

St. Johns County School District

# Alice B. Landrum Middle School



## 2020-21 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>5</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>19</b>

# Alice B. Landrum Middle School

230 LANDRUM LN, Ponte Vedra Beach, FL 32082

www.lms.stjohns.k12.fl.us

## Demographics

**Principal: Ryan Player**

Start Date for this Principal: 8/28/2020

<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>2018-19 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	6%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (78%) 2017-18: A (74%) 2016-17: A (78%) 2015-16: A (77%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Dustin Sims</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, [click here](#).

## 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.

## 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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Player, Ryan	Principal	Facilitates admin team, Building Leadership Team, manages facility, sets mission and vision, sets goals and expectations for progress monitoring, oversees roles and responsibilities of MTSS team, and ensures that all staff comply with the district-wide school site standards.
White, Liza	Guidance Counselor	Bring student's to team attention, provide grade, course and attendance information, gather teacher feedback on student behavior, track academic performance, monitor parent contact and facilitate meetings with parents and teachers.
	Assistant Principal	LEA, Schoology, Facilities, MTSS team member
OConnell, Katherine	Assistant Principal	Testing, Professional Learning Communities, Professional Development, MTSS member
Curran, Bonnie	Instructional Coach	Facilitates RTI process, MTSS team, progress monitoring, provides Tier 1 student data
Wood, Amanda	Psychologist	Identifies need for resources and provides student and guidance support.
Dobbins, Stacey	Guidance Counselor	Bring student's to team attention, provide grade, course and attendance information, gather teacher feedback on student behavior, track academic performance, monitor parent contact and facilitate meetings with parents and teachers.

**Demographic Information**

**Principal start date**

Friday 8/28/2020, Ryan Player

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

9

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

17

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

51

**Demographic Data**

<b>2020-21 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>2018-19 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	6%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (78%) 2017-18: A (74%) 2016-17: A (78%) 2015-16: A (77%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Dustin Sims</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> .	

## 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	342	347	519	0	0	0	0	1208
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	16	29	0	0	0	0	54
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	26	37	0	0	0	71	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	15	23	0	0	0	59	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	15	23	0	0	0	59	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	16	21	0	0	0	54	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	16	21	0	0	0	54	

**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	8	10	16	0	0	0	0	34

**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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Saturday 6/20/2020

**Prior Year - As Reported**

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	339	332	506	0	0	0	0	1177
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	23	46	0	0	0	0	76
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	20	0	0	0	0	38
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	15	21	0	0	0	0	54

**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	1	5	10	0	0	0	0	16



**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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Prior Year - Updated**

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	339	332	506	0	0	0	0	1177
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	23	46	0	0	0	0	76
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	20	0	0	0	0	38
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	15	21	0	0	0	0	54

**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	1	5	10	0	0	0	16

**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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**

**School Data**

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	83%	68%	54%	82%	69%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	66%	59%	54%	63%	57%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	60%	48%	47%	55%	45%	47%
Math Achievement	93%	77%	58%	91%	76%	58%
Math Learning Gains	84%	68%	57%	79%	66%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	82%	60%	51%	73%	58%	51%
Science Achievement	82%	70%	51%	84%	73%	52%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Social Studies Achievement	97%	88%	72%	94%	87%	72%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	85%	74%	11%	54%	31%
	2018	82%	71%	11%	52%	30%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	85%	72%	13%	52%	33%
	2018	77%	70%	7%	51%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
08	2019	79%	71%	8%	56%	23%
	2018	85%	76%	9%	58%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	88%	74%	14%	55%	33%
	2018	87%	73%	14%	52%	35%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	95%	80%	15%	54%	41%
	2018	88%	80%	8%	54%	34%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
08	2019	94%	78%	16%	46%	48%
	2018	94%	73%	21%	45%	49%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

<b>SCIENCE</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
08	2019	82%	72%	10%	48%	34%
	2018	83%	75%	8%	50%	33%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						

<b>BIOLOGY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019	0%	87%	-87%	67%	-67%
2018	0%	84%	-84%	65%	-65%
Compare		0%			

<b>CIVICS EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019	98%	90%	8%	71%	27%
2018	94%	89%	5%	71%	23%
Compare		4%			

<b>HISTORY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019					
2018					

<b>ALGEBRA EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019	99%	79%	20%	61%	38%
2018	100%	79%	21%	62%	38%
Compare		-1%			

<b>GEOMETRY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019	100%	81%	19%	57%	43%
2018	100%	77%	23%	56%	44%
Compare		0%			

**Subgroup Data**

<b>2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b>											
<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2016-17</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2016-17</b>
SWD	43	54	47	61	66	64	31	85	16		

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
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		

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	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		

**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	78
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	702
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
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

<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	65
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Asian Students</b>	
Federal Index - Asian Students	92
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	68
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	71
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	87
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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
<b>Pacific Islander Students</b>	
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
<b>White Students</b>	
Federal Index - White Students	78
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	58
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

## Analysis

### Data Reflection

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

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

The data component showing the lowest performance is ELA LQ with only 60% of the students making gains. This data point continues to be an area of low performance and focus with a 5% improvement over the previous year. Continued growth is anticipated with school wide goals and PLCs focused on students identified in the lowest quartile.

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

The greatest decline was in Science going from an 84% to 92%. The district average declined as well which could be indicative of misaligned curriculum and standards review.

#### 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

There is a 35 percentage point gap between our school data in math with 93% proficient at Landrum while the state average was 58%. This is evidence of our students excelling in math in accelerated courses and rigorous curriculum.

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

The greatest improvement was in the 9% growth in our Math Lowest Quartile. This is a result of school wide data chats, goal setting and progress monitoring for our LQ students.

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

8th grade students with two or more indicators are our greatest concern. These students will be tracked by guidance and assigned a mentor.

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

1. Improve ELA gains by 5%
2. Improve Math gains by 5%
3. Improve LQ ELA & Math by 5%

4. Improve Science by 5%
5. Improve Civics by 1%

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Data indicates a need to continue to focus on learning gains for the lowest quartile and growth for all students.

**Measurable Outcome:** 71% in ELA Learning Gains (up from 66%)  
 89% in Math Learning Gains (up from 84%)  
 65% in ELA Learning Gains for Lowest Quartile (up from 60%)  
 87% in Math Learning Gains for Lowest Quartile (up from 82%)  
 98% in Civics (up from 97%)  
 87% in Science (up from 82%)

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Katherine OConnell (katherine.oconnell@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Standards based progress tracking by course and data chats focused on growth and goal setting with level 1s and 2s. Use of student focused progress monitoring data to remediate and focus on standard based instruction for student growth is the focus of our PLCs and administration. Level 1s and 2s will be tracked by our ILC, through ESE, admin lead data chats and will be provided ongoing academic support.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** School performance data indicates that having a specific plan for our students in the lowest quartile will continue to be successful as growth from previous year supports this conclusion. Data also indicates that continued support of our PLC process in Science, Civics, Math and ELA will lead to sustained trends in growth and a continued emphasis on standards based instruction and remediation in a student centered classroom.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Review student, grade level and school wide data to determine areas of focus and opportunities for growth
2. Communicate school goals and expectations to PLC collaborative teams and support members
3. Identify resources and progress monitoring tools for ongoing tracking and goal setting for individual students
4. School leadership team will conduct data chats quarterly with level 1 & 2 students and allocate resources to address student needs and goals
5. School leadership will monitor and support the PLC process and will communicate cross curricular trends and areas of growth and opportunity for growth

**Person Responsible** Katherine OConnell (katherine.oconnell@stjohns.k12.fl.us)



**#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** To establish a student centered environment that supports the cohesive unit of staff, students and community in the profile of a Landrum Lion. To establish a school environment where we are all part of One Den, recognizing, appreciating and supporting each other.

**Measureable Outcome:** Increased opportunities for students to receive positive recognition on a daily, weekly, and quarterly basis.  
Up to 270 students a week will receive recognition through PBIS cards and rewards  
Students will be recognized quarterly for academic achievements in luncheon with Principal.  
Staff are recognized daily for student centered environments through shout outs.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Ryan Player (ryan.player@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** In creating the Profile of a Landrum Lion the faculty collaborated on identifying characteristics and traits for successful students and students participated in a school wide write to define what they needed to leave middle school prepared for high school and beyond. These collaborative efforts were used to create the profile of a student who is confident in academics, sophisticated in learning, accomplished in 21st century skills, and global in orientation. Students are then recognized and rewarded for displaying the traits of a Landrum Lion.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Recognizing that we are all in One Den will set the tone for interactions and will lead to a greater sense of community. Incentivized performance leads to increased growth and opportunities to recognize and reward. Students responded positively to expansion of PBIS program last year and in response we have added the Lions Den with gaming, activity tables, bean bag chairs, putting green, giant connect four, and other board games.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Identify desirable skills and characteristics to create a Profile of a Landrum Lion through staff and student activities and collaborations. Communicate the Profile to all staff and students.
2. Determine criteria, means and opportunities for recognizing and rewarding students who demonstrate the characteristics of a Landrum Lion.
3. Recognize Den Members weekly through PBIS cards and raffles
4. Plan and invite honor roll students to luncheon with principal quarterly
5. Recognize staff daily via email shout outs and students daily through Words of a Lion announcements

**Person Responsible** Ryan Player (ryan.player@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

**Professional Learning Communities will meet three times monthly and will be directly supported by school leadership team. Lowest Quartile students will be a focus of PLCs and we will schedule and conduct data chats with all of our LQ students. We will achieve the 5% growth goals in ELA and Math through diligent attention to teaching and learning and by ensuring curriculum alignment and support.**

## Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

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

School Culture Goal: Create a student-centered environment where all students learn and show growth

Create opportunities for normalcy and re-acclimation

Mental Health training

Monthly Social/Emotional issues

Consistent approach to discipline

Character Education

Equity and Diversity

All Den Members will be supported as they seek to fulfill the Profile of a Landrum Student:

Confident in Academics

Project based learning, real world problem solvers, application of knowledge

Sophisticated in Learning

Knows how to learn, is self-directed (applies learning independently to solve problems, initiates plans or a course of action, self monitors, self corrects)

Accomplished in 21st Century Skills

Develops expertise in the four C's (critical thinking, collaboration, communication, caring), goal oriented, develops interpersonal skills, work ethic, self direction, personal responsibility and time management, persistence and integrity

Global in Orientation

Understands cultures, demonstrates sensitivity to differences, is knowledgeable about global issues and our interconnectedness

**Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link**

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

<b>Part V: Budget</b>			
<b>1</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Culture &amp; Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>