

Duval County Public Schools

Landmark Middle School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

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: 9/10/2020

2019-20 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	80%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Pacific Islander Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: B (57%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	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 Duval 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.

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

Landmark Middle School

101 KERNAN BLVD N, Jacksonville, FL 32225

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Middle School 6-8</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>79%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>66%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	B	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Duval County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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.
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.
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.
Johnson, Nick	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 9/10/2020, Cicely Tyson White

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	80%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Pacific Islander Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: B (57%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca

Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

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

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

Thursday 9/10/2020

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	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	

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	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	

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	
	(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	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%				
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%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
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		

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
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
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%	0

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%	0

Native American Students

Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students

Federal Index - Asian Students	72
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	52
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	62
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	63
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	64
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	56
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.

Needs to be completed (all)

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

-

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.

-

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

-

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

-

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

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The 2020-2021 area of focus for LMS is standard-based planning. The rationale for this is based on SWD, primarily the evidence of tasks and materials which were used for instruction and misalignment of instructional tasks to the standard.

Measurable Outcome: 90% of our current core content teachers will engage in successful standards-based instruction planning procedures.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Cicely Tyson (tysonc@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Standards-based planning can help instructors:
 During PLC and Common Planning core teachers will use learning arc frameworks to ensure aligned instructional tasks.
 Explore ways to shift their thinking about teaching and lesson plans in order to better understand content as a vehicle for the achievement of standards.
 Discover new styles of instruction, educational assessment, feedback, and curriculum building that are well suited to standards-based education.
 Heflebower et al., 2018
<https://www.marzanoresources.com/reproducibles/teachers-guide-to-standards-based-learning>

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The Learning Arc framework has yielded evidenced-based results which indicate when a teacher employs steps 1-7 with fidelity student learning experiences are aligned to the standard.
 The resources which will be used will include Learning Arc resources located in teams, DCPS curriculum guide, Florida Standards Website, CPALMS, and district selected instructional materials.

Action Steps to Implement

Admin will attend summer Learning Arc Training at Atlantic Coast High School
 Admin will reintroduce Learning Arc Framework to staff and use the resources available in Teams.
 Monitor progress weekly, monthly, quarterly and adjustments as needed

Person Responsible Cicely Tyson (tysonc@duvalschools.org)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Implement PBIS model with fidelity to reduce the number of referrals and suspensions among African American Males, overage, and ESE students. Overall our goal is to increase the number of positive incentives for students so that their conduct will improve.

Measurable Outcome: Reduce the number of infractions, referrals, and suspensions by 50%

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Cicely Tyson (tysonc@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Implement School-Wide Reward System (for students and teachers)
Revamp Guidelines to Success
Develop Mentor Programs (Girls and Boys)

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

na

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.

Needs to be completed

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00