

St. Johns County School District

# Alice B. Landrum Middle School



## 2022-23 Schoolwide 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>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Alice B. Landrum Middle School

230 LANDRUM LN, Ponte Vedra Beach, FL 32082

www.lms.stjohns.k12.fl.us

## Demographics

**Principal: Guy Harris**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	4%
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: A (72%) 2018-19: A (78%) 2017-18: A (74%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	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 St. Johns 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.

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

## 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)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	4%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	23%

### School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	A		A	A

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the St. Johns County School Board.

### 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

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Harris, Guy	Principal	To serve as the instructional leader to Landrum Middle School. Works to create a school culture and environment conducive to teacher efficacy, professional collaboration, and student growth and achievement. Mr. Harris serves as a conduit between District Office and the local school community. Mr. Harris also serves as the instructional leaders for the Landrum School Community.
McCabe, Moira	Assistant Principal	To provide instructional support to the faculty and staff, build healthy relationships with students, and effectively communicate with our parents. Mrs. McCabe also serves as a resources to parents, teachers and students, while working to ensure student growth and achievement. Mrs. McCabe also serves as Landrum's testing coordinator.
Hodges, Matt	Assistant Principal	To provide instructional support to the faculty and staff, build healthy relationships with students, and effectively communicate with our parents. Mrs. McCabe also serves as a resources to parents, teachers and students, while working to ensure student growth and achievement. Mr. Hodges also serves as Landrum's LEA.

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2021, Guy Harris

**Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

4

**Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

22

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

56

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

1,133

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

8

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

10

### Demographic Data

### Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	424	379	434	0	0	0	0	1237
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	40	80	0	0	0	0	165
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	45	56	0	0	0	0	133
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	13	21	0	0	0	0	46
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	28	32	0	0	0	0	70
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	26	40	0	0	0	0	84

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



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

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

Wednesday 8/10/2022

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	339	398	367	0	0	0	0	1104
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	52	51	0	0	0	0	136
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	30	21	0	0	0	0	80
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	29	7	0	0	0	0	49
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	16	11	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	0	17	24	13	0	0	0	0	54

**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	8	13	9	0	0	0	0	30
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	339	398	367	0	0	0	0	1104
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	52	51	0	0	0	0	136
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	30	21	0	0	0	0	80
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	29	7	0	0	0	0	49
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	16	11	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	0	17	24	13	0	0	0	0	54

#### 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	8	13	9	0	0	0	0	30
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

### School Data Review

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

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	79%	67%	50%				83%	68%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	60%						66%	59%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	51%						60%	48%	47%
Math Achievement	86%	37%	36%				93%	77%	58%
Math Learning Gains	75%						84%	68%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	64%						82%	60%	51%
Science Achievement	77%	75%	53%				82%	70%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	93%	65%	58%				97%	88%	72%

**Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments**

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	85%	74%	11%	54%	31%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	85%	72%	13%	52%	33%
Cohort Comparison		-85%				
08	2022					
	2019	79%	71%	8%	56%	23%
Cohort Comparison		-85%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	88%	74%	14%	55%	33%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	95%	80%	15%	54%	41%
Cohort Comparison		-88%				
08	2022					
	2019	94%	78%	16%	46%	48%
Cohort Comparison		-95%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	82%	72%	10%	48%	34%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	0%	87%	-87%	67%	-67%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	98%	90%	8%	71%	27%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	99%	79%	20%	61%	38%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	100%	81%	19%	57%	43%

### Subgroup Data Review

2022 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	34	37	30	52	63	54	34	72	26		
ELL	62	52	62	69	83	67		73			
ASN	87	77	75	92	85	77	86	100	75		
BLK	64	50		68	67	70		85			
HSP	67	44	36	71	71	69	66	88	50		
MUL	74	65	60	81	76	53	76	94	79		
WHT	81	60	51	88	75	62	78	94	66		
FRL	64	50	27	62	73	74	45	100			
2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	42	46	38	54	55	51	48	73	27		
ELL	55	72	67	71	74	70					

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
ASN	82	83	70	94	86		85	100	90		
BLK	60	82		60	45						
HSP	75	68	50	82	67	64	84	95	59		
MUL	69	61	45	83	70		83	89	56		
WHT	80	64	48	88	77	69	79	92	73		
FRL	70	67	67	70	62	70					
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	43	54	47	61	66	64	31	85	16		
ELL		60			70						
ASN	87	78		98	95		100	100	87		
BLK	63	43		81	86						
HSP	78	60	57	88	74	66	72	95	50		
MUL	91	72		90	88			92			
WHT	83	67	61	94	84	83	83	98	53		
FRL	54	51	41	81	73	65	59	87	13		

### ESSA Data Review

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	72
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	652
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	45
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	67
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	84
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	67
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	62
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	73
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial 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	73
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	62
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

#### What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Based upon recent data, it appears that SWD disabilities continue to lag behind in ELA achievement (34), ELA learning gains (37), ELA learning gains of L25% (30), Math achievement (52), Math learning gains (63), Math learning gains of L25%, Science achievement (34), Social Studies achievement (72), and MS acceleration )26) in comparison to the previous school year.

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

Data reflects that the greatest need for improvement is to learning gains for Lowest 25% in ELA and Math.

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

A lack of comprehensive planning and organization related to our intensive reading and intensive math courses. In addition, our VE teachers allocated to provide support facilitation to our mainstreamed ESE population was insufficient and lacking clarity of purpose. We've redesigned both IR and IM programming to provide more targeted instruction, clarity of purpose, as well as new teacher personnel.

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

Those groups/subgroups of students that historically perform well at Landrum continued to meet expectations. No new categories showed marked or significant improvement.

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

Not applicable.

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

Landrum Middle will continue to refine the instructional practice of organizing students to interact with content, while maintaining a collective focus on professional pedagogical best practices.

**Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.**

One of the primary roles to be lead and facilitated by our new instructional literacy coach will be to develop professional development opportunities for instructional staff based upon the needs reflected within an analysis of recent student data in conjunction with PD interest shared by the faculty/staff.

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

We will continue to prioritize resources, scheduling, and support for our most vulnerable learners engaged in the intensive reading, intensive math, and Unique Skills Courses. We will also continue our efforts to promote and encourage an environment of collaborative professional educators committed to the PLC process.

**Areas of Focus**

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities 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 critical need from the data reviewed.**

ELA achievement for SWD fell from 43% to 34% between 2019-2022 . Math achievement for SWD fell from 61% to 52% between 2019-2022. Social Studies achievement for SWD fell from 85% to 72% between 2019-2022. ELA learning gains for SWD fell from 47% to 30% between 2019-2022. Math learning gains for SWD fell from 66% to 63% between 2019-2022.

**Measurable****Outcome:**

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

Landrum's goal is to increase student achievement in ELA, Math, and Social Studies by 3% over the 2022 school year data for students with disabilities. We will also increase learning gains for SWD in ELA and Math by 3% over the 2022 school data.

**Monitoring:**

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

We will monitor this area of focus by using data received from FAST and District created CSA's. More informal walkthroughs and school based common formative and summative assessments that include data analysis from each PLC.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Matt Hodges (matt.hodges@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

We will continue our focus on organizing students to interact with content. We will also encourage individual student data chats with SWD. We've increased the number of support facilitation instructors to support SWD in order to provide 4 days of support in ELA and Math, and two additional days of support in social studies and science. Code B students will receive reading interventions within our intensive reading or unique skills courses.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Consistent application of support facilitation held as best practice throughout the district. Direct phonics instruction according to Hatties visible learning has an effect size of .6 and repeated reading programs has an effect size of .67

**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.

PLC team will create common formative and summative assessments and review their data for each unit.

**Person Responsible** Matt Hodges (matt.hodges@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Master schedule is constructed to allow support facilitation teachers to provide explicit instruction on a four day per week basis.

**Person Responsible** Matt Hodges (matt.hodges@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities****Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

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

It is clear based upon the data that SWD are not showing learning gains desired. We also believe based upon the data that the instructional faculty has not truly identified the PLC process as a valuable tool that when implemented with fidelity will significantly improve learning outcomes for the greatest number of students at all learning levels.

**Measurable****Outcome:**

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

Our measurable school goal related to the instructional faculty re-engaging the PLC process would include PLC team members sharing and reviewing formative and summative student data weekly for the purpose of refining instruction to improve student outcomes. Instructional faculty will also use the PLC process to determine appropriate and consistent remediation/intervention practices that support student learning and success.

**Monitoring:**

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

The administrative team will make weekly visits to PLC team meetings that allow for observation of the process and reinforcement of PLC expectations. Our instructional literacy coach will provide regular coaching cycles to all instructional staff members designed to reinforce best practices as well as provide clarity within the PLC process.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Guy Harris (guy.harris@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Weekly PLC Team walkthroughs. Provide feedback to ensure fidelity to the process.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

The rationale for this evidence based strategy is to observe the PLC process in action.

**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.

PLC team members will provide evidence of their work and commitment to the process by submitting weekly meeting agendas and recorded evidence of student data used by the members.

**Person Responsible** Guy Harris (guy.harris@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

**#3. Transformational Leadership specifically relating to Leadership Development****Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

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

Landrum Middle has two new assistant principles serving faculty, staff, and students during the current school year. Both new assistant principles will require a small degree of coaching and development that will allow their specific skills and strengths to develop into school-wide assets. There are extremely capable and well qualified instructional leaders committed to student growth and achievement that I'd like to see have a significant impact on Landrum's school community.

**Measurable****Outcome:**

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

Student achievement and learning gain data for our lowest 25% should improve by 2% as a result of effective instructional leadership and support by both assistant principles.

**Monitoring:**

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

I will monitor the time commitment to this goal by the two new assistant principles supporting instruction and serving as a resource to the instructional staff.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Guy Harris (guy.harris@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Instructional leaders will spend time visiting classes informally and formally in order to provide meaningful feedback to the instructional staff.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

We must improve the quality, delivery, and focus of instructional practices in order to see improvements in student achievement and teacher efficacy.

**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.

Spend a considerable amount of time in classrooms.

**Person  
Responsible**

Guy Harris (guy.harris@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

**#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher efficacy and student growth****Area of Focus****Description****and Rationale:**

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

Positive school culture and environment set the conditions necessary for a full collective instructional focus on achievement for ALL students. Positive school culture and environment allows for collaborative professional practices designed to identify and target specific student learning gaps/deficiencies, then collectively develop instructional strategies designed for intervention and acceleration. Schoolwide data is essential for plan and program development, specifically data reflective of outcomes for SWD.

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

The school community will increase student performance data points by 2% for all students and student subgroups for every performance measurement.

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

Attention to student outcomes of teacher facilitated formative and summative assessment data will serve as the initial monitoring strategy. Student data reflected in the schoolwide common summative assessments administered throughout the year will serve as the secondary monitoring strategy.

**Person****responsible****for monitoring****outcome:**

Moira McCabe (moira.mccabe@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-****based****Strategy:****Describe the****evidence-****based strategy****being****implemented****for this Area of****Focus.**

Regular celebrations of student growth and achievement within the classrooms. We will provide professional development meaningful and relevant to the instructional needs of our classroom teachers. Organize social team building activities for the faculty and staff on a basis. Prioritize transparent and regular communication with faculty and staff to ensure that they are informed with pertinent and timely information necessary for them to perform with confidence and creativity. Regular classroom visits to observe instructional practices and levels of student engagement so that this activity/ administrative behavior becomes a part of the school culture and fabric.

**Rationale for****Evidence-****based****Strategy:****Explain the**

This strategy was identified because it empowers teachers and staff work in a safe space, confident in the leadership and transparency provided by the administrative team. According to Hattie's "Visible Learning", school climate and teacher expectations prove to have a significant and positive impact on student achievement.

**rationale for selecting this specific strategy.**

**Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

#### **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.

Landrum Middle, in collaboration with faculty & staff and parents will continue to promote a positive school climate/culture and high expectations for the entire school community. This will be done intentionally and deliberately with regular communication/conversations, relationship building, and professional development.

**Person**

**Responsible**

Moira McCabe (moira.mccabe@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

### **Positive Culture & Environment**

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

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

Landrum Middle School is uniquely positioned to build upon a well established positive school culture filled with high expectations for all. Each faculty & staff member is valued and appreciated for their contribution to the school community. We are intentional about recognizing their contributions and celebrating the school's success with the entire Landrum community. We not only celebrate the successes, but we also share the burden of working through the challenges/opportunities faced by the school community with compassion and sensitivity. We embrace the idea of being process focused and that we must continually strive toward student growth and achievement, professional development and teacher efficacy, and community engagement. As a school community, we recognize that the foundation of all healthy relationships is trust, respect, and communication modeled and shared generously by all stakeholders. We hope to be the best version of ourselves on a daily basis so that are students have the best possible opportunity for achievement and success.

Our collective school community focus on those best instructional practices (maintaining pedagogical expertise) that yield the greatest return/impact to student achievement and growth, will serve continue to serve as a pillar of Landrum's culture/environment. Really good focused teaching and learning must be

expected, developed, and sustained in order for the school community to enrich its culture and sustain the the type of environment where all stakeholders thrive.

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

The stakeholders are many and their roles are diverse although interwoven and connected at every level. The goal is to have parents, students, faculty & staff, and community businesses totally invested in the success of the school. All of these stakeholders sharing a vision and passion for the growth, achievement, and success of each student that Landrum serves is essential. This is accomplished over time, with clear and transparent communication that foster an atmosphere of trust and confidence among all stakeholders. Taking the time to invest in relationships with our stakeholders is the secret glue that binds the learning community together. Everyone shares in this responsibility, without any differentiation in level of significance.