

The School District of Palm Beach County

Beacon Cove Intermediate School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Beacon Cove Intermediate School

150 SCHOOLHOUSE RD, Jupiter, FL 33458

<https://bci.palmbeachschools.org>

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Palm Beach County School Board on 10/18/2023.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Buckman, Pamela	Principal	Support the academic, social emotional and behavioral needs of students, support the instructional needs of teachers and communicate with parents.
Aurand, Jan	Assistant Principal	Support the academic, social emotional and behavioral needs of students, support the instructional needs of teachers and communicate with parents.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

All stakeholders are invited to participate in Beacon Cove's SAC. The leadership team presents the school's data from the prior year in order to develop goals for the current year. Ideas for spending SAC funds to support student achievement are also discussed. Stakeholder roles and how they will contribute to student achievement are also discussed. The budget, expectations of SAC members and voting requirements are explained. Diagnostic results, progress monitoring and other relevant student information is shared.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

An update on student progress will be discussed at each monthly SAC meeting. Current data (progress monitoring) will be presented and any additional plans or strategies will be discussed if progress is not being made. Stakeholders will have information and data to assist with the modification of the plan for student achievement.

We strategically plan for a variety of monitoring techniques:

- Review of Lesson Plans,
- Data Analysis,
- Classroom walks,
- Student attendance,
- Data Chats,
- Formal Observations,
- Professional Learning Communities attendance/participation,
- Formative/Summative Assessments and Technology.

The School Improvement Plan (SIP) is a living document that memorializes the continuous improvement work we do at our school. The SIP is updated throughout the year to ensure proper documentation of what we do. Continuous improvement at the forefront of what we do. We work collaboratively to review and analyze data. We make decisions based on the data to ensure all students receive the necessary support and accommodations during instruction. Our team works towards the following student achievement goals:

- Strategic visioning and planning
- Problem identification and root cause analysis
- Developing action steps towards improvement
- Creating and maintaining a culture of collaboration towards shared decision-making
- Supporting professional learning and improvement

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School 3-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	27%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	31%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN)

(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	19	21	19	0	0	0	59
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	3	9	0	0	0	13
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	34	9	25	0	0	0	68
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	23	30	14	0	0	0	67
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	13	10	14	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	14	19	21	0	0	0	54
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	23	29	40	0	0	0	92

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	25	22	24	0	0	0	71

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	16	23	22	0	0	0	61
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	28	10	14	0	0	0	52
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	11	13	25	0	0	0	49
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	2	15	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	21	0	0	0	24
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	18	17	10	0	0	0	45

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	15	12	23	0	0	0	50

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	16	23	22	0	0	0	61
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	28	10	14	0	0	0	52
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	11	13	25	0	0	0	49
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	2	15	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	21	0	0	0	24
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	18	17	10	0	0	0	45

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	15	12	23	0	0	0	50

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	80	53	53	86	59	56	87		
ELA Learning Gains				80			79		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				64			82		
Math Achievement*	78	57	59	88	53	50	85		
Math Learning Gains				78			67		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				74			56		
Science Achievement*	75	54	54	79	59	59	73		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					54	52			
Graduation Rate					47	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	85	56	59	55					

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	79
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	397
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	76
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	604
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	47			
ELL	67			
AMI				
ASN	86			
BLK				
HSP	70			
MUL	85			
PAC				

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
WHT	79			
FRL	57			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	64			
ELL	62			
AMI				
ASN	90			
BLK				
HSP	72			
MUL	84			
PAC				
WHT	81			
FRL	74			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	80			78			75					85
SWD	48			45			44				4	
ELL	71			63			50				4	85
AMI												
ASN	85			91							3	
BLK												
HSP	74			73			52				4	

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
MUL	93			78			85				3	
PAC												
WHT	80			78			78				4	
FRL	57			56			60				4	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	86	80	64	88	78	74	79					55
SWD	58	67	55	66	75	74	52					
ELL	78	70	54	72	61	60	42					55
AMI												
ASN	88	89		94	89							
BLK												
HSP	86	81	67	79	64	44	82					
MUL	94	82		88	73							
PAC												
WHT	86	79	67	91	81	86	78					
FRL	78	78	63	81	75	74	71					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	87	79	82	85	67	56	73					
SWD	61	83	78	55	48	40	57					
ELL	89			89								
AMI												
ASN	94	67		97	80		88					
BLK												
HSP	91	77	80	88	60		71					
MUL	90	90		84	70		70					
PAC												
WHT	86	80	79	83	66	53	73					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
FRL	78	76	87	74	54	44	59					

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	80%	56%	24%	54%	26%
04	2023 - Spring	84%	58%	26%	58%	26%
03	2023 - Spring	78%	48%	30%	50%	28%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	100%	54%	46%	54%	46%
03	2023 - Spring	83%	57%	26%	59%	24%
04	2023 - Spring	77%	52%	25%	61%	16%
05	2023 - Spring	80%	56%	24%	55%	25%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	74%	51%	23%	51%	23%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

ELA:

Data from FY22 to FY23 indicates that proficiency in ELA dropped from 82% to 78% in 3rd grade, increased from 81% to 84% in 4th grade, and dropped from 92% to 80% in 5th grade. Our overall ELA achievement for FY23 was 80.5%. Over the past four years, our ELA proficiency has dropped to the following:

3rd: 83% to 78%

4th: 87% to 84%

5th: 84% to 80%

Subgroups:

There is a significant gap among our subgroups, especially the SWD subgroup. For example, our overall proficiency in ELA stayed the same at 86% in 2019 and 2022, but the SWD subgroup dropped to 58% in FY22 compared with 60% in FY19. In math, the overall proficiency went from 91% in FY19 to 88% in FY22, and the SWD subgroup decreased from 75% in FY19 to 66% in FY22. There is still much work that needs to be done in this subgroup since it is our largest one and includes many students.

Based on this data trend our focus will be to focus on increasing the proficiency within the SWD subgroup in ELA and math. This subgroup makes up a lot of our L25 students as well. Our data shows there is a need to provide students with instructional support which focuses on the acquisition of foundational skills, reteaching standards that were not mastered, while also scaffolding instruction that meets the full intent and rigor of standards. Students will receive targeted support through various modes of instruction, including the inclusion of technology, small group differentiated instruction, tutorials, data chats, and monitoring.

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

Our focus is to increase learning gains for all students, including those identified in the L25 subgroup. Our SWD will be a focus group, as the majority of the students in our L25 subgroup are also our SWD students. Implementation of small group differentiated instruction will occur to address the needs of diverse learners.

It is imperative that we increase our students' reading to allow them success across all content. With literacy as the focus, we also expect to improvement in mathematics and science.

Teachers were beginning to use small group instruction for remediation. Although teachers were gaining in their knowledge and usage of strategies, the contributing factor was the lack of consistency with small group instruction.

I-Ready diagnostic data results indicate a significant number of students scoring below grade level in phonemic awareness, phonics, and vocabulary. To address this problem, teacher leaders are working closely with the teachers to identify these students and provide them with research based interventions. The SAI teachers work directly with targeted students to provide extra support. The master board allows support staff to assist with intervention. In addition, BCI will utilize the district scope to ensure high-level research-based texts are provided for teachers to implement rigorous standards-based instruction, using Core Actions (reading text, talking about the text and completing a task around the text/standard) . After School tutorial will be provided to students as the budget allows. Student and teacher data chats will be scheduled by administration after analyzing student data.

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.

Contributing factors to our lower proficiency scores in our SWD subgroups for Reading and Math include the need for more small group, differentiated instruction within the classroom. ESE and classroom teachers must work closely together to meet the needs of the students and work with them on their

individual deficiencies.

Another area BCI is working to improve is the communication between us and our sister school, Lighthouse Elementary. Since we are a 3-5 school, it is imperative that we communicate effectively and frequently with Lighthouse to ensure a smooth transition for our 3rd graders.

The new reading curriculum has small group instruction embedded within it and administration has revamped the Professional Learning Communities to further address meeting the needs of the students by meeting every 3 weeks to analyze data and plan instruction.

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

Based on FSA data from 2019 to 2022, ELA proficiency stayed flat overall (86%) and math proficiency showed a 3% decrease (91% to 88%). More specifically, 92% of 5th grade ELA were proficient in FY22 compared with 84% in FY19. In math, all grade levels were stagnant or decreased. However, when looking at the subgroups for both ELA and math, SWD continued to be the largest number of students in the subgroup with the lowest percentage of students proficient.

In Science, we are still behind where we were in FY19. FY22 Science scores indicate 78% of students are proficient while 83% were proficient in spring 2019. Although there was an increase in FY21 from 73% to 78%, we still have work to do in this subject.

For the SWD students in ELA, data from FY19 to FY22 indicates an increase of 7% in learning gains within that subgroup, from 60% in FY19 to 67 in FY22.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Upon reflecting on the EWS, a concern for BCI is the number of students with 10 or more absences during the 2022-2023 school year. In grade 3 there were 16 students, grade 4 had 23 students and grade 5 had 22 students. For the 2023-2024 school year, as of September, there are 6 students (Grade 3 has 2 students and Grade 4 has 4 students) showing 10 plus absences. In addition, students being tardy is also a big concern for our school.

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

1. Proficiency of ESE students in ELA
2. Proficiency of ESE students in Math
3. Attendance for all students

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Overall GOAL FY24 SWD ELA

52%

FAST ELA

All SWD 47.1%

3rd 51.2%

4th 44.4%

5th 43.8%

Overall GOAL FY24 SWD Math

56%

FAST Math

All SWD 51%

3rd 60.5%

4th 50.0%

5th 35.5%

Upon reviewing our ELA data, the SWD subgroup dropped to 58% proficient from FY22 to 48% in FY23. Math data shows that SWD dropped from 66% proficient in FY22 to 50% in FY23.

Historically, our data indicates they are the biggest subgroup and lag significantly behind non-SWD students. The focus for FY24 is to focus on the essential components of small group and differentiated instruction and to move toward the application of best practices in the classroom setting. To help support meaningful small group and differentiated instruction, we need to revamp the PLC meetings to focus on analyzing data and having meaningful conversations about differentiated instruction to meet students' individual needs. The ESE support teachers will be an integral part of the planning, data analysis, and instruction with the classroom teachers.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Teachers will continue to increase their knowledge and use of small group instruction, differentiated instruction and engagement strategies. This will be measured through teacher-led PLC meetings, data chats and the analysis of student data.

The percent of SWD scoring proficient in Reading will increase from 47% to 52% as measured by the FAST Assessment PM 3.

The percent of SWD scoring proficient in Math will increase from 50% to 56% as measured by the FAST Assessment PM 3.

Monitoring:

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

Administration will monitor learning/growth through PLC observations, School-Based Team meetings, IEP goals, interactions and walk throughs. Regular data analysis of FAST PM1, PM2, USAs and I-Ready will occur between administration and individual teachers, administration and grade level teams and administration and subject area teams. Lesson plans will continue to be monitored and feedback will be

provided both in writing and verbally. Administration will monitor teacher use, as well as fidelity of small group instructions and differentiated instruction through classroom walkthroughs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Pamela Buckman (pamela.buckman@palmbeachschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

1. Teachers will participate in Professional Learning Communities that focuses on Standards based instruction, Small Group Instruction and Differentiated Instruction.
2. Teachers will utilize small group instruction (within their language arts instruction and math instruction) to individualized student learning.
3. Students will engage in remediation and enrichment learning opportunities to meet their needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

1. Teachers will participate in Professional Learning Communities to focus on the implementation of differentiated Instruction in order to increase the rigor of standards-based instruction.
2. The Master Schedule reflects common planning time and PLC meetings to provide teachers with time to plan and focus on differentiated instruction. ESE and support teachers will also participate to ensure fluidity and fidelity.
3. Differentiated, small group instruction utilized in all classrooms ensures we support all learners at their ability. Differentiated instruction is effective because the teaching is then focused precisely on what the student(s) need to learn. Evidence has demonstrated that ongoing observation of students, combined with systematic assessment enables teachers to support and enhance student learning by an increase in the number of students with successful outcomes.
4. Students will engage in remediation and enrichment learning opportunities, using District Approved curriculum and adaptive technology to support/reteach/enrichment at their level.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Teachers will meet in Professional Learning Opportunities (through PLCs, PD Days and during team planning) to increase their knowledge of differentiated instruction, small group instruction and engagement strategies to meet the needs of each student within their classroom.

- A. Teachers will meet during professional learning communities to review standards, analyze data , determine next steps with the instruction of standards and revise as necessary. Teachers will also be monitoring and managing plans during collaborative times and share insights and knowledge.
- B. Teachers will have the opportunity to collaboratively plan lessons and receive feedback on their differentiated lessons. They will plan with the focus of designing lessons based on students' needs, grouping students by shared topic and/or ability, assessing students' learning in formative assessments, reflecting and adjusting lesson content to meet students' needs.
- C. After planning sessions and delivery, teachers will reflect on their lessons based on students' need.

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

By When: By the end of May 2023.

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Beacon Cove has a history of high attendance concerns and student who arrive late to school. Last year 63 out of 645 students were identified as having 10% or more absences. Grade3 had 16 students, Grade 4 23 students and grade 5 22 students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Beacon Cove Intermediate will decrease the number of students with 10% or more absences by 15% (decrease of 9 students) for the FY24 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Homeroom teacher is responsible for:

contacting parents after a student has missed two (2) consecutive days and five (5) or more days per marking period.

Calls must be documented in the notes section in SIS. If more information is required for documentation purposes, a parent conference form 1051 (date, time, outcome of call) should be used in addition to SIS. Teacher will also send an email to the Principal & Attendance Clerk reporting the 5 absences and outcome of the call.

Attendance clerk is responsible for following up with classroom teacher and parents regarding absences. Attendance clerk is also responsible for sending letter via email through SIS and hard copy home with students after 6 absences and 11 absences.

Attendance clerk and Admin will meet monthly to review absences of those students at both 5 and 10 absences.

Admin will follow up with SBT to monitor students with excessive absences.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Pamela Buckman (pamela.buckman@palmbeachschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

BCI will follow the steps and guidelines as outlined by Safe Schools: The School District of Palm Beach County

Attendance Response Team Guide for Schools

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Chronic Absenteeism:

Makes it harder for students to learn foundational skills, establish positive relationship, & develop essential skills for life and success

Prevents students from learning critical skills, social norms, & healthy behaviors that employers and

colleges look for

Students who are chronically absent are more at risk of experiencing negative social and emotional life circumstances and are more likely to face negative long-term consequences including poverty and diminished mental and physical health

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Homeroom teacher is responsible for:

contacting parents after a student has missed two (2) consecutive days and five (5) or more days per marking period.

Calls must be documented in the notes section in SIS. If more information is required for documentation purposes, a parent conference form 1051 (date, time, outcome of call) should be used in addition to SIS. Teacher will also send an email to the Principal & Attendance Clerk reporting the 5 absences and outcome of the call.

Attendance clerk is responsible for following up with classroom teacher and parents regarding absences. Attendance clerk is also responsible for sending letter via email through SIS and hard copy home with students after 6 absences and 11 absences.

Attendance clerk and Admin will meet monthly to review absences of those students at both 5 and 10 absences.

Admin will follow up with SBT to monitor students with excessive absences.

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

By When: By end of the school year in May, 2024.