

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Beacon College Preparatory Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 6 |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 14 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

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 |
| 2021-22 Title I School | Yes |
| 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 85% |
| 2021-22 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 | 2021-22: C (51%) 2018-19: D (36%) 2017-18: C (45%) |
| 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 | ATSI |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here . | |

School Board Approval

N/A

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 | 6 |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 14 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Beacon College Preparatory Elementary School

13400 NW 28TH AVE, Opa Locka, FL 33054

www.beconpride.org

School Demographics

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| <p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School KG-5</p> | <p>2021-22 Title I School</p> <p style="font-size: 1.2em;">Yes</p> | <p>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="font-size: 1.2em;">85%</p> |
| <p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p> | <p>Charter School</p> <p style="font-size: 1.2em;">Yes</p> | <p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="font-size: 1.2em;">100%</p> |

School Grades History

| | | | | |
|--------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Year | 2021-22 | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 |
| Grade | C | D | D | D |

School Board Approval

N/A

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.

We believe that a holistic educational experience that balances the academic attainment of students, the development of their social skills, and the incorporation of activities that they enjoy both inside and outside of the curriculum will develop empowered, well-rounded, and highly invested students. This is chiefly important because our students are among the most vulnerable and “at-risk” to a variety of external factors.

Our schools exist to provide quality educational services to students and families in Opa Locka and surrounding communities. Miami-Dade suffers from chronic racial and economic segregation, so at any given moment, one’s physical location can inform the degree to which they feel safe, have access to quality resources, or feel socially isolated. Kids do not have a choice on where they grow up, and oftentimes – through no fault of their own – their home zip code can determine the type of school they attend, which has a significant impact on a host of eventual life outcomes.

With racial and economic segregation so deeply entrenched in our community, our students grow up in zip codes where they are less likely to earn a college degree, less likely to own a home, more likely to be saddled with debt, more likely to be incarcerated, and more likely to be the victim of a violent crime. We can speak at length of what data tells us about students who grow up in hyper-segregated communities. If schools in communities like ours were equal with more affluent schools as far as quality and abundance of resources, this wouldn’t be an issue. But it is common knowledge that schools in Opa Locka are not as well-funded, staffed or resourced as schools on Fisher Island, and to accept that reality without attempting to do something about it is to accept that economic inequality and political disenfranchisement along racial lines will continue in this country indefinitely.

So, our schools exist as an alternative for families who typically do not have quality charter options near their home. As of July 2022, our campus is home to Opa Locka’s only “A” school, and we’re beginning to establish ourselves as the aspirational “beacon” for our community. Choice leads to agency, which is a precursor to empowerment, so by standing tall in Opa Locka as a viable and quality alternative for families in lower-income communities, we’re positioned to enable more widespread empowerment throughout our community.

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 year after year. It is ambitious, yet realistic. It lives only if those who execute it daily believe in it. We strive to be a school that sparks the brains of those who will one day change the world. 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 the 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” for greener pastures. Our theory of change involves students and their families 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

that community 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

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|-------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Evans, Patrick | Principal | |
| Torretta, Heather | Assistant Principal | |
| Gibson, Kevin | Dean | |
| Puryear, Marissa | Other | |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 8/18/2014, Patrick Evans

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

6

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

17

Total number of students enrolled at the school

319

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

5

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

7

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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 | 39 | 52 | 59 | 54 | 50 | 65 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 319 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 3 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 6 | 7 | 9 | 9 | 8 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 6 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 19 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47 |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 20 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 |

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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

Friday 9/30/2022

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 | 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 | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|----|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| 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 | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| 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 | |

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 | 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 | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|----|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| 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 | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| 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 | |

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 | 2022 | | | 2021 | | | 2019 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 35% | 62% | 56% | | | | 36% | 62% | 57% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 61% | | | | | | 40% | 62% | 58% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 74% | | | | | | 60% | 58% | 53% |
| Math Achievement | 46% | 58% | 50% | | | | 41% | 69% | 63% |
| Math Learning Gains | 72% | | | | | | 32% | 66% | 62% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 48% | | | | | | 21% | 55% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 22% | 64% | 59% | | | | 24% | 55% | 53% |

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 |
| 01 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 02 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 03 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 40% | 60% | -20% | 58% | -18% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 33% | 64% | -31% | 58% | -25% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -40% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 35% | 60% | -25% | 56% | -21% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -33% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 01 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 02 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 03 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 56% | 67% | -11% | 62% | -6% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 27% | 69% | -42% | 64% | -37% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -56% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 32% | 65% | -33% | 60% | -28% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -27% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 23% | 53% | -30% | 53% | -30% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

Subgroup Data Review

| 2022 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 2020-21 | C & C Accel 2020-21 |
| SWD | 24 | 53 | | 28 | 50 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 34 | 58 | 70 | 47 | 74 | 52 | 22 | | | | |
| HSP | 47 | 90 | | 41 | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 33 | 61 | 77 | 43 | 69 | 48 | 20 | | | | |
| 2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 |
| SWD | 13 | | | 8 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 27 | 33 | 43 | 22 | 15 | 7 | 12 | | | | |
| HSP | 29 | | | 18 | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 27 | 34 | 43 | 21 | 11 | 7 | 11 | | | | |
| 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 | | | | |

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|------|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 51 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 358 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |

| Subgroup Data | |
|--|-----|
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 31 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 2 |
| 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 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 | 51 |
| 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 | 59 |
| 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 | |
| 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 | |
|--|-----|
| 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 | 50 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

4002 improved in all reporting categories. The average improvement was 29% per category from 2021 to 2022, and 15% per category from 2019 to 2022. The most significant improvement was Math Learning Gains, which showed a 59% jump from the previous year. The least significant improvement was ELA achievement, which showed an 8% jump from the prior year, In proficiency metrics (ELA, Math, Science) our average score was 34%, whereas in growth metrics (ELA and Math) our average score was 64%
 4002 outperformed the State and district in 4 of the 7 reporting categories.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

ELA and Science demonstrate the greatest need for improvement. While we improved from years prior, we still lag behind the State and District in these categories, and it is our mission to become a school of excellence, so we need to improve.

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

Curricular alignment was the biggest contributing factor in both Science and ELA. This year, we will more closely follow MDCPS pacing and curricular resources to improve.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Math growth and ELA growth showed the greatest improvement from 2021 to 2022. Math L25 and ELA L25 grew 48% and 74%, respectively. Math and ELA grains for all students improved 72% and 74%,

respectively. Additionally, math proficiency jumped from 24% in 2021 to 46% in 2022 - demonstrating solid instruction and learning across the board.

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

Retention of strong teachers, curricular shift towards MDCPS pacing, utilization of MDCPS Topic Assessments and Performance Matters, additional math only tutoring after school and on Saturdays.

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

Our students will benefit from more differentiated instruction in the core classes, as well as additional remediation outside of core classes. We've adjusted the daily schedule to reflect 30 more minutes of learning and daily intervention time.

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.

Curriculum specific PD will be offered to teachers on PD days, and each teacher will engage in 1 full coaching cycle per month.

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

By providing coaching cycles each month for each teacher, we're helping them improve their practice and experience more success, which should help us retain their services next year and beyond. We're investing in capacity building so that it helps us this year and beyond.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

ELA continues to be our most challenging reporting category. Students demonstrated improvement from 2021 to 2022, but are still only at 35% proficient, which is below the District and State average.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

At least 50% of students in grades 3-5 will demonstrate grade level proficiency by the end of the 2022-23 school year on the FAST or iReady assessment.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

FAST data, topic assessments, and iReady interim assessments

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Heather Torretta (htorretta@beaconpride.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Guided reading in reading foundations courses, as well as 30 minutes of daily DI in core courses.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Guided reading and differentiated instruction are about meeting students where they are, and bridging the gap to where they need to be. By making dedicated time for these activities - especially with those students in the Reading Foundations course - we'll be helping them grow towards proficiency.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Identify and purchase new ELA and Reading curriculum

Person Responsible Heather Torretta (htorretta@beaconpride.org)

Train teachers on new ELA and Reading materials

Person Responsible Heather Torretta (htorretta@beaconpride.org)

Develop walk-through and coaching cycle schedule for teachers with an emphasis on ELA and Reading materials

Person Responsible Heather Torretta (htorretta@beaconpride.org)

Perform monthly coaching cycles with all ELA and reading teachers

Person Responsible Marissa Puryear (mpuryear@beaconpride.org)

Administer topic assessments and interim assessments

Person Responsible Heather Torretta (htorretta@beaconpride.org)

Review data from topic and interim assessments with teachers

Person Responsible Patrick Evans (pevans@dadeschools.net)

Develop interventions above and beyond DI and GR for students who are still struggling

Person Responsible Marissa Puryear (mpuryear@beaconpride.org)

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Grades K, 1 and 2: Phonics instruction and guided reading. Students enter school at various levels. Most of our incoming kindergarten students do not recognize all 26 letters of the alphabet upon entry into school. For that reason, a solid foundation in phonics is necessary to get them reading fluently, and eventually comprehending what they read. Guided reading will be used in small groups to support those students who are at or approaching grade level to focus on comprehension in preparation for the rigorous demands of 3rd grade

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Grades 3 and 4 (Last year's 4th graders were above 50% proficiency) will focus on differentiated instruction, guided reading in small groups, and independent reading. Students at this age who are further behind in reading need ample small group instruction, as well as time to read and respond to text. Maximizing the time students spend doing work on their level, getting explicit coaching and feedback on reading, and practicing reading independently will make them stronger readers.

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

At least 51% of students are at or above grade level in reading by the end of the year on the FAST (STAR) assessment or iReady

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

At least 51% of students in grades 3 and 4 are at or above grade level in reading by the end of the year on the FAST or iReady AP3

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

We'll utilize the FAST progress monitoring assessments, as well as iReady AP1, AP2 and AP3. Additionally, teachers will give students topic assessments in alignment with the curriculum. Students who fall behind will receive additional intervention.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Torretta, Heather, htorretta@beaconpride.org

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Differentiated instruction, guided reading and independent reading are all evidence based strategies to deepen reading skills and comprehension. They have demonstrated significant impacts on student

outcomes for over a decade, and they align to both the BEST ELA standards and the MDCPS K12 Comprehensive Evidence Based Reading Plan

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Differentiated instruction, guided reading and independent reading are all evidence based strategies to deepen reading skills and comprehension. They have demonstrated significant impacts on student outcomes for over a decade, and they align to both the BEST ELA standards and the MDCPS K12 Comprehensive Evidence Based Reading Plan. They're particularly effective when used with student populations similar to ours.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

| Action Step | Person Responsible for Monitoring |
|--|---|
| Develop daily schedule in key grade levels to allow daily differentiated instruction, daily guided reading, daily independent reading, and daily phonics (K-2) | Evans, Patrick, pevans@dadeschools.net |
| Appoint and train grade-team leads to coach teachers in the implementation of literacy strategies in monthly coaching cycles | Evans, Patrick, pevans@dadeschools.net |
| Implement and administer progress monitoring and topic assessments | Torretta, Heather, htorretta@beaconpride.org |
| Review data with teachers and literacy leaders in school to develop interventions | Torretta, Heather, htorretta@beaconpride.org |
| Provide ongoing professional development to all teachers of literacy | Torretta, Heather, htorretta@beaconpride.org |

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

BCP is proactive about building positive school culture and environment. We start each day with an intentional morning meeting or homeroom, where we emphasize our core values (gratitude, self control, grit, curiosity and zest) and celebrate academic improvements. We also utilize class dojo for all of our behavior management and incentives. Students can redeem points they earn on dojo for prizes at the beacon store, or they can save their points and attend a quarterly field trip.

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

Principal - vision and accountability

Dean of students - execution of incentives and discipline

AP - infuse academic incentives and correspond with parents

Teachers - learn expectations and reinforce with consistency

Parents and students - treat others with respect, embody core values, and give maximum effort