

St. Johns County School District

Alice B. Landrum Middle School



2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	3
School Information	4
Needs Assessment	6
Planning for Improvement	9
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	11

Alice B. Landrum Middle School

230 LANDRUM LN, Ponte Vedra Beach, FL 32082

www.lms.stjohns.k12.fl.us

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2017-18 Title I School	2017-18 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	6%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	16%

School Grades History

Year	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15
Grade	A	A	A	A*

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Johns County School Board on 9/25/2018.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Alice B. Landrum Middle School is to prepare students for secondary study while developing learners' critical thinking abilities, encouraging student-centered learning, enhancing their interpersonal relationships and enriching their overall educational experience.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Alice B. Landrum Middle School will create an environment that fosters students of high character and individual academic excellence through authentic experiences.

The 4 C's: Caring, Collaboration, Communication and Critical Thinking

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title
Player, Ryan	Principal
White, Liza	School Counselor
Gates, Jesse	Assistant Principal
OConnell, Katherine	Assistant Principal
Curran, Bonnie	Instructional Coach
Wood, Amanda	Psychologist
Dean, Crystal	School Counselor
Dobbins, Stacey	School Counselor

Duties

Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making.

Principal -- Ryan L. Player (Facilitates Admin Team; Oversees roles and responsibilities of MTSS team). The principal ensures that all staff comply with the district-wide school site standards.

Assistant Principal -- Jesse Gates (LEA; Schoology; MTSS team member)

Assistant Principal-- Katie O'Connell (Oversees testing; Oversees Professional Development; MTSS team member)

Instructional Literacy Coach -- Bonnie Curran (Facilitates RtI process and MTSS team; Gathers from teachers MTSS progress monitoring student data; Provides Tier 1 universal student data)

Guidance Counselors -- Crystal Dean, Stacey Dobbins, & Liza White (Bring students to team's attention; Provide grades and attendance information; Gather teacher feedback on student behavior, academic performance, and other factors hindering academic performance; Monitor parent contact documentation log; MTSS team members)

School Psychologist -- Amanda Wood (Records notes in database during meetings; Sends follow-up email after meetings with "to-do" list for team members)

Early Warning Systems

Year 2017-18

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	47	42	0	0	0	0	108
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	16	29	0	0	0	0	49
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	12	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	20	36	0	0	0	0	70

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	19	0	0	0	0	35	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	5
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected

Wednesday 6/20/2018

Year 2016-17 - 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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	22	33	0	0	0	0	78
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	21	32	0	0	0	0	55
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	19	18	0	0	0	0	58

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	12	0	0	0	0	30	

Year 2016-17 - 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	22	33	0	0	0	0	78	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	21	32	0	0	0	0	55	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4	0	0	0	0	19	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	19	18	0	0	0	0	58	

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	12	0	0	0	0	30	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**Assessment & Analysis**

Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?

The lowest performance for state assessments was 7th grade ELA at 77% proficient. There is no evidence of a school trend for 7th grade ELA, however, this cohort is demonstrating lower proficiency for consecutive years.

District Final Assessments had two areas of low performance in World History District with 55% average (District Average 58%) and Comprehensive Science 2 with 57% average (District Average 60%). There is no evidence of a trend as the scores in World History and Science were higher than the previous year.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

The greatest decline was evident in 7th grade ELA going from a 85% in 2017 to 77% in 2018, 7th grade Math decreasing from 93% in 2017 to 88% in 2018 and the 8th grade Science results declined from 87% in 2017 to 83% in 2018.

Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?

There is no evidence of a negative gap in comparison to state averages. School data components are all a minimum of 23% higher than state averages.

Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?

The assessment data showing the greatest improvement was 6th grade Math FSA rising from 82% in 2017 to 87% in 2018. There is no indication of a trend as this was a new cohort from feeder elementary and this component has not been identified as an area of significant growth for consecutive years.

Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area.

The use of common assessments, course level PLCs, iReady assessments, data based decisions and a high achieving incoming cohort led to improvement in student performance.

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	2018			2017		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	82%	69%	53%	83%	70%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	63%	57%	54%	64%	61%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	55%	45%	47%	57%	51%	45%
Math Achievement	91%	76%	58%	91%	76%	55%
Math Learning Gains	79%	66%	57%	82%	68%	55%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	73%	58%	51%	76%	59%	47%
Science Achievement	84%	73%	52%	90%	74%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	94%	87%	72%	98%	88%	67%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
Attendance below 90 percent	19 (23)	47 (22)	42 (33)	108 (78)
One or more suspensions	4 (2)	16 (21)	29 (32)	49 (55)
Course failure in ELA or Math	2 (5)	7 (10)	12 (4)	21 (19)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	14 (21)	20 (19)	36 (18)	70 (58)

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
06	2018	82%	71%	11%	52%	30%
	2017	82%	73%	9%	52%	30%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2018	77%	70%	7%	51%	26%
	2017	85%	74%	11%	52%	33%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
08	2018	85%	76%	9%	58%	27%
	2017	85%	74%	11%	55%	30%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2018	87%	73%	14%	52%	35%
	2017	82%	73%	9%	51%	31%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2018	88%	80%	8%	54%	34%
	2017	93%	80%	13%	53%	40%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
08	2018	94%	73%	21%	45%	49%
	2017	92%	75%	17%	46%	46%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2018	83%	75%	8%	50%	33%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	0%	84%	-84%	65%	-65%
2017					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	94%	89%	5%	71%	23%
2017	96%	90%	6%	69%	27%
Compare		-2%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					
2017					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	100%	79%	21%	62%	38%
2017	100%	78%	22%	60%	40%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
Compare		0%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	100%	77%	23%	56%	44%
2017	100%	78%	22%	53%	47%
Compare		0%			

Subgroup Data

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	41	50	49	61	63	67	28	67	6		
ASN	91	67		93	83		71	100	87		
BLK	67	67		72	67						
HSP	81	62	67	88	74	65	82	89	47		
MUL	95	80		100	80						
WHT	82	62	54	91	79	74	85	94	48		
FRL	62	55	41	82	75	71	65	76	27		
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	41	39	33	57	68	65	63	84	25		
ASN	93	78		93	83		100	93	75		
BLK	91			91							
HSP	85	71	71	87	81	71	88	91	45		
MUL	79	57		86	86						
WHT	84	68	59	91	82	78	86	97	56		
FRL	62	51	36	78	73	73	77	86	38		

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

Areas of Focus:

Activity #1	
Title	Course and Grade Level PLCs
Rationale	Building and sustaining a collaborative culture with a shared mission to move our practice forward and impact student learning to achieve greater results. Process will focus on individual learners with a goal of achieving learning gains at each level.
Intended Outcome	Use of common formative assessments and increased attention on effective strategies to improve performance of all students. The creation of formative assessments will support pacing and delivery of curriculum in all classrooms.
Point Person	Katherine OConnell (katherine.oconnell@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Action Step	
Description	Twenty five hours of collaborative team planning is incorporated into the master calendar to allow teams to use their data to inform instruction. Each PLC cycle will analyze standards based data from a common formative or summative assessment, identify struggling students, and plan for next steps in enrichment or remediation.
Person Responsible	Katherine OConnell (katherine.oconnell@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Artifacts and assessments will be provided to administration and student progress will be tracked across grades to identify areas for support.
Person Responsible	Katherine OConnell (katherine.oconnell@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Activity #2	
Title	Mentoring of students in lowest quartile for math & ELA
Rationale	To inform and support students to demonstrate achievement in math and ELA. Students will be informed of their status in the lowest quartile, chart their data from assessments in the previous year, set goals for each quarter, and reflect on their growth.
Intended Outcome	Improved learning gains for lowest quartile in math and reading. Increase total points earned for school grade.
Point Person	Ryan Player (ryan.player@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Action Step	
Description	Identified 166 students who are in the lowest quartile for math and ELA. Pull FSA and iReady reports for students and meet with them in small groups. Students will use reports to complete data chat form and set goals for improvement. Students will be assigned to administrator, dean and counselor for ongoing progress monitoring. Students will take mid-year iReady assessment to determine progress and next steps prior to FSA in May.
Person Responsible	Ryan Player (ryan.player@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Data Chat tracking sheets and reflections will be used throughout the year to monitor progress. Quarterly meetings with written reflections will be documented.
Person Responsible	Ryan Player (ryan.player@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Activity #3	
Title	Learning Gains in Math & ELA
Rationale	To improve student performance and increase school grade points.
Intended Outcome	Majority of students will demonstrate gains in ELA and Math. Improve gains in ELA by 7% from 63% to 70%. Improve gains in Math by 4% from 79% to 83%.
Point Person	Bonnie Curran (bonnie.curran@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Action Step	
Description	Providing ongoing opportunities to assess students and track their progress in Math and ELA. Students will self monitor and faculty will reflect and provide data on formative and summative assessments for each of their 25 scheduled PLCs. The use of six common formative assessments and 3 common summative each quarter will support an approach to school wide data and focus on all students making gains.
Person Responsible	Bonnie Curran (bonnie.curran@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	iReady assessments and the use of iReady Toolbox to track progress and set goals for growth. Reports will be shared with teachers in ELA and Math. Cross -curricular plans to support school wide ELA goal have been provided and all faculty has written a Deliberate Growth Plan to support closing the achievement gap. Each teacher will provide data and reflections on their support of school goal.
Person Responsible	Bonnie Curran (bonnie.curran@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Activity #4	
Title	Increased opportunity for Middle School Acceleration
Rationale	Identify and offer opportunities for achievement in high school courses, accelerated courses, certification courses. Exposure and participation in advanced courses will positively impact student performance.
Intended Outcome	Increase enrollment for Algebra I Honors and research courses with an industry certification.
Point Person	Ryan Player (ryan.player@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Action Step	
Description	Define guidelines for teachers to make recommendations for courses for the 2019-20 school year. Volunteer to be on district committee to define the middle school math progression.
Person Responsible	Ryan Player (ryan.player@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Monitored through master schedule, registration, enrollment and course grades.
Person Responsible	Stacey Dobbins (stacey.dobbins@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Part V: Budget

Total:	\$0.00
--------	--------