

School District of Indian River County

Beachland Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	21

Beachland Elementary School

3350 INDIAN RIVER DR E, Vero Beach, FL 32963

www.indianriverschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Rachel Finnegan

Start Date for this Principal: 8/28/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	38%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (71%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: A (63%) 2015-16: B (59%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Indian River County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Beachland Elementary's mission statement is to increase student achievement for all students.

We will close the achievement gap.

We will create problem solvers through inquiry learning.

We will differentiate instruction and collaborate to meet the needs of a diverse student population.

We will partner with our community to enrich student exposure to the arts and our environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Beachland's vision is to create an environment which empowers all students to reach their greatest academic, social, emotional, and physical potential amidst a diverse community. We will accomplish this through a commitment of enrichment and collaboration among parents, teachers, staff, students and the community.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Finnegan, Rachel	Principal	Instructional leadership, analysis of needs and strengths of curriculum and instructional, monitor student progress, support implementation of effective teaching strategies, and ensure a safe and caring school environment to maximize the fullest potential of our students
Del Tufo, Susan	Assistant Principal	Instructional leadership, analysis of needs and strengths of curriculum and instructional, monitor student progress, support implementation of effective teaching strategies, and ensure a safe and caring school environment to maximize the fullest potential of our students
Stawara, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	First Grade Teacher, Grade Level Chair
Brescia, Megan	Teacher, K-12	Fourth Grade Teacher, Grade Level Chair
Polverari, Adrienne	Instructional Media	Media Center Specialist, Grade Level Chair
Masterson, Jena	Teacher, K-12	Third grade teacher, Grade Level Chair
Bangert, Ashley	Teacher, K-12	Teacher Leader
O'Connor, Diana	Teacher, ESE	K-3 Support Facilitator, ESE Grade Chair
Gabbard, Jennifer	Instructional Coach	K-2 Instructional Literacy Coach
McCabe, Danielle	Teacher, K-12	Thinking Maps Trained Trainer IRCEA Building Representative Teacher Leader
Korzon, Amy	Teacher, K-12	Second Grade Teacher, Second Grade Chair
Whelan, Karen	Instructional Coach	K-3 Intervention Teacher
Matschner, Britt	Teacher, K-12	Kindergarten Teacher, Kindergarten Grade Chair
	Guidance Counselor	Elementary School Counselor

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 8/28/2019, Rachel Finnegan

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

32

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	38%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (71%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: A (63%) 2015-16: B (59%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	87	89	87	95	87	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	523
Attendance below 90 percent	0	34	36	41	28	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	174
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	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	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	2	1	9	6	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/31/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	80	79	84	78	84	81	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	486
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	11	7	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	26	13	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	80	79	84	78	84	81	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	486
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	11	7	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
One or more suspensions	2	0	0	2	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	26	13	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	2	1	6	14	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

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	72%	58%	57%	68%	54%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	74%	57%	58%	62%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	68%	54%	53%	58%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	73%	63%	63%	70%	60%	61%
Math Learning Gains	81%	60%	62%	60%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	58%	48%	51%	39%	51%	51%
Science Achievement	71%	54%	53%	81%	48%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	71%	60%	11%	58%	13%
	2018	59%	56%	3%	57%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	79%	61%	18%	58%	21%
	2018	63%	56%	7%	56%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison		20%				
05	2019	64%	54%	10%	56%	8%
	2018	45%	52%	-7%	55%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		19%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	67%	64%	3%	62%	5%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	71%	60%	11%	62%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	81%	64%	17%	64%	17%
	2018	59%	63%	-4%	62%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		22%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
05	2019	74%	57%	17%	60%	14%
	2018	53%	58%	-5%	61%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		21%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	68%	53%	15%	53%	15%
	2018	58%	54%	4%	55%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	30	70	71	27	55	56					
ELL	45	82		55	91						
BLK	30	56	46	52	60	38	38				
HSP	67	84	90	64	80	50	55				
WHT	82	75	69	81	87	85	85				
FRL	59	71	69	58	70	56	56				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	5	36	33	14	38	38	16				
ELL	25			42							
BLK	17	31	39	28	37	36	40				
HSP	44	36		50	59	55	40				
WHT	71	58		76	50	10	71				
FRL	38	38	36	42	47	39	39				

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	22	32	27	27	30	33	27				
ELL	27			36							
BLK	36	54	56	43	46	59	25				
HSP	59	71		58	47		77				
WHT	81	61		83	67		94				
FRL	49	53	54	52	44	37	53				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	71
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	72
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	569
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	52
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners

Federal Index - English Language Learners	69
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners 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	46
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	69
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
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
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	81
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	64
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

The data that showed the lowest performance was Math Lowest 25th Percentile at 58%. The contributing factors to raise the lowest 25th percentile from the 17-18 school year to the 18-19 school year was departmentalizing the grade level with two math teachers. In addition, the schedule did not have Response to Intervention (RTI) for math. Support facilitators were pulling students out as opposed to pushing in to the classroom. Students with disabilities continued to score below their peers (2019 - 30% at Level 3 or higher). However, this was a significant increase over the 2018 data (5% at Level 3 or higher).

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

Due to the 2018-2019 school grade of a "C," there were no declines in any area, as all areas improved from the 17-18 to the 18-19 school year. The only achievement level which declined was third grade mathematics. Since efforts were spent focused on literacy for the 2018-2019 school year, response to intervention did not include mathematics. The Moon Shot Academy was also used to strengthen ELA achievement. Math classes had not been departmentalized and teachers in third and fourth grade were teaching all subjects.

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.

Beachland did not have any gaps compared to the state average. In fact, Beachland outperformed in one particular area compared to the state average.

The greatest gap compared to the state average was Math Learning Gains. The state average was 62% and Beachland Elementary was 81%. The contribution to Math Learning Gains for Beachland was the strategic placement of the instructional staff, the addition of FASTMATH to the curriculum, and departmentalizing third, fourth and fifth grade teachers for ELA and math instruction.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was the ELA Lowest 25th Percentile. The new actions taken were the addition of the third grade interventionist (3GI), fidelity with RTI in literacy, and a focus on literacy through Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) and implementation of the Moonshot Academy to target bottom quartile 2nd and 3rd grade students. Data was shared by grade level and by individual class. The bell schedule was changed to allow for teachers and administrators to have time to meet in the morning to analyze data and create action plans. All areas showed strong areas of growth. Beachland also implemented Thinking Maps, used Professional Learning Communities to conduct data chats and curriculum planning, and grade levels collaboratively planned RtI and enrichment lessons. Ongoing PD was provided in strategies that would promote learning, such as annotation, Kagan Cooperative Learning (reinforcing last year's PD) and other strategies to engage students in higher level thinking.

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

Thirty-nine students have attendance rate below 90% in the current school year (19-20). This is the primary area of concern based on EWS data. In January, a school-wide initiative Attendance H.E.R.O

- Here Every day Ready and On time, was incorporated into all classrooms. This is improved attendance for the two months students were in session before closures due to COVID-19.

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

1. Reduce achievement gaps of minorities in math and English Language Arts (ELA)
2. Increase math achievement K-5 for SWDs
3. Reduce classroom removals and office discipline referrals
4. Embed Project Lead the Way for all students K-5 through Cultural Arts

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: After review of data and the trends analyzed during the impact review, instructional practice will focus on standards based instruction with tasks aligned to the rigor of the standard through weekly collaborative planning and bi-weekly data chats. Student learning is impacted with effective instruction through engaging and meaningful connection with the task.

Measurable Outcome: During 2019-2020 school year, collaborative planning was established based on the impact review/classroom observation data - 90% (23/25 classroom teachers) of classroom teachers show evidence of collaboratively planning.
For the 2020-2021 school year, 100% of classrooms will show evidence of collaborative planning and 85% of students will master standards based on iReady, unit assessment, and DIBELS/FLKRS testing.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Rachel Finnegan (rachel.finnegan@indianriverschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Based on Richard DuFour's PLC research and the four guiding questions, this strategy empowers teachers to make effective decisions regarding instruction to meet the individual needs of the students.
<https://www.dps61.org/domain/1578>

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The four questions will guide the collaborative planning to plan for standards-based instruction with tasks aligned to the rigor of the standard. Data-driven action planning will occur during each collaborative planning session.

- Evidence-based Strategy:**
1. What do we want all students to know and be able to do?
 2. How will we know if they learn it?
 3. How will we respond when some students do not learn?
 4. How will we extend the learning for students who are already proficient?

Action Steps to Implement

Conduct collaborative planning and coaching cycles to improve classroom instruction with administration

Person Responsible Jennifer Gabbard (jennifer.gabbard@indianriverschoos.org)

Monitor upload of grade level plans weekly in Canvas courses by grade chairs or grade level representative

Person Responsible Susan Del Tufo (susan.deltufo@indianriverschools.org)

Monitor for implementation of collaborative planning session through classroom observations and instructional impact reviews.

Person Responsible Rachel Finnegan (rachel.finnegan@indianriverschools.org)

Provide additional feedback and training during collaborative planning session and school-based professional development sessions

Person Responsible Rachel Finnegan (rachel.finnegan@indianriverschools.org)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Social emotional learning will create a safe and caring learning environment. Students engaged in social emotional learning develop relationships with their peers and teachers. The relationships allow students to focus on learning and support one another by caring and being kind members of the school community. Data reviewed focused on classroom incident reports, office discipline referrals (ODRs), and professional development offered for the 2019-2020 school year on Sanford Harmony and FOCUS reporting for ODRs and CIRs.

Measurable Outcome: Reduce office discipline referrals (ODRs) by 25%.
2019-2020 - 103 ODRs
2020-2021 - 75 ODRs or less

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Susan Del Tufo (susan.deltufo@indianriverschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Sanford Harmony will be used in all classrooms to support social emotional learning. <https://www.sanfordharmony.org/research/>

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Sanford Harmony provides lessons on character traits and SEL. The class meetings, part of Sanford Harmony, will help instill a sense of community for all students. Students will be participating and engaging in a daily and weekly activities to promote a safe and caring learning environment.

Action Steps to Implement

Train, coach, and model Sanford Harmony with new teachers

Person Responsible: Adrienne Polverari (adrienne.polverari@indianriverschools.org)

Train teachers and staff on 2020-2021 Student Code of Conduct, including classroom management plan, classroom interventions for level one and level two behaviors, and inputting classroom incident reports (CIRs) on FOCUS

Person Responsible: Rachel Finnegan (rachel.finnegan@indianriverschools.org)

Implement Sanford Harmony in the classroom daily with fidelity

Person Responsible: Susan Del Tufo (susan.deltufo@indianriverschools.org)

Conduct quarterly discipline data reviews on CIRs and provide support to classroom teachers who have higher instances of CIRs

Person Responsible: Rachel Finnegan (rachel.finnegan@indianriverschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

As a STEAM School of Enrichment, all teachers will be enriching the curriculum with real-world application through science standards and Project Lead the Way. In addition, two teacher leaders are training the Cultural Arts teachers to target all students in real-world problem-solving application through Project Lead the Way. Based on science unit assessment scores from 19-20, science standards will be taught in cultural arts as well as in grade level classrooms through Project Lead the Way modules and STEAM units.

Measurable Outcome:

During the first semester, Cultural Arts teachers will complete two modules with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth.
Unit assessment scores in grades third, fourth and fifth will increase by 10% between each assessment

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Susan Del Tufo (susan.deltufo@indianriverschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Project Lead the Way will be infused to the Cultural Arts curriculum every fifth day.
<https://www.pltw.org/our-programs/pltw-launch>

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Project Lead the Way engages students in hands-on activities in computer science, engineering, and biomedical science in order to promote creative, critical, and collaborative problem solving.

Action Steps to Implement

Train Cultural Arts teachers during pre-planning weeks and during one of the first school-based professional development days on Project Lead the Way

Person Responsible

Dianne Jellie (dianne.jellie@indianriverschools.org)

Collaboratively plan the Project Lead the Way modules with Cultural Arts teachers (teacher leaders will plan with cultural arts department)

Person Responsible

Adrienne Polverari (adrienne.polverari@indianriverschools.org)

Follow a schedule to allow for the fifth day of instruction to be Project Lead the Way class within Cultural Arts

Person Responsible

Adrienne Polverari (adrienne.polverari@indianriverschools.org)

Monitor for implementation of Project Lead the Way modules on fifth day of Cultural Arts classes and completion of modules

Person Responsible

Rachel Finnegan (rachel.finnegan@indianriverschools.org)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: After review of lowest quartile data and the African American Achievement Plan (AAA), instructional practice will target math deficits through extended learning opportunities, support facilitation, and Response to Intervention (RTI). Student learning is impacted with effective small group instruction utilizing research-based interventions.

Measurable Outcome: We will begin to reduce the achievement gap among our African American students and students with disabilities (SWDs) by 10%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Susan Del Tufo (susan.deltufo@indianriverschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Small group instruction and research based intervention materials will be implemented to increase student achievement for African American students and SWDs. We will use the following research based intervention materials: iReady toolbox, Reflex Math, Do the Math, and Thinking Maps.

<https://www.curriculumassociates.com/research-and-efficacy/i-ready-evidence-impact>

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Research based interventions and small group instruction will provide the remediation needed to reduce the achievement gap of our African American students and SWDs. Teachers will be trained and supported by administration and resource specialist to better identify and serve students.

Action Steps to Implement

Train teachers on generating student data notebooks to fully examine data
Identify needs of students based on the African American Achievement Plan and Individualized Education Plan goals and accommodations of students.

Person Responsible Rachel Finnegan (rachel.finnegan@indianriverschools.org)

Provide math intervention during Response to Intervention for students who only need math intervention

Person Responsible Diana O'Connor (diana.o'connor@indianriverschools.org)

Monitor with fidelity co-teaching of support facilitators in the general education classroom

Person Responsible Susan Del Tufo (susan.deltufo@indianriverschools.org)

Advertise and offer extended learning opportunities before and after school by invitation only to African American students and SWDs first

Person Responsible Rachel Finnegan (rachel.finnegan@indianriverschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

All areas of focus relate directly to school-wide improvement priorities. Focuses and priorities are outlined in the teacher and staff handbook. All teachers were trained on the priorities and focus areas during the pre-planning weeks. Priorities and areas of focus will be discussed and reviewed during learning opportunity meetings bi-weekly during PLCs and during faculty meetings (Ride and Surf Opportunities at BES).

The school leadership will be training all teachers on learning goals/targets and tasks aligned to the rigor of the standard through collaborative planning and utilizing the strategies and school-wide initiatives the school team has been training on. These initiatives include Sanford Harmony, Thinking Maps, and Kagan.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

For the 2020-2021 school year, our entire school team is "Riding the WAVE of Success" by being warm-hearted, active and attentive, vigilant, and enthusiastic for learning as a STEAM School of Enrichment. During the 2019-2020 school year, this idea was shared by the school principal with the school team, School Advisory Council, and PTA. The PTA used the theme as the slogan for the annual Christmas Parade - winning "BEST of Schools" at the conclusion of the parade. The School Advisory Council learned about the upcoming school-wide expectations and what a STEAM School of Enrichment means. Parents and families had the opportunity to attend principal-parent meetings at Beachland Elementary or in the community at Gifford Youth Achievement Center to learn about upcoming ideas, voice concerns, and discuss current happenings.

In addition weekly ConnectEd calls are consistently sent every Sunday at 6:00p and posted shortly after on Facebook, Twitter, and our school website.

Weekly newsletters are published once a week and shared on all social media platforms as well.

Parents and community members are always encouraged to voice concerns and ideas. Business partners are involved with the donation of supplies, time, and incentives for our students.

In addition to the above actions, Beachland Elementary School has created a Focus Area in Section III which addresses steps to improve Positive Culture and Climate in greater depth than required in this section, please reference that section of the plan for this information.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction				\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				\$385.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
		120-Classroom Teachers	0061 - Beachland Elementary School			\$385.00
			<i>Notes: Kids at HOPE manuals for all teachers and staff - All teachers will be trained on incorporating Kids at HOPE, a belief system for everyone to believe, "All children are capable of success, no exceptions!"</i>			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science				\$950.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0061 - Beachland Elementary School	Other		\$950.00
			<i>Notes: In order to be a Project Lead the Way School, an annual fee must be paid. This fee allows for use of the Project Lead the Way logo, student and teacher access to the website, video/conference sessions with the regional representative, and access to standards, curriculum, and lesson planning.</i>			
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$0.00
Total:					\$1,335.00	