

Duval County Public Schools

Mandarin High School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents	
School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	15
Budget to Support Goals	16

Mandarin High School

4831 GREENLAND RD, Jacksonville, FL 32258

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

Demographics

Principal: Sara Bravo

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	48%
2018-19 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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: A (63%) 2015-16: B (56%) 2014-15: A (64%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

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.

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	8
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	15
Budget to Support Goals	16

Mandarin High School

4831 GREENLAND RD, Jacksonville, FL 32258

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	32%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	44%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	B	A	A	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.

Mandarin High School is dedicated to providing a high quality, equal education for all students while we daily inspire a well-rounded, literate, character-filled cohort of young people who will graduate on time with a career choice in mind and have all the knowledge and skills necessary to succeed in a diverse and global society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Mandarin High School will inspire, engage, and educate every student every day, preparing him or her for graduation and entry into post-secondary education and/or the work force.

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
Kniseley, John	Principal	
Flynn, Mary	Assistant Principal	
Pecarek, Elizabeth	Assistant Principal	
Holloway, Brian	Assistant Principal	
Lucas, Janetta	Assistant Principal	

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	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	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	

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	
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)

114

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/20/2019

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	0	0	0	75	90	95	172	432
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	47	58	26	186
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	113	101	81	25	320
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	326	294	249	193	1062

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	178	197	143	105	623

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	62%	47%	56%	61%	46%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	48%	48%	51%	50%	45%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	32%	42%	42%	35%	39%	41%
Math Achievement	46%	51%	51%	64%	59%	49%
Math Learning Gains	40%	52%	48%	51%	52%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	33%	47%	45%	48%	45%	39%
Science Achievement	66%	65%	68%	73%	64%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	80%	70%	73%	83%	64%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (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.

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
09	2019	58%	48%	10%	55%	3%
	2018	66%	48%	18%	53%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	63%	48%	15%	53%	10%
	2018	58%	49%	9%	53%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	65%	67%	-2%	67%	-2%
2018	71%	63%	8%	65%	6%
Compare		-6%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	78%	68%	10%	70%	8%
2018	77%	64%	13%	68%	9%
Compare		1%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	46%	57%	-11%	61%	-15%
2018	48%	61%	-13%	62%	-14%
Compare		-2%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	45%	61%	-16%	57%	-12%
2018	56%	57%	-1%	56%	0%
Compare		-11%			

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	21	29	26	21	35	35	22	39		95	38
ELL	27	32	22	44	43	43	48	54		94	48
ASN	76	62		52	33		86	87		100	92
BLK	43	38	29	29	28	21	47	68		95	57

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
HSP	55	45	25	46	44	43	64	78		96	55
MUL	58	41	20	47	44		68	79		88	83
WHT	69	52	39	55	45	36	73	84		95	77
FRL	52	41	25	37	34	37	56	68		93	63
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	27	48	44	23	53	59	36	48		94	37
ELL	23	53	55	43	50		53	45		91	38
ASN	83	65		65	45		94	83		97	72
BLK	44	46	39	39	47	39	56	69		97	48
HSP	56	52	42	57	53	53	68	67		99	52
MUL	53	52	38	58	50		63	82		94	73
WHT	70	52	44	60	54	56	79	82		93	66
FRL	53	48	45	47	51	43	65	68		92	54
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	22	28	19	37	28	31	36	60		89	39
ELL	18	33	32	47	59		70			88	50
ASN	85	71		78	50		75	84		94	77
BLK	40	36	27	43	43	40	53	72		94	61
HSP	52	43	41	72	59	50	72	70		89	71
MUL	58	54	15	71	37		76	88		100	86
WHT	68	54	41	66	53	51	79	87		96	73
FRL	46	42	29	57	50	48	62	75		88	65

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	57
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	631
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	47
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	74
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	46
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	55
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	59
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

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	62
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	50
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 lowest performance was the ELA lowest 25th percentile for gains with 32%. A few of the contributing factors were losing the Reading Coach, testing environment for the FSA, and the overall school environment due to multiple threats to the school to include unfounded shooting and bomb threats (in testing window).

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from previous year was the Math lowest 25th percentile for gains (50% to 33%). The most inexperienced teachers were assigned the majority of the LPQ in Geometry.

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 greatest gap was in Math Lowest 25th Percentile for gains (33% to 45%). The most inexperienced teachers were assigned the majority of the LPQ in Geometry.

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

The most improvement was Social Studies (78% to 80%). The US History PLC analyze data and maintain a common experience for all students. They identify students who are non proficient and provided safety nets such as after school tutoring and small group instruction.

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

Number of course failures in ELA and Math and number of students with less than 90% attendance.

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

1. Increase gains for LPQ for Math.
2. increase gains for LPQ for ELA.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

Title	Increase growth for LPQ in Math. The goal is 50% of LPQ Math students making gains.
Rationale	It was our greatest decline from the previous year and also in comparison to greatest gap with State.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve

Our goal is for 50% gain for LPQ in Math.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

John Kniseley (kniseleyj@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy

Ensuring that all LPQ's are double-blocked with the same teacher. The teacher assigned has data overtime to support moving LPQ's. We will have quarterly district assessments to monitor/gauge/track academic progress.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy

We are following the Master Schedule Guidelines as well as State Guidelines that emphasizes Level 3 students needing additional support.

Action Step

Description

1. PLC
2. After School tutoring focusing on remediation of low performing standards.
3. Moved accountability classes into main building from portables.
4. Quarterly PD around the Principal's to Action book (NCTM).
5. District Coach provides additional support wherever needed.

Person Responsible

John Kniseley (kniseleyj@duvalschools.org)

#2

Title

Increase growth for LPQ in ELA. The goal is 42% of LPQ ELA students making gains.

Rationale

The growth for ELA LPQ dropped 10% from the previous year to 32%. This also was our lowest component.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve

The Goal for gains in ELA LPQ is 42%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Mary Flynn (flynnm@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy

The majority of the ELA LPQ students are double blocked with Reading. The Reading Teachers will be using Actively Learn which is designed to support LPQ students through deeper learning and rigorous engagement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy

We followed the Master Schedule Guidelines for double blocking and the Actively Learn is a newly adopted platform by the district to deepen the learning and rigorous engagement by our LPQ students in ELA.

Action Step**Description**

1. PLC
2. After School tutoring to provide remediation for lowest performing standards.
3. PMA's
- 4.
- 5.

Person Responsible

Mary Flynn (flynnm@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).

One area of Focus is the number of students with less than 90% attendance. We are looking at new AIT procedures and we have assigned students by grade level to administrators. In addition, our school wide theme is Mustangs build Relationships and hope that students will want to come to school based on relationships forged with adults on campus.

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.

NA

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.

NA

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

NA

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.

NA

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

NA

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase growth for LPQ in Math. The goal is 50% of LPQ Math students making gains.	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase growth for LPQ in ELA. The goal is 42% of LPQ ELA students making gains.	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00