Alice B. Landrum Middle School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Alice B. Landrum Middle School

230 LANDRUM LN, Ponte Vedra Beach, FL 32082

www.lms.stjohns.k12.fl.us

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

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

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

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

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

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

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

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Alice B. Landrum Middle School is to prepare students for high school by developing the learners' critical thinking capacity, strengthening the literacy skills of all learners, encouraging student agency, and providing opportunities for students to build healthy interpersonal character.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Landrum Middle School will forever honor its rich academic traditions and history of student achievement, as we set a course for the future success of all students.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Harris, Guy	Principal	To provide stewardship, leadership, and vision for the overall growth, academic achievement and success of all learners.
Hodges, Matt	Assistant Principal	To provide support to and for the schools' mission and vision.
McCabe, Moira	Assistant Principal	To provide support to and for the school's mission and vision.

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

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

Landrum Middle School engages its SAC and PTO on a monthly basis to collaborate on ideas and opportunities to improve outcomes for the learning community. Our monthly agendas will reflect the school's priorities and our plans for ongoing improvement. Monthly faculty/departmental meetings provide an opportunity to share and engage with instructional stakeholders and support staff on those priorities and ideas developed with community stakeholders. Our leadership team provides a platform to the student council to ensure that the student leadership organization's values are reflected within the leadership priorities.

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

Our leadership team will facilitate an ESSA data discussion with members of the SAC, PTO, and Student Council on September 21, 2023, to increase awareness of the opportunities presented within our school data analysis. Our goal is to increase transparency as well as provide a rationale for our academic/ learning areas of focus throughout the school year. Monthly updates throughout the school year will be provided regarding our processes implemented to ensure success for all students, particularly those identified as ESSA subgroups. Our team will encourage and support the instructional staff's efforts to maintain expertise in content and pedagogy as our primary tool to reduce learning gaps and increase teacher efficacy. Collectively our school community will work deliberately to promote a school culture and environment that all students feel a sense of belonging, while we work to foster agency among all learners.

Demographic Data	
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	23%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	4%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	63	55	143
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	47	45	116
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	10	25
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	10	25
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	27	33	77
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	27	33	77
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	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 that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	27	28	68

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

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	40	80	165
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	45	56	133
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	13	21	46
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	28	32	70
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	40	80	165
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	45	56	133
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	13	21	46
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	28	32	70
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	80	71	49	79	67	50	79		
ELA Learning Gains				60			65		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				51			50		
Math Achievement*	91	79	56	86	37	36	87		
Math Learning Gains				75			76		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				64			67		
Science Achievement*	79	73	49	77	75	53	79		
Social Studies Achievement*	94	87	68	93	65	58	93		
Middle School Acceleration	71	68	73	67	51	49	73		
Graduation Rate					70	49			
College and Career Acceleration					90	70			
ELP Progress		49	40		71	76			

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

See Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings.

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	83
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	415
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	72
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	652
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	47			
ELL	79			
AMI				
ASN	90			
BLK	67			
HSP	72			
MUL	80			
PAC				
WHT	84			
FRL	74			

	2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY			
ESSA Subgroup	**Federal Percent of Points Index**	**Subgroup Below 41%**	**Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%**	**Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%**
SWD	45			
ELL	67			
AMI				
ASN	84			
BLK	67			
HSP	62			
MUL	73			
PAC				
WHT	73			
FRL	62			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

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

	2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	**ELA Ach.**	**ELA LG**	**ELA LG L25%**	**Math Ach.**	**Math LG**	**Math LG L25%**	**Sci Ach.**	**SS Ach.**	**MS Accel.**	**Grad Rate 2021-22**	**C & C Accel 2021-22**	**ELP Progress**
All Students	80			91			79	94	71			
SWD	40			67			31		48		4	
ELL	64			93							2	
AMI												
ASN	90			95			92		84		4	
BLK	62			73			67				3	
HSP	75			82			71		59		4	
MUL	81			80			79		81		4	
PAC												
WHT	80			93			80	95	70		5	
FRL	73			78			71				3	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	79	60	51	86	75	64	77	93	67			
SWD	34	37	30	52	63	54	34	72	26			
ELL	62	52	62	69	83	67		73				
AMI												
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			
PAC												
WHT	81	60	51	88	75	62	78	94	66			
FRL	64	50	27	62	73	74	45	100				

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	79	65	50	87	76	67	79	93	73			
SWD	42	46	38	54	55	51	48	73	27			
ELL	55	72	67	71	74	70						
AMI												
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			
PAC												
WHT	80	64	48	88	77	69	79	92	73			
FRL	70	67	67	70	62	70						

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.
The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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

ELA

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	78%	69%	9%	47%	31%
08	2023 - Spring	73%	69%	4%	47%	26%
06	2023 - Spring	79%	70%	9%	47%	32%

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	86%	81%	5%	54%	32%
07	2023 - Spring	79%	66%	13%	48%	31%
08	2023 - Spring	95%	81%	14%	55%	40%

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	79%	71%	8%	44%	35%

ALGEBRA

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	78%	22%	50%	50%

GEOMETRY

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	98%	67%	31%	48%	50%

BIOLOGY

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	86%	*	63%	*

CIVICS

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	91%	85%	6%	66%	25%

III. Planning for Improvement

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

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

Landrum's SWD showed the lowest performance last year. We believe that there are two primary factors responsible for the performance of our SWD. First, the needs of this subgroup have not been adequately and accurately assessed by the classroom teachers. Second, our instructional faculty has to become more efficient and effective in implementing evidence based differentiated instructional strategies in a timely manner with this subgroup of students. Finally, we must collectively sustain and cultivate a learning environment that is equipped and eager to meet the learning needs of all students.

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

The learning gains for our students with disabilities showed the greatest decline. In the 2021 school year, 56% of our students with disabilities showed learning gains. In the 2022 school year, 37% of our students with disabilities demonstrated gains in their learning.

There are a few factors that contributed to this decline. Reading proficiency continues to be a focus for some of our students. Direct and targeted instruction needs to be provided to fill in gaps in learning while exposing the students to grade level material. Teachers need more training in how to strategically group students for small group instruction and creating differentiated pathways of learning tailored to student needs.

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.

The data component with the greatest gap (7%) was in middle school acceleration. Landrum has been adding more accelerated classes for students to select.

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 in middle school acceleration. Landrum has added more accelerated classes for students to select.

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

Area 1- students scoring a level one on the FSA

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

1-Meeting the needs of our students with disabilities by utilizing targeted small group instruction and differentiated learning pathways in order to increase ELA learning gains.
2-Providing professional development opportunities and resources for teachers to gain and maintain expertise in content and pedagogy.
3-Fostering collaborative relationships, sharing of best practices, and analyzing student data during the PLC process.

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

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

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

After analyzing the data, Landrum is performing at a "C" level when it comes to the learning of our students with disabilities. This subgroup scored in the 34% in both ELA and Science achievement and showed 37% in ELA learning gains.

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 Science by 3% over the 2023 school year data for students with disabilities. We will also increase learning gains for SWD in ELA and Math by 3% over the 2023 school year 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 the FAST results. A focus for each PLC will be to analyze data from formative and summative assessments to drive the instructional decision making and to strategically group students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

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

Utilizing a co-teaching partnership and providing targeted small group instruction will be the evidence-based interventions implemented for this area of focus.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

According to the Learning Disabilities Association of America, students with disabilities require specific and direct learning. This can be accomplished through small group learning. This intervention allows teachers to provide additional scaffolding which helps students to acquire skills needed to be successful. Small group instruction also allows for immediate and specific feedback from the teacher which also contributes to successful learning.
According to Walther-Thomas (1997) and Weichel (2001), the benefits to students with disabilities who participated in co-teaching classrooms included improved academic performance, increased time and attention from teachers, increased emphasis on cognitive strategies and study skills, increased emphasis on
social skills, and improved classroom communities.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Knowing the students with disabilities early and identifying gaps in their skill sets based on their previous data to begin learning acceleration.

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

By When: September 2023

Provide professional learning focused on co-teaching models for ELA and how to organize small groups based on assessment data.

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

By When: October 2023

Increase collaboration time between general education teachers, ESE teachers, and other stakeholders to share information and strategies in order to meet the needs of the students.

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

By When: Ongoing

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

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

Landrum will focus on strengthening relationships and fostering collaboration amongst staff members with the goal of increasing student achievement for all students.

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

80% of students will score a 3 or above on the PM3 FAST test in grades sixth through eighth.

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

This area of focus will be monitored through the effectiveness of the grade level PLCs. Departments will analyze data and share best practices based on effective strategies and practices implemented in the classrooms.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

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

Professional Learning Communities- Utilizing a PLC framework by following a process of school improvement that brings consistency to the work of educators by connecting standards, student learning, assessment, professional learning, educator effectiveness, and school climate and culture to the work of professional learning communities.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Well developed PLCs have a positive impact on school culture and student learning (Department of Education, 2016). The focus on fostering collaboration between educators will assist students in their learning.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Set clear objectives that are focused on student learning.
Provide structure and guidance for PLC time.
Provide opportunities for peer observations.
Focus on results.

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

By When: Ongoing

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

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

After analyzing the school data, there was a slight decrease in the number of students scoring at the proficiency level in ELA. In 2019, 83% of students scored proficient or above in ELA Achievement and 66% in ELA Learning Gains. In 2022, 79% of students scored at a level of 3 or above and 60% in ELA Learning Gains.

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

80% of students will score a 3 or above on the PM3 FAST test in grades sixth through eighth.

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

This area of focus will be monitored by using data received from PM 1 and PM 2 FAST scores and District created common assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

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

Targeted small group instruction will be the evidence-based intervention implemented for this area of focus.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Small group instruction is a high yield classroom strategy. It is a tier one intervention that is good for all students. Research has shown that there are many benefits to small group instruction. It is effective because the teaching is focused on the needs of the students, with the goal of growing their academic skills. Small group instruction provides opportunities for flexible and differentiated learning. Teachers are able to monitor the students better, thus providing better and more individualized feedback and support. Small-group instruction can be used in all content classes and is beneficial for students of all levels. (Marzano)

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Professional learning opportunities focused on the "why and how" of small group learning.

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

By When: October 2023

PLCs will analyze student data and intentionally group students based on the data.

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

By When: Ongoing

The ILC will provide modeling and coaching on the structure and implementation of small group instruction.

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

By When: Ongoing