
Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	22
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	22
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	25

Landmark Middle School

101 KERNAN BLVD N, Jacksonville, FL 32225

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

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

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

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

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

To create a school environment where students successfully use every opportunity to be optimistic and aspire to be great and resilient at Landmark and beyond.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Tyson, Cicely	Principal	Oversee Instructional Implementation and School Safety. Admin over ELA and Reading
Crisp, Monica	Assistant Principal	Responsible for Math, Varying Exceptionalities, and School Safety.
Johnson, Nick	Assistant Principal	Responsible for Science, Social Studies, ESE, and Testing.
Baker, Patricia	Dean	Lead Dean 7th Grade PBIS
Williams, Anthony	Dean	6th Grade Dean
Hysesani, Emanuela	Teacher, K-12	ELA Department Chair
Bogart, Caitlin	Teacher, K-12	Math Department Chair
Robinson, Rebecca	School Counselor	8th Grade School Counselor
Rorhbaugh, Ginger	School Counselor	7th Grade School Counselor

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

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

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

In order to create a meaningful SIP the two key groups met to discuss school wide goals, needs, and review necessary data points for the 2023-2024 SIP. The Landmark Leadership team and the School Advisory Committee met to review the aforementioned components of the SIP.

SIP Monitoring

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

The Landmark Leadership team will meet bi-weekly to discuss components of the SIP.
 Content Area teachers will meet weekly to plan lessons and review data.
 Grade level teams will meet monthly to discuss SIP
 The School Advisory Committee will meet monthly.
 Admin will be present at all meetings to provide data and commentary on school wide goals,

Demographic Data	
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	67%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	80%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History	2021-22: B

*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	99	92	202
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	9	17
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	15	23
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	106	147	143	396
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	110	121	100	331
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	94	148	144	386

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	7	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	7

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	65	71	160
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	39	45	91
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	3	7	21
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	7	23
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	41	34	108
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	48	46	125
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	41	34	108

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	56	91	209

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	7	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	6	11	26

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	65	71	160
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	39	45	91
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	3	7	21
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	7	23
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	41	34	108
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	48	46	125
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	41	34	108

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	56	91	209

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	7	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	6	11	26

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	41	42	49	45	43	50	45		
ELA Learning Gains				48			43		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				39			28		
Math Achievement*	50	49	56	52	35	36	49		
Math Learning Gains				59			38		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				55			31		
Science Achievement*	46	48	49	52	48	53	51		
Social Studies Achievement*	75	66	68	72	53	58	75		
Middle School Acceleration	95	82	73	90	47	49	72		
Graduation Rate					48	49			
College and Career Acceleration					69	70			
ELP Progress	45	31	40	53	85	76	57		

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

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	352
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	565
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	29	Yes	1	1
ELL	44			
AMI				
ASN	68			
BLK	52			
HSP	56			
MUL	66			
PAC	54			
WHT	71			

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	53			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	45			
ELL	48			
AMI				
ASN	71			
BLK	48			
HSP	54			
MUL	62			
PAC				
WHT	60			
FRL	50			

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

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	41			50			46	75	95			45
SWD	22			29			19	45			4	
ELL	24			47			25	80			5	45
AMI												
ASN	40			62			48	90	100		5	
BLK	34			40			33	63	90		5	
HSP	44			51			37	73	85		6	43
MUL	44			55			57	74	100		5	

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC	50			58							2	
WHT	48			58			62	88	99		5	
FRL	32			40			34	70	91		5	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	45	48	39	52	59	55	52	72	90			53
SWD	31	39	35	36	55	54	30	49	77			
ELL	33	46	37	44	51	61	23	62	71			53
AMI												
ASN	51	66	62	70	71		70	83	95			67
BLK	32	39	38	35	53	51	30	63	92			
HSP	51	50	29	52	52	37	55	76	71			67
MUL	52	49	50	59	59	53	61	83	95			
PAC												
WHT	54	52	34	64	66	70	64	75	92			27
FRL	38	42	34	44	54	52	40	65	84			43

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	45	43	28	49	38	31	51	75	72			57
SWD	20	28	27	22	29	28	27	49	60			
ELL	32	51	50	38	34	40	21	63	62			57
AMI												
ASN	61	59	36	70	47		64	90	82			
BLK	34	36	21	34	30	26	40	61	64			
HSP	44	51	46	40	38	38	43	78	70			63
MUL	48	37	8	52	33	19	29	84	59			
PAC												
WHT	55	47	32	63	47	34	67	79	79			50
FRL	38	36	24	40	34	29	41	65	63			56

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	39%	40%	-1%	47%	-8%
08	2023 - Spring	40%	41%	-1%	47%	-7%
06	2023 - Spring	35%	38%	-3%	47%	-12%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	45%	43%	2%	54%	-9%
07	2023 - Spring	22%	40%	-18%	48%	-26%
08	2023 - Spring	52%	45%	7%	55%	-3%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	28%	35%	-7%	44%	-16%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	95%	52%	43%	50%	45%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	52%	48%	48%	52%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	99%	64%	35%	63%	36%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	74%	63%	11%	66%	8%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

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

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

8th grade science showed the lowest performance at 28%.
 Most of our higher performing students were placed in Biology.
 Many students did not meet the standards on Earth, Space Science and Nature of Science which were topics that should have been covered in 6th grade. This was a Covid year so it impacted their learning.

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

Science-Nature of science has always been a struggle for grade 8. This year instead of the unit being embedded throughout the curriculum, we are teaching the nature of science standard as a whole spending 10 days teaching the various components of the scientific method. We plan on incorporating more hands on learning this school year. We will be attending the monthly science meetings rotating and taking turns so teachers are not continually missing from the classroom.

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.

Science-Each component had a significant double-digit gap not exceeding 17. It goes back to having a strong foundation in the prior years, and the lack there of due to the Covid year when students were in 6th grade.

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

8th Grade Math showed the most improvement. During the 2022-2023 we were fully staffed and had a good group of teachers who were committed to implementing benchmark-based instruction. Our instructional coach provided direct support to math teachers. Teachers used Saavas, Acaletics, and

Delta Math. We used the district created curriculum and developed a strong focus on guided notes, teacher led small groups, and created numerous opportunities for remediation.

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

Two areas of concern are:

The number of level 1 students in reading within our school. That number is very concerning because it's nearly forty percent of the population. This will be a heavy lift to move these students towards proficiency.

The number of students who had multiple suspensions. What can we do to decrease that number? How can we be more proactive to decrease and prevent some of those behaviors/incidents.

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

Priority #1- LPQ Reading

Priority #2-LPQ Math

Priority #3- Student Discipline

Area of Focus

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

396 or 35% of the student population has been identified as performing at at Level 1 on the 2022-2023 state ELA assessment.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The school will use benchmark based curriculum

Push-in Support with Para

Students will be placed in Intensive Reading

Students will be double-blocked in ELA

Instructional Strategies- Direct Instruction, Remediation, Teacher Led Small Groups, Guided Notes, Anchor Charts, and Independent Reading Opportunities.

Monitoring:

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

Weekly Lesson Plan Reviews

Weekly Common Planning

Admin Walkthroughs

District Monitoring Assessments

Progress Monitoring Assessments

Teacher Created Assessments (Exit Tickets)

Student Data Tracking

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cicely Tyson (tysonc@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Teachers will work with collaborative planning team to develop lesson plans with:

Differentiation- create lesson plans to meet the needs of varied learners with attention to level 1 learners.

Teachers will use formal and informal data to guide their benchmark based planning.

Explicit Instruction- Teachers will use gradual release model to implement and execute instruction.

Teachers will also use stations (individual, partner/group, and teacher-led small group).

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These strategies are supported by our district and are also interventions that teachers can be trained on through scaffolded PD.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Data Review

Lesson Plan Review

Weekly Collaborative Planning/Learning

Person Responsible: Cicely Tyson (tysonc@duvalschools.org)

By When: Weekly Quarterly June 2024

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

331 students performed at a level 1 on the 2022-2023 state assessment. Based on our overall data this is an area of concern that will need to be a focus for the 2023-2024 academic school year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The school will use benchmark based curriculum
 Students will be double-blocked in Math
 Instructional Strategies- Direct Instruction, Remediation, Teacher Led Small Groups, Guided Notes, Anchor Charts, and Independent Reading Opportunities.

Monitoring:

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

- Weekly Lesson Plan Reviews
- Weekly Common Planning
- Admin Walkthroughs
- District Monitoring Assessments
- Progress Monitoring Assessments
- Teacher Created Assessments (Exit Tickets)
- Student Data Tracking

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Monica Crisp (crispm@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Teachers will work with collaborative planning team to develop lesson plans with:
 Differentiation- create lesson plans to meet the needs of varied learners with attention to level 1 learners. Teachers will use formal and informal data to guide their benchmark based planning.
 Explicit Instruction- Teachers will use gradual release model to implement and execute instruction. Teachers will also use stations (individual, partner/group, and teacher-led small group).

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These strategies are supported by our district and are also interventions that teachers can be trained on through scaffolded PD.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Weekly Lesson Plan Review
Weekly Collaborative Learning/Planning
Data Review

Person Responsible: Monica Crisp (crispm@duvalschools.org)

By When: Weekly Quarterly June 2024

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Decrease the number of students who are suspended one or more times. During the 2022-2023 school year, 202 students were suspended one or more times. T

Measurable Outcome:

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

Reduce the number of suspensions by 10% during the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Admin and Deans will monitor school climate data (discipline) on a weekly basis.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Patricia Baker (bakerp2@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Establish behavior plans for students

Assign mentors

PBIS

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Behavior plans will allow us to review data (Test, Attendance, Behaviors, and etc.) and set reasonable goals for students.

Research shows that when students are connected to a caring adult their behaviors are likely to improve.

Weekly and daily check-in/check-outs.

PBIS- Research based positive strategies.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

No description entered

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C)).

Landmark faculty and staff meet during a Shared Decision Making (SDM) Committee to review data and needs. Representatives of SDM have a vote on how school improvement funding is allocated.

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The school improvement plan email address will be shared with stakeholders during Open House and enrollment. Families who wish to have a hard copy can request a copy at Open House or during enrollment.

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

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

The school will build positive relationships with families during various school events (listed below), social media presence and school wide communication.

Orientation

Open House

Title 1 Parent Engagement Activities

PTA Meetings

SAC Meetings

School Athletic Events

Student Showcase Events

The school will inform parents of their child's progress through monthly progress reports, parent teacher conferences, Focus, parent calls home, and parent emails.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

The school will strengthen the academic programs but creating meaningful PD schedule focused on teacher development and teaching and learning.

Topics will include
Tier 1 Supports
Direct Instruction
Small Group Instruction
Reading Strategies
Understanding Data
Student Social and Emotional Learning in Middle School
CHAMPS

Teachers will:
Attend weekly Planning Sessions
Complete Peer Observations
Complete Book Study
Attend District Content Area PD

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

This plan was developed with content area teachers, admin, deans, and ESE support staff.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

Landmark Middle School has (2) school counselors, (1) mental health therapist, and (3) deans. Students are able to request meetings with their counselor as needed. Counselors develop a counseling plan to support the SE health of students. Students can also be referred to full service health with the mental health therapist if they need additional support. Students at Landmark also have access to Hazel Health and can schedule virtual meetings with licensed mental health experts.

Landmark offers a variety of extra curricular activities to improve students' skills outside of academic subject areas: 5000 Role Models, Yearbook Club, Student Government, Robotics, Art Club, Recycling Club, Math Club, Chess Club, and much more. These organizations help develop the whole child and provide opportunities for students to develop and thrive outside of the academic classroom.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

Landmark has an annual career fair which is hosted by the school counselors. Students are able to connect with people from various industries (Law Enforcement, Entertainment, Beauty, Medicine, and Education)

Students who are members of the 5000 Role Models of Excellence meet weekly and have the opportunity to meet men from various industries to serve as guest speakers on a variety of topics. Landmark has the annual transition to high school event, wherein students and parents learn about various high school acceleration programs, high school requirements, and school choice options.

Families listen to a whole group presentation and then are given an opportunity to meet representative from a number of area high schools.

Landmark students enrolled in AVID, conduct research on colleges across the country, participate in college visits, and learn about the student grant and scholarship opportunities. Students learn study skills through student led tutorials and reading strategies (WICOR and Costa's Level of Questioning). Students who are accepted into the Landmark Honors Academy and enrolled into STEM classes attend various field experiences in different career industries.

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

SWPBIS provides an evidence-based framework that aims to develop advanced systems and procedures for adverting and reacting to undesirable behaviors. This multi-tiered framework focuses on promoting educationally significant academic, behavioral, and organizational outcomes for all students. This is a proactive framework where the school systemically promotes positive behavioral expectations for all students and creates a system to support positive behaviors and data-based decisions.

Through the universal tier (tier one), the school has identified three to five positive expectations for all students. Through this tier, the teachers are teaching school-wide behavioral expectations, teaching school routines, and developing/implementing school-wide recognition systems.

School store

Talon tickets for positive behaviors

End-of-the-year celebrations based on positive behaviors

Trivia Tuesday in the lunchroom

I Freestyle Friday, where students are able to pick music during lunchtime

Restorative justice (i.e., classroom, guidance, or small group)

Referrals data-decisions

Behavioral cues within the hallways and/or classroom

Small group to teach appropriate social skills, conflict resolution, coping skills

Peer lead interventions with a dean or school counselor

Zones of Regulation

Calm Classroom

CHAMPS (sets up classroom expectations)

Calming area zone within the classroom(s)

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

Lead Teachers and Admin work to develop a school-wide PD schedule. Topics are based on walkthrough data and student data.

Novice teachers participate in a New Seahawk Soiree before the start of the school year. During the meet and greet teachers are able to visit their classrooms and get supplies to get an early start.

Teachers are assigned a buddy within their grade level or content area. Novice teachers meet monthly with our in-house PDF Professional Development Facilitator and also have frequent meetings with the District Teacher Support person. Both the PDF and DTS provide support strategies for teachers to meet certification requirements and enhance craft/skillset.

Landmark has developed a partnership with the University of North Florida and Jacksonville University. Students at both universities complete their internships and practicum hours here. We have hired a number of this students to become full-time teachers post graduation.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

N/A

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

Yes