organization

- Community events/supports- Development of links between students and local representatives, charities and businesses to help identify projects to participate
- Work with Light House Elementary, Beacon Cove’s sister school, to create a community between the two schools

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: ELA | | | | \$772.00 |
|---|----------|---|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-----------------|
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21 |
| | 5000 | 120-Classroom Teachers | 2541 - Beacon Cove Intermediate Schl | School Improvement Funds | 702.0 | \$772.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Pending SAC approval</i> | | | |
| | | | | | Total: | \$772.00 |