

Duval County Public Schools

# Landmark Middle School



## 2019-20 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>16</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>19</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>21</b> |

# Landmark Middle School

101 KERNAN BLVD N, Jacksonville, FL 32225

<http://www.duvalschools.org/landmark>

## Demographics

**Principal: Cicely Tyson White**

Start Date for this Principal: 8/2/2019

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Middle School<br>6-8   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2018-19 Title I School</b>  | Yes  |
| <b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 80%  |
| <b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners<br>Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>Pacific Islander Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: B (60%)<br>2017-18: B (58%)<br>2016-17: C (51%)<br>2015-16: B (57%)<br>2014-15: B (59%)   |
| <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 was approved by the Duval County School Board on 10/1/2019.

### 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>16</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>19</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>21</b> |

## Landmark Middle School

101 KERNAN BLVD N, Jacksonville, FL 32225

<http://www.duvalschools.org/landmark>

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2018-19 Title I School | 2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Middle School<br>6-8                             | Yes                    | 75%  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | No                     | 62%  |

### School Grades History

| Year  | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 | 2015-16 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | B       | B       | C       | B       |

### School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Duval County School Board on 10/1/2019.

### 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.**

To provide educational excellence in every classroom, for every student, everyday.

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

Every student is inspired and prepared for success in high school and life.

### School Leadership Team

**Membership**

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

| Name              | Title               | Job Duties and Responsibilities   |
|-------------------|---------------------|---|
| Tyson, Cicely     | Principal           | Ensures the highest academic standards in a safe and secure learning environment for all students. Leads, manages, supervises, and administers all programs, policies, and activities of the school. Monitors instruction, ensures implementation of district curriculum and assesses the effectiveness of instructional and support personnel. |
| Hays, Eugene      | Assistant Principal | Assist the school principal in the overall administration of instructional programs and campus-level operations. Coordinates assigned student activities and services.  |
| Crisp, Monica     | Assistant Principal | Assist the school principal in the overall administration of instructional programs and campus-level operations. Coordinates assigned student activities and services.  |
| Johnson, Karen    | School Counselor    | Designs and implements a data-driven, comprehensive guidance program to meet the academic, career, and social/personal needs of students at the school as outlined by district's school counseling plan.  |
| Baker, Patricia   | Dean                | Under the direction of the principal, assist in the development, implementation, and evaluation of student conduct, intervention programs, and attendance that address the needs of all students.   |
| Bassett, Monique  | Dean                | Assist the school principal in the overall administration of instructional programs and campus-level operations. Coordinates assigned student activities and services.  |
| Johnson, Nick     | Dean                | Assist the school principal in the overall administration of instructional programs and campus-level operations. Coordinates assigned student activities and services.  |
| Davis, Jeannette  | Instructional Coach | Assist in the implementation of the math plan by coaching, training, and supporting classroom teachers.   |
| Danner, William   | Teacher, K-12       | Guides the learning process towards the achievement of curriculum goals and in harmony with the goals establishes clear objectives for all lessons, units, projects and the like to communicate the objectives to students.   |
| Kellam, Aylia     | Teacher, K-12       | Guides the learning process towards the achievement of curriculum goals and in harmony with the goals establishes clear objectives for all lessons, units, projects and the like to communicate the objectives to students.   |
| Robinson, Rebecca | Instructional Coach | Assist in the implementation of the reading plan by coaching, training, and supporting classroom teachers.  |



| Name             | Title               | Job Duties and Responsibilities   |
|------------------|---------------------|---|
| Madrigal, Esther | Instructional Coach | Assist in the implementation of the gifted plan by coaching, training, and supporting classroom teachers.   |
| Grillo, Margaret | Teacher, ESE        | Serves as the direct school liaison between the district and all teachers of exceptional students within the school. Provides training and information regarding compliance of federal, state, and district initiatives. Serves as the local education agency designee when requested. Mentors and supports teachers of students with disabilities. |

## 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 | 397 | 419 | 511 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1327  |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7   | 3   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 10    |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 87  | 89  | 121 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 297   |

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 | 121 | 142 | 176 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 439   |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 6     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/23/2019

### Prior Year - As Reported

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

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

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|-------|
| Students with two or more indicators |             |       |

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

| Indicator                       | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |     |     |     |   |    |    |    | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                 | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63  | 100 | 85  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 248   |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 74  | 145 | 99  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 318   |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5   | 9   | 5   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 19    |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 243 | 301 | 260 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 804   |

**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 | 134 | 126 | 169 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 429   |

**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             | 47%    | 43%      | 54%   | 46%    | 41%      | 52%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 52%    | 49%      | 54%   | 49%    | 48%      | 54%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 42%    | 45%      | 47%   | 35%    | 43%      | 44%   |
| Math Achievement            | 65%    | 49%      | 58%   | 48%    | 44%      | 56%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 67%    | 50%      | 57%   | 46%    | 49%      | 57%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 54%    | 47%      | 51%   | 34%    | 46%      | 50%   |
| Science Achievement         | 48%    | 44%      | 51%   | 47%    | 45%      | 50%   |
| Social Studies Achievement  | 83%    | 68%      | 72%   | 74%    | 65%      | 70%   |

**EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey**

| Indicator                       | Grade Level (prior year reported) |         |         | Total    |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------|---------|----------|
|                                 | 6                                 | 7       | 8       |          |
| Number of students enrolled     | 397 (0)                           | 419 (0) | 511 (0) | 1327 (0) |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0 ( )                             | 0 ( )   | 0 ( )   | 0 (0)    |
| One or more suspensions         | 7 (0)                             | 3 (0)   | 0 (0)   | 10 (0)   |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0 (0)                             | 0 (0)   | 0 (0)   | 0 (0)    |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 87 (0)                            | 89 (0)  | 121 (0) | 297 (0)  |

**Grade Level Data**

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

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

| ELA                   |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06                    | 2019 | 44%    | 47%      | -3%                        | 54%   | -10%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 43%    | 44%      | -1%                        | 52%   | -9%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 1%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                    | 2019 | 43%    | 44%      | -1%                        | 52%   | -9%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 37%    | 41%      | -4%                        | 51%   | -14%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 6%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                    | 2019 | 50%    | 49%      | 1%                         | 56%   | -6%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 51%    | 51%      | 0%                         | 58%   | -7%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -1%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 13%    |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH                  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06                    | 2019 | 66%    | 51%      | 15%                        | 55%   | 11%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 41%    | 42%      | -1%                        | 52%   | -11%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 25%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                    | 2019 | 58%    | 47%      | 11%                        | 54%   | 4%                      |
|                       | 2018 | 57%    | 50%      | 7%                         | 54%   | 3%                      |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 1%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 17%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                    | 2019 | 39%    | 32%      | 7%                         | 46%   | -7%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 33%    | 31%      | 2%                         | 45%   | -12%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 6%     |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH              |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -18%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE               |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08                    | 2019 | 46%    | 40%      | 6%                         | 48%   | -2%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 47%    | 44%      | 3%                         | 50%   | -3%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -1%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |

| BIOLOGY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year        | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019        |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2018        |        |          |                       |       |                    |

| CIVICS EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
|------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year       | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019       | 83%    | 69%      | 14%                   | 71%   | 12%                |
| 2018       | 97%    | 84%      | 13%                   | 71%   | 26%                |
| Compare    |        | -14%     |                       |       |                    |

| HISTORY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year        | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019        |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2018        |        |          |                       |       |                    |

| ALGEBRA EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year        | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019        | 83%    | 57%      | 26%                   | 61%   | 22%                |
| 2018        | 89%    | 61%      | 28%                   | 62%   | 27%                |
| Compare     |        | -6%      |                       |       |                    |

| GEOMETRY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019         | 98%    | 61%      | 37%                   | 57%   | 41%                |
| 2018         | 100%   | 57%      | 43%                   | 56%   | 44%                |
| Compare      |        | -2%      |                       |       |                    |

### Subgroup Data

| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD                                       | 30       | 46     | 36          | 44        | 53      | 45           | 35       | 60      | 82        |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 29       | 51     | 45          | 58        | 64      | 51           | 30       | 62      | 83        |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 55       | 67     | 65          | 82        | 79      | 59           | 65       | 90      | 90        |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 37       | 46     | 38          | 51        | 62      | 53           | 30       | 79      | 74        |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 44       | 47     | 36          | 65        | 65      | 62           | 60       | 83      | 94        |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 49       | 43     | 45          | 76        | 69      | 46           | 57       | 94      | 92        |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 56       | 58     | 43          | 72        | 70      | 54           | 57       | 84      | 85        |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 39       | 48     | 40          | 57        | 62      | 50           | 38       | 80      | 75        |                   |                     |
| 2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| SWD                                       | 30       | 47     | 41          | 37        | 49      | 40           | 30       | 67      |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 33       | 45     | 29          | 42        | 54      | 52           |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 68       | 52     | 53          | 72        | 57      | 60           | 88       | 90      | 91        |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 34       | 45     | 39          | 42        | 47      | 42           | 34       | 89      | 82        |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 44       | 47     | 41          | 57        | 62      | 55           | 58       | 97      | 88        |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 56       | 55     | 48          | 71        | 44      | 44           | 54       | 90      | 100       |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 54       | 54     | 49          | 66        | 59      | 55           | 61       | 93      | 92        |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 40       | 46     | 40          | 51        | 50      | 46           | 39       | 89      | 83        |                   |                     |
| 2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2015-16 | C & C Accel 2015-16 |
| SWD                                       | 15       | 33     | 28          | 19        | 32      | 27           | 16       | 43      | 60        |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 36       | 56     |             | 52        | 39      | 30           |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 64       | 63     |             | 76        | 63      |              | 68       | 86      | 83        |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 33       | 42     | 33          | 32        | 37      | 31           | 31       | 64      | 69        |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 52       | 55     | 45          | 56        | 52      | 36           | 49       | 78      | 71        |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 43       | 53     | 35          | 56        | 54      | 50           | 56       | 71      | 85        |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 57       | 53     | 40          | 57        | 48      | 36           | 61       | 83      | 80        |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 37       | 44     | 34          | 37        | 41      | 33           | 34       | 66      | 57        |                   |                     |

### 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  | 61  |
| 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 | 68  |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 611 |

| ESSA Federal Index   |     |
|--|-----|
| Total Components for the Federal Index   | 10  |
| Percent Tested   | 99% |
| Subgroup Data  |     |
| Students With Disabilities   |     |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                     | 48  |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?             | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%      |     |
| English Language Learners  |     |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                      | 54  |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%       |     |
| 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%        |     |
| Asian Students   |     |
| Federal Index - Asian Students   | 72  |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                         | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%                  |     |
| Black/African American Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students                                | 52  |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% |     |
| 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%               |     |
| Multiracial Students   |     |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students   | 63  |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                   | NO  |

| Multiracial Students   |     |
|--|-----|
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%                |     |
| 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%           |     |
| White Students   |     |
| Federal Index - White Students   | 64  |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                             | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%                      |     |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students                                | 56  |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% |     |

## 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 which showed the lowest performance was the reading lowest 25th percentile. The contributing factor was the inability to fill key positions in the reading department. We were unable to secure two full-time reading teachers, resulting in inconsistent instruction for our most vulnerable students.

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

The data component which showed the greatest decline from the prior year was Civics. There is a direct correlation between students' Lexile levels, reading proficiency, and their ability to pass the Civics EOC. Many of our lowest-performing quartile students were enrolled in Civics due to social studies progression and these students' Lexile levels did not improve as much as needed during the additional year of instruction.

**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 which had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was overall ELA achievement. Our PLC's were not structured and focused on quality standards-based instruction, therefore, overall performance was affected.

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

The data component which showed the most improvement was Math Learning Gains. 2/3rds of the student population were double-blocked in another math course. Teachers met regularly for PLC and attended district professional development. Teachers were provided with monthly curriculum support from IREADY vendor.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)**

Reflecting on the EWS the areas of concern are the number of suspensions and the number of level 1 students.

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

1. School Culture and Climate Improvement
2. PLC's focused on standards-based data-driven instruction, student mastery, and common goals.

**Part III: Planning for Improvement****Areas of Focus:**



| #1  |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Title</b>  | School Culture and Climate  |
| <b>Rationale</b>  | School Culture and Climate are a priority for us for two reasons:<br>1. To decrease teacher turnover and increase morale  |
| <b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b> | 1. Decrease attrition rate from 21% to 10% by June 1, 2020.   |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>                | Cicely Tyson (tysonc@duvalschools.org)  |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>                                  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide Diverse and all-inclusive Classrooms</li> <li>2. Engaging families and communities</li> <li>3. Providing students and staff with socia-emotional support</li> <li>4. Use incentives to promote teacher engagement</li> <li>5. Increase teacher buy-in and support through collaboration and shared decision making.</li> </ol>  |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>                    | <p>The effects of chronic teacher turnover:<br/>           Reduces the time teachers spend with their students due to supporting new colleagues.<br/>           Repetition of professional development experiences for all teachers.<br/>           Loss of established teacher experience.<br/>           Disruption and repetition of program planning and implementation processes.<br/>           Burnout and drain on the energy of staff that stay<br/>           Cited from ASCD.org 2004 (<a href="http://www.ascd.org/publications/researchbrief/v2n19/toc.aspx">www.ascd.org/publications/researchbrief/v2n19/toc.aspx</a>)</p>   |
| <b>Action Step</b>  |   |
| <b>Description</b>  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Revive Sunshine Committee and Whole-Staff Celebrations</li> <li>2. Differentiate PD for staff based on need and experience</li> <li>3. Provide new teachers with a mentor and buddy for support</li> <li>4. Monitor completion of certification requirements</li> <li>5. Hire 2 additional deans. Assign a dean for each grade level in an effort to provide classroom management support to teachers, implement restorative practices and PBIS strategies at each grade level with fidelity, and decrease discipline referrals. These 2 additional positions (6th grade dean and 8th grade dean) will be funded by Title 1.</li> </ol> |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>                                       | Cicely Tyson (tysonc@duvalschools.org)  |

| #2  |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Title</b>  | Improving Instructional Practices (Standards-Based Instruction)  |
| <b>Rationale</b>  | Landmark did not meet expected learning goals in three reporting categories, therefore our goal is to improve standards-based instruction to increase student achievement on the FSA in all accountability areas because.  |
| <b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b> | Increase 3 points in reading proficiency, 4 points in science proficiency, and 2 points in Civics proficiency. In addition, we strive to increase 6% in our lowest 25% of students showing gains in reading and 7% in our overall students showing gains in reading.   |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>                | Eugene Hays (hayse@duvalschools.org)   |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>                                  | We intend to use professional learning communities to break down the standards and increase our standards based instruction. As a team, we will review student work and district provided curriculum resources to evaluate their alignment to the standards. The instructional coach will develop and facilitate model lessons with newer teachers to assist teachers in understanding how to teach to the rigor of the Florida Standards. Using the Achievement Level Descriptors, the team will look at student work to determine the alignment of the student work examples to the standard.  |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>                    | In observing classrooms specifically related to alignment of instruction to the Florida Standards, it has been documented that teachers, while teaching high level material, are not necessarily meeting the rigor and depth of the standards. It has also been noted that the curriculum resources, while providing on grade level texts and higher order questions, do not always align to the standards based on the achievement level descriptors.   |
| <b>Action Step</b>  |  |
| <b>Description</b>  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Plan lessons with teachers and model lessons as appropriate</li> <li>2. Meet as a PLC team to review student work and curriculum resources to determine their alignment to the Florida Standards</li> <li>3. Complete classroom observations to determine the alignment of the instruction being provided to the Florida Standards</li> <li>4. Use Title 1 Funds to purchase supplemental materials for 8th-grade science. Accaletics will be purchased to provide additional support and exposure of the Florida Science standards to 8th-grade students. As an accountability area, it is our goal to provide professional development (funded by Title 1) and standards-based instructional resources to enhance student learning and increase overall science scores.</li> <li>5. Use Title 1 Funds to purchase additional licenses of Math 180. In order to provide intensive Math support to students enrolled in intensive math, Landmark Middle school needed to cover the cost of additional licenses for Level 2 students. The goal is to provide non-level 3 students with intensive Math support through this standards-based program.</li> <li>6. Use Title 1 Funds to purchase a Math Coach and a Reading Coach. Having two master teachers, in the role of the coach will allow us an opportunity to provide additional support for teachers as they increase their capacity to provide standards-based instruction.</li> <li>7. To effectively implement corrective reading, and provide intensive reading support for dis-fluent readers Landmark Middle School will use title 1 funds to purchase a reading teacher position. This will increase students, fluency, reading comprehension, and ultimately increase their scores on the FSA.</li> </ol> |

8. In an effort to decrease class size and double-block Algebra 1 students, Landmark will use title 1 funds to purchase an additional math teacher. This will allow us to double-block our Alg. 1 student and provide them with additional instructional support. Our goal is that this will allow us to increase our acceleration points.
9. To enhance the learning experience and increase student learning acquisition, Landmark will use title 1 funds for field experiences during the 2019-2020 academic school year. It is our hope that these field experiences will allow students an opportunity to experience their learning beyond a textbook and that they will have a better understanding of the content.

**Person Responsible** Rebecca Robinson (mullr@duvalschools.org)

### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

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

To decrease the number of referrals/out of school suspensions with a focus on the subgroup of African American/Black students.

Decrease the number of referrals/out of school suspensions by 30% by June 1, 2020.

Provide the following training: Culturally Responsive Teaching, CHAMPS, PBIS, and Youth Mental Health

Implement a school-wide incentive program to increase student engagement.

## Part IV: Title I Requirements

### Additional Title I Requirements

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

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

Landmark will improve parent participation and engagement using open two-way communication with parents. We will exchange information involving academics and school activities. We will focus our efforts on providing parents with the resources and assistance they need to actively monitor and help their student's achievement.

#### PFEP Link

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

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

Counseling is provided by the school counseling office through: guidance referrals from faculty, parent and/or student request and student statements.

Other pupil services are met or included in classroom guidance lessons.

Students/families can be referred to community organizations, such as, Full Service Schools and Big Brothers/Big Sisters.

We also refer families and students to resources that include, the District's Homeless Liaison, YCC, and

#### CRISIS Team

We pair students with adult mentors individually, as needed. A barrier to this being a larger program is teacher time and availability.

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

LMS supports incoming 6th grade students, by presenting 5th grade recruitment assemblies at feeder pattern elementary schools, as well as, conducting 5th grade tours on LMS campus.

Summer Orientation is provided for all grade levels.

The school counseling department would like to propose a Rising 6th Grade Parent Night, January 2020 on LMS campus. (Prior to the School Choice Expo timeline.)

LMS partners with Kernan Middle School for the 8th Grade Transition to High School Parent Night in January. Area high schools, such as feeder pattern and magnet schools attend. The middle school counselors present general high school and graduation information to parents and students. High school counselors give information about their schools and programs. For the second part of the program, everyone goes into the gym where the high schools have tables set up for more information and individualized answers to questions.

Feeder pattern high schools, Sandalwood and Terry Parker, visit the 8th grade classrooms for 9th grade scheduling.

8th grade counselors visit classrooms for students to complete the High School Course Advisement Form. Students and parents are made aware of the importance of beginning their high school grade point average (GPA), high school transcripts, college admissions, and Bright Futures Eligibility.

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

The principal met with the leadership team and the entire staff to discuss funding. It was determined that teachers could get with their department and decide where funding would be most needed. Staff felt that a good portion of the funding could go to educational experiences outside of the classroom. Teachers and School Counselors met within their respective departments to decide which experiences would be most meaningful to students and which experiences would help us meet our SIP goals. Admin was responsible for facilitating the meetings and getting information from faculty members.

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

8th grade students have the opportunity to take one Pre-Early College course, Strategies for Academic Success, at LMS. Not only can they earn high school credit, but this course gives students the chance to earn college credit through dual enrollment.

Counselors provide Academic Advising to students in all grade levels, focusing on requirements for moving forward.

Counselors use mycareershines.org in guidance classroom lessons. This strategy has a wealth of knowledge on colleges and careers, as well as, four year high school year planning.

Counselors participate in the district Jacksonville Goes to College Week, through fun activities and guidance classroom lessons (in the media center) about education, career, job and income. The school counseling office would like to propose taking 8th graders to the Jacksonville College Fair in October.

The school counseling office would like to propose a Career Fair @ LMS in March 2020. There would be coordination with the AVID teachers, UNF SOAR Program, and our Military Counselor. Speakers would be from various community organizations, area business and industry.

## Part V: Budget

**The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.**

|        |        |   |        |
|--------|--------|---|--------|
| 1      | III.A. | Areas of Focus: School Culture and Climate                                      | \$0.00 |
| 2      | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Improving Instructional Practices (Standards-Based Instruction) | \$0.00 |
| Total: |        |   | \$0.00 |