Mandarin Middle School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Mandarin Middle School

5100 HOOD RD, Jacksonville, FL 32257

http://www.duvalschools.org/mandarin

Demographics

Principal: Julie Humphreys   Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
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 (64%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: B (58%)
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 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

Mandarin Middle School

5100 HOOD RD, Jacksonville, FL 32257

http://www.duvalschools.org/mandarin

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)
Middle School 6-8	No	39%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	50%

School Grades History

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

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.

It is our core belief that through intentional, tailored learning experiences all students can maximize their potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

As a premier middle school within the Duval County Public School system, we are committed to ensuring that students are prepared for success in college or a career, and life. Our mission is to provide educational excellence in every classroom, for every student, every day.

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
Williams, Moses	Principal	Create a safe and secure environment where students can learn and gain meaningful life experiences.
Bailey, Stephanie	Assistant Principal	Development of Master Schedule Instructional Leader in support of ELA Support of Guidance Department Safety and Security of School
Gee, Lourdes	Assistant Principal	Building Operations Testing Coordination Instructional Leader in Support of Science and Social Studies Support Exceptional Student Education

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Saturday 7/1/2017, Julie Humphreys

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.*
7

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.*
12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
54

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
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 (64%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: B (58%)
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.	

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	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	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	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	

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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/21/2020

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	58%	43%	54%	59%	41%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	54%	49%	54%	56%	48%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	45%	47%	46%	43%	44%
Math Achievement	64%	49%	58%	56%	44%	56%
Math Learning Gains	64%	50%	57%	53%	49%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	47%	51%	43%	46%	50%
Science Achievement	67%	44%	51%	60%	45%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	87%	68%	72%	67%	65%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**			**Total**
	6	**7**	**8**	
	(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**
06	2019	55%	47%	8%	54%	1%
	2018	53%	44%	9%	52%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	51%	44%	7%	52%	-1%
	2018	49%	41%	8%	51%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
08	2019	63%	49%	14%	56%	7%
	2018	63%	51%	12%	58%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2019	63%	51%	12%	55%	8%
	2018	42%	42%	0%	52%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		21%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	49%	47%	2%	54%	-5%
	2018	54%	50%	4%	54%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
08	2019	49%	32%	17%	46%	3%
	2018	28%	31%	-3%	45%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		21%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
08	2019	47%	40%	7%	48%	-1%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	52%	44%	8%	50%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	95%	67%	28%	67%	28%
2018	91%	63%	28%	65%	26%
Compare		4%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	86%	69%	17%	71%	15%
2018	99%	84%	15%	71%	28%
Compare		-13%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	87%	57%	30%	61%	26%
2018	78%	61%	17%	62%	16%
Compare		9%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	61%	39%	57%	43%
2018	99%	57%	42%	56%	43%
Compare		1%			

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	25	34	24	31	43	35	37	49			

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	35	39	35	48	55	39	48	87	83		
ASN	73	59		82	83		91	100	95		
BLK	40	47	38	49	50	37	44	83	95		
HSP	49	49	42	60	59	46	61	78	87		
MUL	62	58	42	75	64		74	93	89		
WHT	67	58	40	71	70	59	74	90	88		
FRL	47	49	36	54	57	44	50	81	89		

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	25	40	35	25	39	40	19	81			
ELL	21	47	48	31	48	53	29		90		
ASN	71	63	70	72	73		70	100	100		
BLK	39	47	39	37	41	40	45	91	73		
HSP	50	59	50	49	48	44	47	97	80		
MUL	56	59	77	61	59	58	50	100	83		
WHT	65	56	47	62	56	48	66	99	83		
FRL	45	50	44	44	45	42	49	95	74		

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	18	43	44	21	26	22	29	35	53		
ELL	31	48	42	31	40	25	40	42			
ASN	67	57		62	66		75	82	90		
BLK	39	50	48	37	44	33	35	55	71		
HSP	58	56	44	53	47	40	67	67	84		
MUL	58	53	20	59	52	36	63	62	73		
WHT	69	60	47	65	58	54	71	71	83		
FRL	49	52	45	45	47	37	48	58	73		

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	62
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	52
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	624

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
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	52
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	83
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	54
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	58
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	70
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	69
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	55
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.

LPQ Reading showed the lowest performance at MMS. MMS had a reduction in staff that directly support Reading classes

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

LPQ Reading showed the lowest performance at MMS. MMS had a reduction in staff that directly support Reading classes

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.

Social studies exhibited the largest gap when compared to the state average. Strategic master scheduling to promote familiarity with tested standards.

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

Math Learning Gains. Strategic master scheduling and strong PLCs.

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. LPQ Reading
2. LPQ Math
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:	Mandarin Middle School endeavors to ensure that all students receive quality instruction with strong pedagogy anchored by standards. Fewer than 60% of classrooms at Mandarin Middle School consistently presented standards aligned instruction. 5 essential survey indicates a need to define and enhance the level of rigor in MMS classrooms, indicating alignment with research found in the Opportunity Myth.
Measurable Outcome:	86.5% Mandarin of Mandarin Middle teachers will work within a framework to present standards based instruction to students daily
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Moses Williams (williamsm4@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Classroom walks are utilized to provide guidance, feedback, and discussion towards desired outcomes of standards based classrooms. Professional learning communities as well as professional development opportunities to build teacher efficacy and collaboration.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	As expressed in the Opportunity Myth, Standard based classrooms are the baseline for creating equal access to excellent instruction. Providing students with grade appropriate and standard aligned instruction will provide students opportunity to close learning gaps and maximize performance opportunities.

Action Steps to Implement

Calibrated administration- Continue standard based walks to calibrate leadership team in an effort to promote consistency of feedback and support through out the building.

Person Responsible   Moses Williams (williamsm4@duvalschools.org)

Standards Based Planning- guide strong Professional Learning Communities that will focus the planning process around standards and the creation of aligned tasks.

Person Responsible   Moses Williams (williamsm4@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

LPQ- Math and Reading. MMS will strategically schedule students to provide them the best instructional opportunities. LPQ students will be monitored to ensure that they are connected to their data and owning their academic process. MMS will provide incentives and leverage regional personnel to provide additional layers of support.

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.

Mandarin Middle School works collaboratively with stakeholders and community members to create and strong culture and inclusive environment. MMS invites community members to participate in orientations, open house, and student advisory council meetings. Mandarin Middle hosts board walks, district parent nights, and develops faith based partnerships to contribute to the culture of service and excellence at Mandarin Middle School.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.