Mandarin High School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	48%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: A (63%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* 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 High School

4831 GREENLAND RD, Jacksonville, FL 32258

http://www.duvalschools.org/mhs

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	28%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	47%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	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 commits to providing an effective learning environment that is rich in academic mastery, while promoting the development of physical, social, and emotional well-being. Through a combination of consistent faculty engagement and community involvement, all students will be prepared to realize their full potential today, tomorrow and in the future.

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 global society with career choices and pathways to success.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Bravo, Sara	Principal	
Thomas, Karen	Assistant Principal	
Pecarek, Elizabeth	Assistant Principal	
Baldwin, Robert	Assistant Principal	
Banks, Antonio	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.*
3

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
116

Total number of students enrolled at the school
2,460

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
13

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
11

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	607	738	594	521	2460
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84	102	60	55	301
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	92	56	45	261
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	95	33	12	171
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	78	51	44	199
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	165	71	102	411
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	242	188	26	34	490
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	131	204	67	73	475

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	26	87	31	3	147
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	36	23	15	88

Date this data was collected or last updated
Tuesday 9/14/2021

2020-21 - 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	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	

2020-21 - 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	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	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				62%	47%	56%	62%	47%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				48%	48%	51%	51%	49%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				32%	42%	42%	42%	42%	44%
Math Achievement				46%	51%	51%	54%	51%	51%
Math Learning Gains				40%	52%	48%	51%	55%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				33%	47%	45%	50%	50%	45%
Science Achievement				66%	65%	68%	73%	61%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				80%	70%	73%	78%	67%	71%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
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	2021					
	2019	58%	48%	10%	55%	3%
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	63%	48%	15%	53%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				

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
2021					
2019	65%	67%	-2%	67%	-2%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	78%	68%	10%	70%	8%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	46%	57%	-11%	61%	-15%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	45%	61%	-16%	57%	-12%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

For ELA 9, ELA 10, Algebra I, Geometry, Biology, and US History we are looking at PMA1, PMA2, PMA3, Achieve

Grade 9				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	358/59%	358/56%	300/49%
	Economically Disadvantaged	84/50%	78/42%	64/39%
	Students With Disabilities	17/24%	21/27%	13/18%
	English Language Learners	5/23%	6/19%	3/10%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	173/53%	187/56%	182/57%
	Economically Disadvantaged	42/48%	46/48%	50/57%
	Students With Disabilities	8/30%	13/50%	12/48%
	English Language Learners	4/50%	7/70%	4/40%
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	68/71%	83/81%	71/76%
	Economically Disadvantaged	16/70%	22/81%	16/67%
	Students With Disabilities	4/67%	5/71%	5/100%
	English Language Learners	0/.%	0/.%	0/.%
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0/.%	0/.%	0/.%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0/.%	0/.%	0/.%
	Students With Disabilities	0/.%	0/.%	0/.%
	English Language Learners	0/.%	0/.%	0/.%

Grade 10				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	347/56%	403/64%	321/52%
	Economically Disadvantaged	90/52%	92/54%	76/46%
	Students With Disabilities	20/37%	20/36%	14/25%
	English Language Learners	1/3%	4/10%	2/5%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	159/46%	185/52%	119/37%
	Economically Disadvantaged	59/50%	64/58%	38/36%
	Students With Disabilities	11/27%	18/49%	9/21%
	English Language Learners	15/42%	20/50%	8/26%
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	131/45%	170/57%	130/46%
	Economically Disadvantaged	34/37%	50/54%	40/44%
	Students With Disabilities	15/35%	18/41%	13/34%
	English Language Learners	4/18%	3/13%	2/12%
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	28/47%	35/51%	9/41%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6/46%	7/37%	2/29%
	Students With Disabilities	6/67%	5/56%	1/50%
	English Language Learners	2/17%	3/27%	0/0%

Grade 11				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	198/44%	182/45%	24/18%
	Economically Disadvantaged	34/35%	25/30%	4/14%
	Students With Disabilities	4/13%	5/19%	3/23%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	1/6%	0/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	25/23%	36/32%	29/25%
	Economically Disadvantaged	5/17%	8/26%	5/17%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	1/13%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	8/47%	10/59%	9/39%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	13/34%	24/62%	20/43%
	Economically Disadvantaged	3/30%	6/60%	4/36%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	1/50%	2/100%
	English Language Learners	2/15%	4/31%	6/32%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	198/58%	241/67%	324/66%
	Economically Disadvantaged	48/56%	58/65%	59/59%
	Students With Disabilities	8/35%	15/63%	15/45%
	English Language Learners	9/53%	7/39%	7/29%

Grade 12				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	89/32%	98/34%	41/27%
	Economically Disadvantaged	23/32%	23/30%	11/24%
	Students With Disabilities	3/10%	3/12%	5/19%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	6/23%	3/11%	5/15%
	Economically Disadvantaged	3/30%	0/0%	1/8%
	Students With Disabilities	3/100%	0/0%	1/25%
	English Language Learners	1/25%	0/0%	2/40%
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	1/50%	2/67%	1/20%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0/.%	0/.%	0/.%
	Students With Disabilities	0/.%	0/.%	0/.%
	English Language Learners	1/100%	1/100%	1/100%
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	4/80%	3/75%	7/47%
	Economically Disadvantaged	1/100%	1/100%	2/40%
	Students With Disabilities	0/.%	0/.%	0/.%
	English Language Learners	1/50%	1/50%	0/0%

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	17	37	38	25	36	36	42	41		95	57
ELL	25	59	53	41	42	42	30	38		98	80
ASN	63	59		53	50		53	77		100	94
BLK	42	47	38	38	36	41	53	53		98	81
HSP	46	52	43	40	48	54	49	60		95	86

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
MUL	52	44	50	47	39		56	83		100	83
WHT	63	54	50	52	37	44	64	80		96	89
FRL	46	49	45	43	38	44	58	63		95	79
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

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
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	63
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	662
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	42
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	52
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	69
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	53
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	57
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	62
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students 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	65
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	58
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

ELA overall proficiency dropped 6 points, Math overall proficiency did not change and Math Learning Gains dropped one point, Biology dropped 7 points, and US History dropped 6 points. The LPQ students in ELA and Math both improved significantly

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Biology, US History, and ELA proficiency all had drops larger than one point.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

The entire Biology team is new this school year to Mandarin. Shifts have taken place in US History as well. The 9th grade ELA team was newer to the school last year. More math students are double blocked this school year.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

The LPQ students showed the most significant increases with 13 points improvement in both ELA and Math.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Concentrated effort and focus on making sure the needs of those students were being met through push in, small group pull out, and an analysis of standards based instruction

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Keep the push with Intensive Math and Reading courses and double blocking where available. Shifts in common planning and PLC focus based upon data and renewed focus on the alignment to the curriculum guides

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

An entire professional development plan was created over the summer that focuses on rotations through professional development sessions led by teachers and tailored to the changing needs of the school. School based instructional coach in place to develop teachers and assist in the support to all subject areas and developing pedagogy. Common planning agendas and PLC agendas submitted and approved each week to make sure all subjects are aligned over the course of the year.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Continued focus on supporting new teachers and utilizing teachers to lead the PD so they can take ownership and want to improve across the board.

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 Common Planning within high accountability content areas. The work done in common planning will result in standards based and aligned lessons, common assessments, and performance tasks to be utilized across the core content areas. Having these items in place will help to determine when a lesson is working or not and how to meet the needs of all students in those classes. The goal comes from the increase in scores from last year and to continue that focus and push in the high accountability areas.
Measurable Outcome:	90% + core content teachers will engage in standards-based, results-driven collaborative planning on a weekly basis alongside leadership team content area liaison.
Monitoring:	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:	Standards-based, consistent collaborative planning ensures that all students, in all core content classrooms, are equitably exposed to standards-aligned instruction, tasks and assessments.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Train new administration 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 bi-weekly Collaborative Planning sessions within core content areas, producing a product at the close of each session.
7. Development of Core Content PLC trainings emphasizing standards-based instructional practices and the ongoing use of data to drive instructional decision-making to be delivered bi-weekly
8. Engagement in the Instructional Review Process with District Staff on a consistent basis.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

For the 19-20 school year, the safe schools for Alex site show a moderate level of drug/public order incidents. We have been working very hard on campaigns with the district to curtail these behaviors.

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.

Dean of students works very closely with the district specialist on the PBIS plan and working toward model school status. We work hard to build a culture of restorative justice

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

All members of the SAC, all parents, all business partners, all faith based partners, all teachers, all staff, all students.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00