Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Beacon College Preparatory Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| School Demographics | 3 |
|--------------------------------|--------------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| r dipose and Saline of the on | _ |
| School Information | 6 |
| Needs Assessment | 9 |
| Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 18 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 18 |

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: 8/24/2014

| 2019-20 Status | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| (per MSID File) | Closed: 2023-06-30 |
| School Type and Grades Served | Elementary School |
| (per MSID File) | KG-5 |
| (per iviolib i lie) | 110-5 |
| Primary Service Type | K-12 General Education |
| (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2020-21 Title I School | Yes |
| 2020 24 Foonamically | |
| 2020-21 Economically | 0.50/ |
| Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 85% |
| (as reported on Survey 3) | |
| | Students With Disabilities* |
| 2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented | English Language Learners |
| (subgroups with 10 or more students) | Black/African American Students |
| (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an | Hispanic Students* |
| asterisk) | |
| asterisk) | Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| | Students |
| | |
| | 2018-19: D (36%) |
| | 2047 40 0 (450() |
| School Grades History | 2017-18: C (45%) |
| | 2016-17: C (53%) |
| | 2010-17.0 (3370) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Info | prmation* |
| SI Region | Southeast |
| Regional Executive Director | LaShawn Russ-Porterfield |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | |
| + A | |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For | or 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:

- 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 | 6 |
| | |
| Needs Assessment | 9 |
| Noodo / Noodoomont | |
| Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| | |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| | |
| Budget to Support Goals | 18 |

Last Modified: 5/5/2024 https://www.floridacims.org Page 4 of 19

Beacon College Preparatory Elementary School

13400 NW 28TH AVE, Opa Locka, FL 33054

www.beconpride.org

School Demographics

| School Type and Gi (per MSID | | 2020-21 Title I Schoo | l Disadvan | Economically taged (FRL) Rate ted on Survey 3) |
|---------------------------------|----------|-----------------------|------------|--|
| Elementary S KG-5 | School | Yes | | 94% |
| Primary Servio (per MSID I | • • | Charter School | (Reporte | Minority Rate ed as Non-white Survey 2) |
| K-12 General E | ducation | Yes | | 100% |
| School Grades Histo | ory | | | |
| Year | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 |
| Grade | | D | D | С |

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 | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|----------------------|-------------------|---|
| Evans, Patrick | Principal | Set vision for the school, and manage all employees towards the attainment of goals in alignment with that vision. Responsible for the operational, cultural and instructional leadership, as well as maintaining safety, appropriate staffing levels, and a financially viable budget. |
| Torretta, Heather | | Primary function of the Assistant Principal is Instructional Leadership. AP leads the Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) comprised of grade-level chairs in each grade. She is responsible for the coaching and support of teachers, professional development facilitation, and data analysis at a grade-level and school-level. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 8/24/2014, 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.

1

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.

1

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

17

Total number of students enrolled at the school

420

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

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

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

| Indicator | | | | | Gr | ade | Le | ve | ı | | | | | Total |
|--|----|----|----|----|----|-----|----|----|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOtal |
| Number of students enrolled | 44 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 72 | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 368 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 5 | 10 | 4 | 5 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 6 | 10 | 6 | 11 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 6 | 10 | 6 | 11 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 15 | 16 | 12 | 20 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 85 |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | | | | | (| 3ra | de l | Lev | el | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|----|---|----|-----|------|-----|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| mulcator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOLAI |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 6 | 10 | 6 | 11 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|--|
| maicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 2 | 4 | 3 | 11 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | |
| 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

Friday 7/30/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| 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 | | | | | | Gr | ade | e Le | vel | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|------|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| 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 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|--|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total | |
| 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 | | |

2020-21 - Updated

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

| Indicator | | | Total | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----|----|-------|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| mulcator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOtal |
| 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 | | | | | | Gr | ade | e Le | evel | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|------|------|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| 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 | |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| 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 | |

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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

| School Grade Component | | 2021 | | | 2019 | | | 2018 | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| School Grade Component | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | | | | 36% | 62% | 57% | 42% | 62% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 40% | 62% | 58% | 52% | 62% | 55% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 60% | 58% | 53% | 53% | 59% | 48% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 41% | 69% | 63% | 49% | 69% | 62% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 32% | 66% | 62% | 49% | 64% | 59% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 21% | 55% | 51% | 40% | 55% | 47% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 24% | 55% | 53% | 29% | 58% | 55% |

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

| | | | ELA | | | |
|------------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 40% | 60% | -20% | 58% | -18% |
| Cohort Com | nparison | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 33% | 64% | -31% | 58% | -25% |
| Cohort Com | parison | -40% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 35% | 60% | -25% | 56% | -21% |
| Cohort Com | parison | -33% | | | • | |

| | | | MATH | I | | |
|-----------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 56% | 67% | -11% | 62% | -6% |
| Cohort Co | mparison | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 27% | 69% | -42% | 64% | -37% |
| Cohort Co | mparison | -56% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 32% | 65% | -33% | 60% | -28% |
| Cohort Co | mparison | -27% | | | • | |

| | | | SCIEN | CE | | |
|------------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 23% | 53% | -30% | 53% | -30% |
| Cohort Com | nparison | | | | | |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

iReady. The data below represents the number of proficient students and the total number of students in that grade-level/sub category.

| | | Grade 1 | | |
|--------------------------|--|---|---|---|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 12/62 | 30/62 | 35/62 |
| English Language Arts | Economically Disadvantaged | 25/61 | 30/61 | 35/61 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 2/4 | 2/4 | 2/4 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 16/62 | 20/62 | 26/62 |
| Mathematics | Economically Disadvantaged | 16/61 | 20/61 | 26/61 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 2/4 | 2/4 | 2/4 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | Grade 2 | | |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | Proficiency All Students | Fall 26/73 | Winter 29/73 | Spring 33/73 |
| English Language Arts | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged | | | . • |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities | 26/73 | 29/73 | 33/73 |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | 26/73 26/73 | 29/73 29/73 | 33/73 33/73 |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency | 26/73 26/73 2/5 0 Fall | 29/73 29/73 2/5 0 Winter | 33/73 33/73 2/5 0 Spring |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students | 26/73 26/73 2/5 0 | 29/73 29/73 2/5 0 | 33/73 33/73 2/5 0 |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged | 26/73 26/73 2/5 0 Fall | 29/73 29/73 2/5 0 Winter | 33/73 33/73 2/5 0 Spring |
| Arts | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students Economically | 26/73 26/73 2/5 0 Fall 13/73 | 29/73 29/73 2/5 0 Winter 14/73 | 33/73 33/73 2/5 0 Spring 28/73 |

| | | Grade 3 | | |
|--------------------------|--|--|---|---|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 5/74 | 8/74 | 15/74 |
| English Language Arts | Economically Disadvantaged | 5/74 | 8/74 | 15/74 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 19/74 | 18/74 | 22/74 |
| Mathematics | Economically Disadvantaged | 19/74 | 18/74 | 22/74 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | Grade 4 | | |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | Proficiency All Students | Fall 31/81 | Winter 36/81 | Spring 43/81 |
| English Language Arts | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities | 31/81 | 36/81 | 43/81 |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | 31/81 31/81 | 36/81 36/81 | 43/81 43/81 |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language | 31/81 31/81 0 | 36/81 36/81 0 | 43/81 43/81 0 |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students | 31/81 31/81 0 0 | 36/81 36/81 0 0 | 43/81 43/81 0 0 |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged | 31/81 31/81 0 0 Fall | 36/81 36/81 0 0 Winter | 43/81 43/81 0 0 Spring |
| Arts | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students Economically | 31/81 31/81 0 0 Fall 5/81 | 36/81 36/81 0 0 Winter 13/81 | 43/81 43/81 0 0 Spring 31/81 |

| | | Grade 5 | | |
|--------------------------|------------------------------|---------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 10/78 | 20/78 | 21/78 |
| English Language Arts | Economically Disadvantaged | 10/78 | 20/78 | 21/78 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 8/78 | 23/78 | 25/78 |
| Mathematics | Economically Disadvantaged | 8/78 | 23/78 | 25/78 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Science | Economically Disadvantaged | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | Students With Disabilities | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | English Language Learners | N/A | N/A | N/A |

Subgroup Data Review

| | | 2021 | SCHOO | DL GRAD | E COMP | PONENT | S BY SI | JBGRO | UPS | | |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 |
| SWD | 13 | | | 8 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 27 | 33 | 43 | 22 | 15 | 7 | 12 | | | | |
| HSP | 29 | | | 18 | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 27 | 34 | 43 | 21 | 11 | 7 | 11 | | | | |
| | | 2019 | SCHOO | DL GRAD | E COMP | PONENT | S BY SI | JBGRO | UPS | | |
| 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 | | | | |

ESSA Data Review

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

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|-----|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 22 |
| 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 | 157 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 82% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 11 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Native American Students | |
| Federal Index - Native American Students | |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Asian Students | |
| Federal Index - Asian Students | |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |

| Asian Students | | | | | | | |
|--|-----|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | | | | | | | |
| Black/African American Students | | | | | | | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 23 | | | | | | |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | | | | | | | |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | | | | | | | |
| Hispanic Students | | | | | | | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 24 | | | | | | |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES | | | | | | |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | | | | | | | |
| Multiracial Students | | | | | | | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | | | | | | | |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A | | | | | | |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | | | | | | | |
| Pacific Islander Students | | | | | | | |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students | | | | | | | |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | | | | | | | |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% | | | | | | | |
| 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% | | | | | | | |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | | | | | | | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 22 | | | | | | |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | | | | | | | |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | | | | | | | |

Analysis

Data Analysis

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

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

The COVID slide was pronounced in mathematics across all grade-levels. There was much more movement between Window 1 and Window 3 in mathematics than there was in Reading, suggesting that the teachers effectively were able to fill gaps in knowledge and skills.

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

Mathematics and Science, as well as the growth of the lowest 25%

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

Students lacked quality intervention and/or targeted support. Teachers need to be trained on providing targeted support, and interventionists need to be employed to work with our most vulnerable students in small groups.

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

3rd grade mathematics

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

We had a veteran team of 3rd grade math teachers. We need to replicate this success by hiring more qualified teachers with instructional know-how and knowledge of the assessment.

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

Targeted support for students who are 1 or 2 grade-levels behind, and weekly teacher professional development.

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

Teachers have common planning in each grade-level, as well as an earlier release each Wednesday afternoon for professional development, collaborative planning and teacher development.

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

Robust intervention schedule for students who are 1 or 2 grade-levels behind, more time in mathematics and ELA, more time in Science across all grade-levels so that the 5th grade teacher is not overburdened, and targeted instructional support for teachers.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

Area of Focus

Description and

Our school will not receive a letter grade this year (2020/21) however we will will receive data from the 2020 FSA season (the COVID year). We are anticipating that this data will be lower than years past. Students will be further behind than they typically are, and therefore need lots of targeted intervention/small group instruction

Rationale: Measurable

Outcome:

Learning gains for L25% in ELA and Mathematics

Monitoring: iReady interim assessments

Person

responsible

for

Heather Torretta (htorretta@beaconpride.org)

monitoring outcome:

Evidencebased Strategy:

Differentiated instruction is learning the nuanced needs of your students, and creating the conditions to target those needs in smaller, more intimate settings. By investing heavily in the individualization of the student experience, we'll be able better prepare them for gradelevel proficiency.

for

Evidencebased

Strategy:

Rationale

COVID has left larger than normal gaps in student learning. These gaps are best plugged

by maximizing the amount of small group instruction we provide.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Our discipline data is lower than other schools. We report fewer referrals than typical.

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.

Beacon College Prep communicates the mission and vision to all stakeholders, including teachers and students. From this vision, we define the instructional and cultural goals necessary to succeed. Each morning, we hold a school-wide assembly where the principal leads the school in a routine that is designed to promote our core values (Gratitude, self-control, grit, curiosity and zest), and teachers hold a more intimate morning meeting where they promote SEL. We have a Dean of culture who is responsible for organizing a PBS incentive system for all students, and teachers use Class Dojo to track and incentivize students to do the right thing. When necessary, teachers refer students to our counselor to approach discipline first from an SEL perspective, and with empathy. We also implemented a "no yelling" policy for the adults to clearly communicate that the appropriate way to deal with discipline is not through fear or cohesion, but rather through communication and accountability.

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

Principal, Assistant Principal, Grade-level chairs, Director of Operations and the Dean of Culture all play a critical role in fostering a positive environment that is reflective of our goals and designed to help students succeed.

Part V: Budget

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

| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructiona | \$198,550.00 | | | |
|---|----------|--|---|----------------|-----|---------------------------------------|
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2021-22 |
| | 5100 | 130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel | 4002 - Beacon College Preparatory Elementary School | UniSIG | 1.0 | \$45,000.00 |
| Notes: Salaries - Mental Health Coordinator. New position to assist students who may be in need of mental health services. Position is not funded by the school district for full-time services for students. The MHC will carry appropriate certifications and experience, and provide direct tier 2 services to students, while coordinating the delivery of tier 3 services we community organizations equipped to provide them. | | | | | | rict for full-time experience, and |

| | | | | Total: | \$198,550.00 |
|---|------------------------|---|---|---|--|
| | | Notes: Classroom Supplies - Each tea approximately \$252.50 for classroom supplies that are necessary for the fur With 20 teachers in the elementary so supplies teachers may select include markers, folders, organizational suppli | supplies. They will be paction of their classroor hool, this amounts to \$ - but are not limited to | orovided wit m, and used 55,050 for th - pencils, pa | th a list of allowable I to educate students. It year. Examples of |
| 5100 | 510-Supplies | 4002 - Beacon College Preparatory Elementary School | UniSIG | 0.0 | \$5,050.00 |
| Notes: Salaries - Full-time Intervention for tier 2 and tier 3 students. Postiion has forme been funded by Federal funds. This certified professional will spend 100% of her time working with our most struggling students in either small group or one-on-one settings. | | | | | % of her time |
| 5100 | 120-Classroom Teachers | 4002 - Beacon College Preparatory Elementary School | UniSIG | 1.0 | \$49,500.00 |
| Notes: Salaries - Paraprofessional. Two (2) New full-time positions. Paraprofessionals will push into classrooms with students who are lower performing to assist the classroom teach in providing differentiated instruction. This supplemental position will help teachers educate their lowest-perforing students. Paras are paid at a rate of \$125 per day, for 196 working days of the year. This amounts to \$24,500 each. | | | | | he classroom teacher p teachers educate |
| 5100 | 150-Aides | 4002 - Beacon College Preparatory Elementary School | UniSIG | 2.0 | \$49,000.00 |
| | | Notes: Salaries - Full-time ESE teachers support to students in our ESE prograformerly contracted with ESE service translated and nuanced support to our support to our support towards our school perform | m. Position is not fund providers, but this posi students with needs, m | ed by the so toin will help | chool district. We o us provide more |
| 5100 | 120-Classroom Teachers | 4002 - Beacon College Preparatory Elementary School | UniSIG | 1.0 | \$50,000.00 |