

Duval County Public Schools

Mandarin Oaks Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	13
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	21

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: 7/27/2017

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	54%
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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (68%) 2017-18: A (65%) 2016-17: A (68%) 2015-16: A (67%)
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	13
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	21

Mandarin Oaks Elementary School

10600 HORNETS NEST RD, Jacksonville, FL 32257

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School PK-5</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>38%</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>46%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	A	A

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.

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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
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 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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Instructional Leadership Discipline and Safety Parent/Community Engagement School Culture Operations
Boysen, Paul	Assistant 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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Instructional Leadership Discipline and Safety Parent/Community Engagement School Culture Operations

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.

Christensen, Treva	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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Instructional Leadership Discipline and Safety Parent/Community Engagement School Culture Operations
--------------------	---------------------	--

Demographic Information

Principal start date
 Thursday 7/27/2017, Leigh Butterfield

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.*

8

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.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

79

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	54%
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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (68%) 2017-18: A (65%) 2016-17: A (68%) 2015-16: A (67%)
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	180	176	176	170	186	179	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1067
Attendance below 90 percent	27	24	30	11	23	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	144
One or more suspensions	5	0	1	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	48	82	65	63	30	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	313
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	76	108	99	86	19	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	413

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	49	75	65	56	19	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	286

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	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/7/2020

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	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

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	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

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	
	(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.

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%

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

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
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
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%	0

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%	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	87
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	56
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	75
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	74
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	70
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	64
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.

ELA Lowest 25th Percentile: 54%

A lack of differentiation in some ELA classrooms might have contributed to this data point. Some students in our LPQ would have benefited from increased exposure to grade level text or tasks. Some students would have benefited from receiving work that was more aligned to the outcomes. Our LPQ needs to be assessed (formally and informally) on a regular basis to ensure learning is taking place. Once a standard has been fully covered, an assessment must be given that assesses the standard in its entirety. (including multiple item types and question stems)

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

5th ELA. The 5th grade group was 11% lower than the 5th graders the previous year. Contributing factors may have been a lack of differentiation in instruction and interventions with students exhibiting EWS. Due to the transition to online instruction, there was no testing in 2020; however PMA 2 data supported these were still areas in need of growth.

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.

There were no data components with a gap when compared to the state average in 2018-2019. There were also no gaps when looking at PMA 2 data. The smallest positive gap with +6% difference is 4th ELA.

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

Based upon 2018-2019 data, 3rd grade reading showed the most improvement. (An increase of 8% from 64% to 72%) We reassigned teachers according to strengths to better meet the needs of students and closely monitor the LPQ. Teachers also created small group differentiated lesson plans on a weekly basis that were monitored by admin. and used during collaboration sessions.

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

Attendance- particularly in the grade levels with the lowest performance (4th and 5th)

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

1. Standards based instruction
2. Continue LPQ protocols
3. Tier teachers by support needs based upon scores and data gathered on SWT
4. Work with teachers and guidance to identify and support students with risk indicators and implement MTSS procedures for interventions
5. Continue with roll out of Project Lead the Way Science Curriculum

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: 4th and 5th ELA- lowest performance scores based upon 2018-2019 data and supported by 2019-2020 PMA data.

Measurable Outcome: 75% of 4th graders will achieve reading proficiency by the end of the 20-21 school year.
75% of 5th graders will achieve reading proficiency by the end of the 20-21 school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Leigh Butterfield (butterfieldl@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will create and implement differentiated small group instruction plans. Common planning time will be utilized to develop learning arcs for upcoming ELA standards, identify aligned tasks, and create/plan for aligned assessment opportunities.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Small group instruction allows teachers to target the needs of each student. It also allows them to get a better idea of what students strengths and weaknesses are. Collaboration and leveraging the learning arc framework will ensure teachers create a road map to mastery of the ELA standards.

Action Steps to Implement

- Teachers will track and monitor their LPQ.
- Teachers will conduct regular data chats.
- Teachers will collaborate during PLC and common planning, leveraging the Learning Arc framework.
- Teachers will cultivate assignments, tasks, and assessments to teach/assess the appropriate standards.

Person Responsible Leigh Butterfield (butterfieldl@duvalschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Teachers on each grade level team collaborate and agree on task alignment for the most part (which activities are appropriate for where they should be in the Learning Arc of the standard); however, there is not a consistent implementation of student assessments that creates an experience equivalent to the state standards (item specs, appropriate item types, assessment limits, etc.)

Measurable Outcome: 80% of teachers will be observed utilizing standards-aligned assessments. All teachers will continue to have conversations during PLC regarding the tasks and assignments students are working on, but time will also be devoted to the formative assessment pieces for that standard and the teacher leader on each grade level will create the final product (based on conversations and input from all team members) and email to administration.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Leigh Butterfield (butterfieldl@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Collaboration among teachers, Professional Learning Communities, Common Planning, and Instructional Rounds.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers need to ensure that students are being assessed appropriately and that the summative assessments by the county and state are not the most rigorous questions they have ever had exposure to. Formative assessment will help determine if students understand the task and what is expected.

Action Steps to Implement

Conduct regular classroom walk-throughs and admin will assist with leading the discussions during PLC using findings.

Person Responsible Leigh Butterfield (butterfieldl@duvalschools.org)

Facilitate professional development that aligns with standards based instruction. Implement the Student Equip work protocol.

Person Responsible Leigh Butterfield (butterfieldl@duvalschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: 5th grade science- there was a decrease in scores by 5% from the previous year based upon 2018-2019 data. 2019-2020 PMA data supported the need for this to be an area of focus.

Measurable Outcome: Increase of science proficiency.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will integrate Project Lead the Way curriculum into their lesson plans. Teachers will use standards based instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Project Lead the way will increase critical thinking skills, standards based instruction will ensure lessons and rigor match those on the end of year assessments.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will be trained on Project Lead the Way curriculum
 Teachers will unpack standards and create lessons aligned with standards

Person Responsible Leigh Butterfield (butterfieldl@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Our administrative team is going to meet 3 times per week during the 1st quarter and weekly thereafter to discuss alignment findings using our standards walkthrough data. We will have deep conversations surrounding the standards and how we can support teachers in assigning tasks and assessments that align with the standard.

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.

An objective observer need not look long to find ample evidence of Mandarin Oaks’ healthy culture, which is often summarized with the word, “family”. It is the explicitly stated directive by myself and leadership that

students should feel that a day at MOE should feel as joyous and positive as a trip to Disney. To that end, a variety of strategic and meaningful systems are in place to encourage positive engagement among students, teachers, staff and other members of the Mandarin Oaks Community. Our vision and mission statement can be seen manifest throughout the school community. From the most novice to most experienced teachers, the faculty and staff understand and embrace our vision and mission as evidenced through their discussion and collaboration in Professional Learning Communities, faculty meetings and professional development sessions. The students exhibit and embody our direction through their ownership of their own learning in the classroom and meeting the daily challenge of high expectations communicated consistently by their teachers. Parents and other various stakeholders share in our stated purpose through the priorities and policies that are developed through collaborative bodies such as our School Advisory Committee and Parent Teacher Association. Even families that newly enroll to Mandarin Oaks often report that our reputation for equitable, quality instruction was something about which they were fully aware when they decided to become a part of the MOE family. Our PTA plays a huge role in producing programs which strengthen school culture. Events include Family Fall Festival, Student Social, Spirit Nights, Daddy-Daughter Dance, Muffins with Mom/Donuts with Dad, Grandparents day, Family Movie Nights and a bevy of other items which produce stronger bonds among students and other stakeholders. Mandarin Oaks also recognizes the need to be proactive and preventative in our support for students who demonstrate at-risk indicators such as family struggles, aggressive behaviors, social/emotional needs or excessive absences. The support community of teachers, administration and school counselors work to identify student needs and address them in a holistic fashion that provides services and resources to students and their families to ensure their hierarchy of needs is fulfilled to enable students to access meaningful instruction.

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: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00