

Duval County Public Schools

Mandarin Oaks Elementary School



2019-20 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
Title I Requirements	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

Mandarin Oaks Elementary School

10600 HORNETS NEST RD, Jacksonville, FL 32257

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

Demographics

Principal: Leigh Butterfield

Start Date for this Principal: 7/27/2016

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
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)	54%
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: A (68%) 2017-18: A (65%) 2016-17: A (68%) 2015-16: A (67%) 2014-15: A (73%)
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 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	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

Mandarin Oaks Elementary School

10600 HORNETS NEST RD, Jacksonville, FL 32257

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

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)
Elementary School PK-5	No	45%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	42%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	A	A	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 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 Oaks will provide students with engaging and challenging instruction in every classroom, for every student, every day.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Mandarin Oaks will inspire and prepare every student for success through active engagement in quality educational opportunities.

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
		<p>School-based administrators serve as the primary leaders of the school for which they are responsible. They offer guidance and support to our instructional and support staff and create a positive learning environment which is centered around student success. School-based administrator positions include: Principals, associate principals, assistant principals, directors of student services, and dean of students.</p> <p>The purpose of the School-Based Performance Evaluation System is to specify performance expectations in a number of performance areas. Through analyzing self-assessments and observations, school-based administrators (SBA) and their evaluators will identify areas of strength and areas for growth. This process assures that SBA performance is continually enhanced and refined.</p>
Rocquin, Sandi	Assistant Principal	<p>The process allows evaluators to collect comprehensive and accurate assessment data for judging SBA effectiveness so they can support quality leadership every day. Effective school leaders improve schools by enhancing the teaching opportunities of educators and the learning opportunities of students. In the 2015-2016 school year, DCPS will prioritize key elements and provide immediate support and development where needed, to ensure improvement and validate achievement in all facets of an effective leader.</p> <p>DCPS has identified FIVE categories that define an effective leader. The five categories are as follows:</p> <p>Instructional Leadership Discipline and Safety Parent/Community Engagement School Culture Operations</p>
Butterfield, Leigh	Principal	<p>School-based administrators serve as the primary leaders of the school for which they are responsible. They offer guidance and support to our instructional and support staff and create a positive learning environment which is centered around student success. School-based administrator positions include: Principals, associate principals, assistant principals, directors of student services, and dean of students.</p> <p>The purpose of the School-Based Performance Evaluation System is to specify performance expectations in a number of performance areas. Through analyzing self-assessments and observations, school-based administrators (SBA) and their evaluators will identify areas of strength and areas for growth. This process assures that SBA performance is continually enhanced and refined.</p> <p>The process allows evaluators to collect comprehensive and accurate assessment data for judging SBA effectiveness so they can support quality leadership every day. Effective school leaders improve schools by enhancing the teaching opportunities of educators and the learning opportunities of</p>

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<p>students. In the 2015-2016 school year, DCPS will prioritize key elements and provide immediate support and development where needed, to ensure improvement and validate achievement in all facets of an effective leader.</p> <p>DCPS has identified FIVE categories that define an effective leader. The five categories are as follows:</p> <p>Instructional Leadership Discipline and Safety Parent/Community Engagement School Culture Operations</p>

School-based administrators serve as the primary leaders of the school for which they are responsible. They offer guidance and support to our instructional and support staff and create a positive learning environment which is centered around student success. School-based administrator positions include: Principals, associate principals, assistant principals, directors of student services, and dean of students.

The purpose of the School-Based Performance Evaluation System is to specify performance expectations in a number of performance areas. Through analyzing self-assessments and observations, school-based administrators (SBA) and their evaluators will identify areas of strength and areas for growth. This process assures that SBA performance is continually enhanced and refined.

Edmunds, Darrell	Assistant Principal	<p>The process allows evaluators to collect comprehensive and accurate assessment data for judging SBA effectiveness so they can support quality leadership every day. Effective school leaders improve schools by enhancing the teaching opportunities of educators and the learning opportunities of students. In the 2015-2016 school year, DCPS will prioritize key elements and provide immediate support and development where needed, to ensure improvement and validate achievement in all facets of an effective leader.</p> <p>DCPS has identified FIVE categories that define an effective leader. The five categories are as follows:</p> <p>Instructional Leadership Discipline and Safety Parent/Community Engagement School Culture Operations</p>
---------------------	------------------------	---

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	175	177	174	169	179	177	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1051
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	3	4	11	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
One or more suspensions	2	1	3	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	4	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	24	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51

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	1	1	1	2	6	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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

73

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/27/2019

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	26	24	12	21	30	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	132
One or more suspensions	2	1	3	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
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	7	30	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65

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	2	1	2	5	19	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47

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	70%	50%	57%	75%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	62%	56%	58%	70%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	50%	53%	56%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	79%	62%	63%	79%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	82%	63%	62%	70%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	68%	52%	51%	62%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	64%	48%	53%	66%	50%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	175 (0)	177 (0)	174 (0)	169 (0)	179 (0)	177 (0)	1051 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ()	1 ()	3 ()	4 ()	11 ()	14 ()	33 (0)
One or more suspensions	2 ()	1 (0)	3 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0)	3 (0)	12 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	4 (0)	2 (0)	2 (0)	1 (0)	9 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	24 (0)	25 (0)	51 (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
03	2019	74%	51%	23%	58%	16%
	2018	62%	50%	12%	57%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	64%	52%	12%	58%	6%
	2018	72%	49%	23%	56%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	65%	50%	15%	56%	9%
	2018	76%	51%	25%	55%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	77%	61%	16%	62%	15%
	2018	71%	59%	12%	62%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	77%	64%	13%	64%	13%
	2018	77%	60%	17%	62%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2019	76%	57%	19%	60%	16%
	2018	82%	61%	21%	61%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	65%	49%	16%	53%	12%
	2018	70%	56%	14%	55%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						

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	38	52	59	49	71	68	26				

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
ELL	57	67		65	79						
ASN	88	76		98	90		83				
BLK	49	54	43	61	81	70	35				
HSP	63	65		83	88						
MUL	88	53		79	68		82				
WHT	72	63	56	81	82	71	68				
FRL	60	57	50	69	82	67	56				
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	43	51	38	44	63	48	29				
ELL	61	38	33	54	53						
ASN	85	67		88	71		90				
BLK	56	53	29	64	71	59	59				
HSP	60	56	50	62	71	65	43				
MUL	82	71		90	82		88				
WHT	73	60	34	81	78	59	75				
FRL	61	54	40	68	70	58	60				
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	36	47	42	48	57	56	31				
ELL	20	42	47	45	68	67					
ASN	85	79		91	84		67				
BLK	58	61	48	66	66	59	31				
HSP	61	62	46	66	57	47	50				
MUL	77	77		85	73						
WHT	81	72	58	83	72	71	79				
FRL	65	65	56	68	68	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	68
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	547

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	52
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	67
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	87
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	56
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	75
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	74
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	70
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	64
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.

4th grade ELA (64%) and 5th grade Science (65%) showed the lowest performance this year. Contributing factors include: Lack on continuity with writing instruction overall. One of our 4th grade ELA teachers was on long term leave last year which lasted through the testing window. One teacher used Writer's Workshop for a majority of the year, which resulted in less student exposure with evidence-based writing. Our lowest performing quartile gains were also very low on this grade level due to lack of differentiation for the most struggling students. Science decline could be attributed to the lack of fidelity to the instructional framework, while overcompensating with longer math instruction.

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

Data reflects greatest decline in ELA 4th and 5th grade. The 2019 5th grade cohort scored 7 percent lower than last year. In addition, the 5th grade group scored 11% lower than the 5th grade group the previous year. This year's 4th graders scored 2% higher than the 2018 4th grade cohort, but their score was 8% lower than they had performed as 3rd graders on the 2018 FSA. Contributing factors include our VE teachers having limited time with the students who they served.

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.

School achievement data shows no negative gaps between student performance at MOE as compared to state averages. The smallest gap is with 4th grade ELA (+6%).

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

3rd Grade reading - increased from 62% to 74%. We had assigned 2 of our strongest teachers (who taught GATE) to teach inclusion. We also moved a teacher from 3rd to 2nd to help our 2nd grade team prepare their students for 3rd. We closely monitored LPQ as well as students with multiple at risk indicators. We also ensured that the team uploaded their small group differentiated lesson plans each week.

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

Attendance - over 10% of students with lower than 90% attendance prior year.

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

1. Continue LPQ protocols (student info cards, folders in all intermediate classes)
2. Tier teachers by support needs and develop instructional support plan for teachers with lowest 18-19 scores
3. Work with grade levels above to identify students with risk indicators and prescribe support
4. Implement MTSS protocols for intervention of absences and students with at-risk indicators
5. Roll out Project Lead the Way Science Curriculum

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	4th and 5th Grade ELA
Rationale	4th grade ELA - lowest performance score. 5th Grade had highest decrease in scores compared to previous year. 5th grade cohort had highest drop compared to 2018 cohort (-7%)
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Based on our FSA Goal Setting Sheet: (increase in 11 points overall) Spring 2020 ELA FSA: 3% increase (73%) Gains +1% (63%) LPQ Gains increase +1% (55%)
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Leigh Butterfield (butterfieldl@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers will implement differentiated small-group instruction after identifying Lowest-performing quartile. Teachers will use common planning time to identify standards of focus after analyzing student performance data.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Small group instruction gives teachers a natural opportunity to provide targeted, differentiated instruction for small groups of students. It gives the teacher an opportunity to evaluate and assess more closely what each student can do and build strategic plans around those assessments. Unpacking standards allow teachers to create aligned, rigorous lessons and assessments.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers will compile the data of their LPQ students which will include services provided, Rtl tier information, previous FSA data if applicable, iReady profile, Achieve profile, etc. 2. Teachers will conduct data chats weekly with LPQ students and every 2 weeks for all other students. 3. Teachers will discuss progress of students during PLC and share strategies for differentiation. 4. Teachers will upload and share small group instructional plans on One Note.
Person Responsible	Leigh Butterfield (butterfieldl@duvalschools.org)

#2	
Title	5th Grade Science
Rationale	5th Grade science saw a decrease of 5% from previous year's proficiency rates.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	For the 2019-20 Science FCAT, students will score a 3 or higher at a rate of 67%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Sandi Rocquin (rocquins@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers will emphasize project and inquiry-based learning as we implement the Project Lead the Way curriculum. This comprehensive system of materials includes training
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Above strategies will increase critical thinking and analysis skills among students.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Train teachers and implement PLTW curriculum 2. Allow teachers common planning time to identify LPQ and standards of focus from baseline assessment 3. Monitor teacher fidelity to science instructional framework
Person Responsible	Sandi Rocquin (rocquins@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).

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.

N/A

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.

N/A

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

N/A

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.

N/A

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

N/A

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: 4th and 5th Grade ELA				\$8,800.44
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	7200	790-Miscellaneous Expenses	2581 - Mandarin Oaks Elementary School	School Improvement Funds	73.0	\$8,800.44
			<i>Notes: Top Score materials for students that are not provided by the district, data folders, novel studies.</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: 5th Grade Science				\$8,800.44
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	7200	790-Miscellaneous Expenses	2581 - Mandarin Oaks Elementary School	School Improvement Funds	73.0	\$8,800.44
			<i>Notes: Project Lead the Way and Vex Kits in order to implement our STEM science curriculum.</i>			
Total:						\$17,600.88