

Duval County Public Schools

# Mandarin High School



## 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Mandarin High School

4831 GREENLAND RD, Jacksonville, FL 32258

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Sara Bravo**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

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

\* 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

## Mandarin High School

4831 GREENLAND RD, Jacksonville, FL 32258

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

### School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	25%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	46%

### School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	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 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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Bravo, Sara	Principal	
Thomas, Karen	Assistant Principal	
Mainor, Michael	Assistant Principal	
McKenzie, Joseph	Assistant Principal	
Pecarek, Elizabeth	Assistant Principal	

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Sara Bravo

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

#### Demographic Data

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	High School 9-12

<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	48%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: A (63%) 2015-16: B (56%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## Early Warning Systems

### Current Year

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



Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
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		

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Wednesday 7/29/2020

**Prior Year - As Reported**

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	

**Prior Year - Updated****The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	

**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	
	(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
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
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%	0
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%	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	74
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	46
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	55
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	59
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	62
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	50
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 performed at 32% proficiency, the lowest performance for the 2019 school year.

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

Math Lowest 25th Percentile dropped 17%, showing the greatest decline from the 2018 to the 2019 school year.

**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.**

Math Lowest 25th Percentile had the greatest gap of 12% when compared to the state average for the 2019 school year.

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

Social Studies showed the most improvement from the 2018 to 2019 school year with a gain of 2%.

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

Needs to be completed

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

1. Needs to be completed
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

The Mandarin High School Area of Focus (Goal #1) is teacher collaborative planning within high accountability content areas. The creation of strong, data-driven, standards-based lessons, tasks, assessments and measurable outcomes within PLCs will provide consistent instructional practices resulting in an increase in student engagement, learning and performance.

The 2018 - 2019 MHS State Assessment Data showed drops in each content area with the exception of Social Studies. After further analysis it was revealed that pockets of growth and increased proficiency were noted within cohorts of students assigned to specific teachers. This is evidence that common planning did not occur on a consistent basis within each content area.

90% + core content teachers will engage in standards-based, results-driven collaborative planning on a weekly basis alongside leadership team content area liaison.

**Measurable Outcome:**

Using standards-walk-through tool, collaborative planning assessment results and feedback from Instructional Reviews, Mandarin High School Instructional Leaders will consistently assess and adjust PLC and Collaborative Planning support systems to ensure student improvement, increased proficiency and gains.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Sara Bravo (bravos@duvalschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Standards-based, consistent collaborative planning ensures that all students, in all core content classrooms, are equitably exposed to standards-aligned instruction, tasks and assessments.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:****Action Steps to Implement**

1. Train APs on the relationship, but differentiation, between PLCs and Collaborative Planning.
2. Engage in phases 1-2 on the Continuum of School Improvement with Admin Team.
3. Develop PLC and Common Planning Calendar for Core Content Areas.
4. Utilize Pre-Planning to provide teachers with a better understanding of their roles in PLCs and the Collaborative Planning Process.
5. Admin Team engages in calibration walk-throughs over the first four weeks of school to align findings through use of the SWT Portal.
6. Ongoing engagement in weekly/bi-monthly Collaborative Planning sessions within core content areas, producing a product at the close of each session.
7. Development of Early Release Core Content PLC trainings emphasizing standards-based instructional practices and the ongoing use of data to drive instructional decision-making.
8. Engagement in the Instructional Review Process with District Staff on a consistent basis.

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]



**#2. -- Select below -- specifically relating to****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:****Measurable Outcome:****Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

[no one identified]

**Evidence-based Strategy:****Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:****Action Steps to Implement***No action steps were entered for this area of focus***#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** The Mandarin High School Area of Focus (Goal #2) addresses collective responsibility. Teachers share a strong sense of responsibility for student development, school improvement, and professional growth.

**Measurable Outcome:****Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

[no one identified]

**Evidence-based Strategy:****Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:****Action Steps to Implement***No action steps were entered for this area of focus***Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

na

**Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment**

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Needs to be completed

**Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link**

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