

School District of Indian River County

# Beachland Elementary School



## 2019-20 School Improvement Plan

---

**Table of Contents**

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>16</b>

# Beachland Elementary School

3350 INDIAN RIVER DR E, Vero Beach, FL 32963

www.indianriverschools.org

## Demographics

**Principal: Rachel Finnegan**

Start Date for this Principal: 8/29/2019

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	54%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students
<b>School Grade</b>	2018-19: A
<b>School Grades History</b>	2017-18: C 2016-17: A 2015-16: B 2014-15: A 2013-14: A
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Diane Leinenbach</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	NOT IN DA

ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

### 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](http://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**

To challenge every student to reach their highest potential in a safe and caring environment

#### **Provide the school's vision statement**

Our vision is to enable every child develop their full potential while becoming innovative and self-directed lifelong learners empowering all to reach their greatest academic, emotional, social, and physical potential. We will accomplish this through a commitment to excellence and collaboration among parents, staff, students and the community.

### School Leadership Team

#### **Membership**

Identify the name, email address and position title 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 school environment
Del Tufo, Susan	Assistant Principal	InInstructional leadership, analysis of needs and strengths of curriculum and instructional, monitor student progress, support implementation of effective teaching strategies, and ensure a safe school environment.structional leadership, analysis of needs and strengths of curriculum and instructional, monitor student progress, support implementation of effective teaching strategies, and ensure a safe school environment.
Bishop, Lisa	Teacher, K-12	Kindergarten Grade Teacher, Grade Level Chair
Stawara, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	First Grade Teacher, Grade Level Chair
Durwin, Brenda	Teacher, K-12	Second Grade Teacher, Grade Level Chair
Brescia, Megan	Teacher, K-12	Fourth Grade Teacher, Grade Level Chair
Polverari, Adrianne	Instructional Media	Media Center Specialist, Grade Level Chair
Masterson, Jena	Teacher, K-12	Third grade teacher, Grade Level Chair
Crisafulli, Samantha	Teacher, K-12	Fifth grade teacher, Grade Level Chair

## 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	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	

**FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)**

39

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Sunday 8/18/2019

**Prior Year - As Reported****The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
Attendance below 90 percent														
One or more suspensions														
Course failure in ELA or Math														
Level 1 on statewide assessment														

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
Students with two or more indicators														

**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	
Attendance below 90 percent	15	15	9	13	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	20	13	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59

**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	4	13	20	15	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75

## 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%	55%	57%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	74%	57%	58%	47%	55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	68%	54%	53%	31%	49%	48%
Math Achievement	73%	63%	63%	62%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains	81%	60%	62%	49%	61%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	58%	48%	51%	34%	52%	47%
Science Achievement	71%	54%	53%	59%	55%	55%

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	80 (0)	79 (0)	84 (0)	78 (0)	84 (0)	81 (0)	486 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ( )	1 ( )	11 ( )	7 ( )	10 ( )	10 ( )	39 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ( )	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)
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)	0 (0)	26 (0)	13 (0)	10 (0)	49 (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.

NOTE: 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
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%



ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
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%
	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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
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				

### 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**

Beachland achieved gains in all academic areas, with the exception of math achievement in third grade. 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**

The only achievement level which declined was third grade mathematics. Since efforts were spent focused on literacy, response to intervention and the Moon Shot Academy were used to strengthen ELA achievement. A focus on math instruction will occur for the 2019-2020 school year.

**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 Elementary scored above the state in every academic area. Factors contributing to this were the work done for English Language Arts (ELA). Students received intensive reading instruction in all grade levels. Students also had the opportunity for after school Moon Shot Academy, which focused on literacy. All other areas of academics increased significantly.

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

All areas showed strong areas of growth. Beachland 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? (see Guidance tab for additional information)**

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.

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

1. Reducing gap in subcategories, specifically Black and Hispanic students
2. Increase math achievement in grades 3-5
3. Math interventions for kindergarten through fifth grade to meet the needs of the bottom quartile

**Part III: Planning for Improvement**

**Areas of Focus:****#1**

<b>Title</b>	Higher order thinking skills to promote learning for all students
<b>Rationale</b>	Students who are engaged in lessons which promote vocabulary development and higher order thinking skills demonstrate increased levels of achievement in ELA, Math and Science
<b>State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	85% of the third to fifth grade students will make learning gains in ELA, based on the 2020 FSA 85% of the third to fifth grade students will make learning gains in Math, based on the 2020 FSA 80% of the fifth grade students will achieve a Level 3 or higher on the Science FSA 2020 100% of the students will reach their learning goals on the Math and Reading iReady assessments from Fall 2019 to Spring 2020
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Jennifer Gabbard (jennifer.gabbard@indianriverschoos.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Sanford Harmony Social-Emotional Learning Strategies Thinking Maps infused with vocabulary Kagan Cooperative Learning  Classroom walk throughs support the use of the research-based strategies to promote learning for all students.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Non-evaluative feedback forms will be used to gain feedback about what is occurring in the classroom and data trends will be analyzed. Instructional support will be provided by the district's professional development department to work on next steps for Kagan Strategies and Sanford Harmony
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	1. Professional development on student-led discussion in preplanning 2. Follow up sessions to support implementation in the classroom, including video model lessons 3. Professional development by literacy coach and interventionist 4. Professional Learning Communities are implemented to support data disaggregation, RtI planning, and Tier 1 Instruction
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Jennifer Gabbard (jennifer.gabbard@indianriverschoos.org)

#2	
<b>Title</b>	Teachers will work in collaborative teams to plan quality lessons and assessments
<b>Rationale</b>	The professional learning community process engages teachers in data analysis, determining the needs of the students or groups of students, and how to meet those particular needs.
<b>State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	<p>85% of the third to fifth grade students will make learning gains in ELA, based on the 2020 FSA</p> <p>85% of the third to fifth grade students will make learning gains in Math, based on the 2020 FSA</p> <p>80% of the fifth grade students will achieve a Level 3 or higher on the Science FSA 2020</p> <p>100% of the students will reach their learning goals on the Math and Reading iReady assessments from Fall 2019 to Spring 2020</p>
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Susan Del Tufo (susan.deltufo@indianriverschools.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Professional Learning Communities will be continued and strengthened as a method to examine data and develop quality lessons and assessments. Data chats will be conducted monthly.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Based on Richard DuFour's PLC research, this strategy empowers teachers to make effective decisions regarding instruction to meet the individual needs of the students.
Action Step	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Review process for Professional Learning Communities</li> <li>2. Teachers, coaches, and intervention teachers work in teams to examine data</li> <li>3. Teachers meet regularly (twice a month) to break down diagnostic, formative and summative assessments</li> <li>4. Teachers and coaches collaborate to develop RtI instruction designed to meet individual needs</li> <li>5. Teachers identify ways to challenge all students</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Susan Del Tufo (susan.deltufo@indianriverschools.org)

#3	
<b>Title</b>	Social Emotional Learning will create a safe, caring learning environment
<b>Rationale</b>	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.
<b>State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Classroom disruptions will be reduced by 25% in kindergarten through fifth grade as determined by the office discipline referrals. 2018-2019 ODRs - 47 referrals including transportation, 42 referrals - referrals would go down to 30-32 2018-2019 ODRs and CIRs (Classroom Incident Report) - 107 classroom ODRs and CIRs
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Susan Del Tufo (susan.deltufo@indianriverschools.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Sanford Harmony will be used in all classrooms to support SEL Kagan strategies will be implemented in all classrooms
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Sanford Harmony provides lessons on character traits in SEL. The class meetings, part of Sanford Harmony, will help instill a sense of community for all students. Students will be participating in a daily "Meet-up," a weekly buddy with daily "buddy-ups" and weekly activities on a particular topic.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Professional development on SEL Sanford Harmony program (District personnel will be working with Behavior intervention specialist and administration to conduct in-class modeling and work on next steps for Sanford Inspire)</li> <li>2. Implement Sanford Harmony in the classroom</li> <li>3. Create Positive Learning Environment Team to address school-wide needs in PBIS, student management, and school culture</li> <li>4. Professional Learning Communities (PLC) and leadership team develops school goals and strategies to improve school culture</li> <li>5. Documentation of classroom incident reports on FOCUS to monitor classroom interventions for level 1 and level 2 behaviors</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Rachel Finnegan (rachel.serra@indianriverschools.org)

#### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

**After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information)**

## Part IV: Title I Requirements

**Additional Title I Requirements**

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

**Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students**

N/

**PFEP Link**

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

**Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services**

N/A

**Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another**

N/A

**Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact**

N/A

**Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations**

N/A

## Part V: Budget

1	III.A	Areas of Focus: Higher order thinking skills to promote learning for all students				\$2,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			0061 - Beachland Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$2,000.00



			<i>Notes: Funds were approved in 2018-19 school year for Dr. Larry Chew, consultant.</i>
<b>2</b>	<b>III.A</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Teachers will work in collaborative teams to plan quality lessons and assessments</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>III.A</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Social Emotional Learning will create a safe, caring learning environment</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$2,000.00</b>