Beacon College Preparatory Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Beacon College Preparatory Elementary School

13400 NW 28TH AVE, Opa Locka, FL 33054

www.beconpride.org

Demographics

Principal: Patrick Evans

Start Date for this Principal: 8/18/2014

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Closed: 2023-06-30
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	85%
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 Black/African American Students Hispanic Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: D (36%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: C (47%)
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	CS&I
* 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 Dade 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

Beacon College Preparatory Elementary School

13400 NW 28TH AVE, Opa Locka, FL 33054

www.beconpride.org

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-5	Yes	94%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	100%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	D	D	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Dade 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 College Prep leads elementary students to superior academic achievement, cultivate their talents and interests, and foster admirable character traits to build strong foundations that empower their success to-and-through college.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is the path to our mission. It is both what we seek to realize 20 years down the road, as well as our methodical path towards that aim. It is ambitious, yet necessary. It lives only if those who execute it daily believe in it. We're ultimately working to achieve something that will last for our students and our community.

Beacon College Prep works to change the world through the eventual accomplishments of our students. We exist to serve low-income students of color, however, we do not believe – as many institutions do – that success is defined by "getting out" of their current neighborhood circumstance. It is actually quite opposite. We teach our students about systemic injustice, work-ethic, empathy, the history of Miami and opportunities all in hopes that they will embrace their community and deeply aspire to come back and improve it. We want our students to be prepared for success to and through college in hopes that they commit to improving the community which raised them instead of "escaping" to line their pockets in prestigious legal or corporate jobs. Our theory of change involves students as well as our institution because we know that change – enduring change - comes from within. No external entity can fundamentally change Opa Locka, Liberty City or any other predominantly black community for the better: only residents from and that can do that. Beacon College Prep seeks to position itself to facilitate that change because we believe so deeply in the potential of our students and the promise of our community.

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
Evans, Patrick	Principal	Instructional, cultural and operational leader of Beacon College Prep Set educational priorities and vision Develop and align budget to mission and vision of school Develop master which aligns to our mission and vision Hire, prepare and lead staff to execute mission and vision Facilitate leadership team, instructional leadership team, faculty and PTSA meetings Lead students in whole-school cultural routines Direct major operational activities of the school
Torretta, Heather	Assistant Principal	Manage and develop teachers Oversee and lead RtI for struggling students Select and administer curricular resources that align with student achievement goals Manage and oversee testing
Rivera, Nina	Other	Serve as grade-level chair Teach full-time Sit on Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) as grade-level representative Observe and develop teachers in grade level Facilitate weekly PD for teachers in grade-level
Armour, Hannah	Other	Serve as grade-level chair Teach full-time Sit on Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) as grade-level representative Observe and develop teachers in grade level Facilitate weekly PD for teachers in grade-level
Bryant, Curtis	Dean	Sit on school-wide Leadership Team Develop teachers in managing student behavior Check-in with students exhibiting behavior concerns, and refer to ESE for RtIB where necessary Manage school-security and bus-aides Communicate with parents and teachers about students who display EWS
Fenelon, Kerna	Other	Serve as grade-level chair Teach full-time Sit on Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) as grade-level representative Observe and develop teachers in grade level Facilitate weekly PD for teachers in grade-level
Puryear, Marissa	Other	Serve as grade-level chair Teach full-time Sit on Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) as grade-level representative

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		Observe and develop teachers in grade level Facilitate weekly PD for teachers in grade-level
Williams, Kendra	Other	Serve as grade-level chair Teach full-time Sit on Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) as grade-level representative Observe and develop teachers in grade level Facilitate weekly PD for teachers in grade-level
Golden, Shawonna	Other	Serve as grade-level chair Teach full-time Sit on Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) as grade-level representative Observe and develop teachers in grade level Facilitate weekly PD for teachers in grade-level

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 8/18/2014, Patrick Evans

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.*
0

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
22

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Closed: 2023-06-30
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	85%

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 Black/African American Students Hispanic Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: D (36%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: C (47%)
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	CS&I
* 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	65	65	65	75	75	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	420
Attendance below 90 percent	0	4	7	5	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	4	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	4	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	21	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	21	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51

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	2	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	3	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
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

Monday 10/12/2020

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	65	65	65	75	75	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	420
Attendance below 90 percent	0	4	7	5	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	4	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	21	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51

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	2	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	3	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
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	65	65	65	75	75	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	420
Attendance below 90 percent	10	11	12	9	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	20	20	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	20	20	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

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	3	5	2	2	9	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	3	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
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	36%	62%	57%	33%	57%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	40%	62%	58%	71%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	60%	58%	53%	91%	58%	52%
Math Achievement	41%	69%	63%	38%	66%	61%
Math Learning Gains	32%	66%	62%	41%	65%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	21%	55%	51%	45%	57%	51%
Science Achievement	24%	55%	53%	0%	52%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(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	40%	60%	-20%	58%	-18%
	2018	43%	61%	-18%	57%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	33%	64%	-31%	58%	-25%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	31%	60%	-29%	56%	-25%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				
05	2019	35%	60%	-25%	56%	-21%
	2018	48%	59%	-11%	55%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	56%	67%	-11%	62%	-6%
	2018	49%	67%	-18%	62%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	27%	69%	-42%	64%	-37%
	2018	31%	68%	-37%	62%	-31%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-22%				
05	2019	32%	65%	-33%	60%	-28%
	2018	55%	66%	-11%	61%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-23%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	23%	53%	-30%	53%	-30%
	2018	26%	56%	-30%	55%	-29%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
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	15			25							
BLK	35	39	60	42	33	24	29				
HSP	38	42		35	27						
FRL	35	40	60	40	31	21	23				

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
BLK	43	53	63	49	46	31	32				
HSP	35	40		53	70						
FRL	41	53	53	49	49	40	29				
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
BLK	36	73		35	41						
HSP	10			60							
FRL	33	71	91	38	41	45					

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)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	36
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	254
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	20
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	
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	37
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	36
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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%	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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	36
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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.

In 2018/19, we were ineffective at leading our students to adequate performance on Statewide Assessments. In particular, our performance was strikingly poor in 4th grade mathematics. In 2017/18, this cohort of students scored at 49%, whereas this year, they performed at 27%. This 22% regression affected our proficiency, learning gains, and lowest 25% learning gains for the entire school, and ultimately served as a significant contributing factor in the regression of our school grade. In fact, we only led 17% of our students to learning gains for math in all of 4th grade, and only 8% of the 4th graders in the lowest 25% made gains. These numbers feed our 32% LG for math and 24% L25 LG for math. While we underperformed globally on mathematics, 4th grade was where we failed to lead our students the most.

We were also ineffective at leading our 4th grade cohort to success in ELA. The cohort of 4th graders regressed 10% points from last year. Additionally, despite a significant investment in ELA intervention for our struggling readers, only 40% of our 4th and 5th graders made learning gains in ELA.

The major contributing factor to our poor performance in mathematics comes down to our inability to support great instruction in the 4th and 5th grade classes with a fairly new 4th/5th grade team of teachers. Despite our efforts coaching and pushing support into the classroom, we were ineffective in supporting the 2018/19 4th grade team in leading their students.

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

Learning Gains for Math (L25) was the component that showed the most significant reduction from 2018 to 2019. This drop off was due largely to the performance of our 4th grade cohort. Our 4th grade cohort regressed 22% on their math assessment, and 10% on their reading assessment from the 2018 assessment to the 2019 assessment. To translate these into state accountability measures, only 17% of 4th graders made learning gains on the math assessment, and only 32% of 4th graders made learning gains in ELA. As stated above, school-based leadership was unsuccessful at coaching and developing these teachers to lead their students. Our 4th (now 5th) grade cohort is incredibly capable, but - despite aggressive coaching and instructional support - we failed to support their teachers in leading them.

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.

There were two components that each were 30% off from the State average: Math LG and Math LG in the L25%. As noted earlier, this is an area we struggled to support our teacher in leading students. This is also an area we struggled to provide intervention for students to plug gaps and promote grade-level proficiency

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

L25 ELA Learning Gains showed the most improvement (53% in 2018 to 60% in 2019). This is likely a direct result of our reading intervention program for all L25 students. Using Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) in small groups each day, our interventionists were able to support students in developing their comprehension and overall critical reading abilities.

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

The biggest concerns we see are the volume of students scoring a Level 1 on at least 1 assessment. This means that this year, we'll need to facilitate a considerable amount of remediation through differentiation, while keeping the bar high in whole-group instruction.

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

1. Supporting teachers through professional development
2. Differentiating instruction to target academic gaps identified through the use of data
3. Increase student achievement/proficiency in 5th grade Science
4. Leading effective whole group instruction in ELA and Math in 5th grade.
5. Providing teachers with high-quality professional development Opportunities.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We aim to improve reading instruction and learning, as measured by learning gains on the FSA
Measurable Outcome:	5th grade students will earn at least 65% learning gains in ELA
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Heather Torretta (htorretta@beaconpride.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Increased time in literacy Differentiated Instruction Explicit vocabulary instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students are behind in ELA, and thus need more time, and differentiated instruction to meet their varied needs. Additionally, vocabulary is a gap for our students, so utilizing a curriculum such as Wordly Wise will enable us to explicitly expand their vocabulary.

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.

All priorities will be monitored via weekly leadership team meetings. These goals will be listed on the agendas, and the individuals responsible for monitoring progress will report out. All priorities will be pursued with vigor to pull our school performance up to an acceptable level.

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.

Beacon College Prep executes a variety of strategies that help build positive relationships with families to increase involvement:
Monthly parent meetings - We conduct monthly parent meetings to share information (student data, new procedures, etc), hear parent concerns, and facilitate sessions that build parent skill in translating the things we do at school to the home life. These sessions focus primarily on helping parents structure practice for literacy and mathematics, as well as how to implement an incentive system at home for behavior.
Events for families - We also try to hold events for parents to get together in a less formal setting so they can network and form a more personal bond with staff. These events range from a fall festival to social outings.
Volunteer opportunities for parents - We offer many volunteer opportunities for our parents, including bus aide, breakfast helper, lunch helper, snack helper, classroom management support, and office support. Parents are eager to assist us in the realization of our mission. By structuring opportunities for them to assist, we gain a tangible benefit of their work products, as well as the intangible benefit of them being role models in the school for all of our students.
Weekly communication logs with parents - We have developed a weekly communication log that is sent home each Friday where teachers communicate student behavior, academic performance, homework completion and uniform compliance. We have received positive feedback from parents about the log, as it helps them stay informed about what occurs while their child is in school.

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	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00