

APPENDIX II-6



MAGNET 2019-20

SCHOOL LEVEL QUARTERLY REPORT

SCHOOL NAME: Bonillas Traditional Elementary Magnet School	MAGNET THEME(S): Traditional Academics/Character Counts
---	--

MAGNET LEADERSHIP TEAM MEMBERS	
NAME	TITLE
Frank Schiavone	Principal
Christine Voelkel	Magnet Coordinator
Leticia Miranda Garcia	Curriculum Service Provider
James Christopher	Counselor
James Green	Dean of Students
Maria Bernardi	Ex Ed
Celeste Perrotta	5 th Grade teacher
Dianna Duran	4 th Grade teacher
Elizabeth Uriarte	3 rd Grade teacher
Natalie Baker	2 nd Grade teacher
Nicole Keel	1 st Grade teacher
Carissa Lamm	K Grade teacher

MAGNET LEADERSHIP TEAM MEETINGS	
DATE	# MINUTES MET
August 12, 2019	60
September 16, 2019	60
October 14, 2019	60
November 18, 2019	60
December 16, 2019	60
January 13, 2020	60
February 10, 2020	60



INTEGRATION

Recruitment: Record actions taken this quarter to support your integration goal. Include tours, phone inquiries, mailings, school visits, other recruitment activities conducted by your site. Include District recruitment events and mailings that were specific to your magnet program. Insert additional lines as needed. Keep appropriate documentation (recruitment log) on site for review.

COMMUNICATION

Activity: Recruitment Mailings/Fliers

(Record the # of school/district generated magnet mailings. Examples: 100 surveys to neighborhood parents, 500 open house postcards. Dropping off fliers at schools counts as mailings.)

Range	# Mailings/ Fliers	# of responses	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	0	0	No mailing sent
Quarter 2	1500/140	4	Open House postcards/Bonillas packets
Quarter 3/4	500	5	Bonillas packets
Totals	2140	9	

Activity: Recruitment Related Phone Calls

Range	#	# ParentLink (recruitment)	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	7	0	All families who made inquiries at the Sierra Ridge and Love of Literacy evenings were contacted.
Quarter 2	17	0	All families who made inquiries at TUSD Magnet Night and Dodge Middle School were contacted
Quarter 3/4	14	0	All families who made contact at TUSD Choice Nights and Jewish Community Center
Totals	38	0	

Activity: Retention Related Phone Calls

Range	#	# ParentLink (retention)	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	13	16	13 parents called our school to inquire about our program and if space is available. Of the 13, ten came and enrolled after school tour.



Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

INTEGRATION

Quarter 2	2	14	4 families contacted our school to set up tours; 3 registered their students. One cancelled tour.
Quarter 3/4	4	15	4 families contacted our school to set up tours; 3 registered students. ParentLinks were made regularly to inform community of updates
Totals	19	54	

Activity: Recruitment - Electronic Communication

Range	Outgoing e-mails	Incoming e-mails	Social media (ie: # posts)	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	0	0	21	We try to post at least 3 times per week, with different events happening at the school, reminders for families, and any special events. Facebook posts reached 2,734; 1903 engagements, 365 followers;
Quarter 2	0	0	14	Facebook posts reached 2330, 1812 engagements, 369 followers.
Quarter 3/4	0	0	22	Facebook posts reached 4,667, 2452 engagements, 386 followers
Totals	0	0	57	

Activity: Retention - Electronic Communication

Range	Outgoing e-mails	Incoming e-mails	Social media (ie: # posts)	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	3	0	21	We try to post at least 3 times per week, with different events happening at the school, reminders for families, and any special events. Facebook posts reached 2,734; 1903 engagements, 365 followers. The Principal sends out a monthly, bilingual letter to all parents through ParentLink
Quarter 2	3	0	14	Facebook posts reached 2330, 1812 engagements, 369 followers.
Quarter 3/4	4	0	22	Facebook posts reached 4,667, 2452 engagements, 386 followers
Totals	10	0	57	



INTEGRATION

RECRUITMENT ACTIVITIES AND EVENTS

Activity: On-Site Recruitment

(For example, open house, classes visiting from feeder schools, student shadowing)

Range	Activity	# of participants	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	Open House, Meet Your Teacher Event	256, 453	We count this as recruitment, because our best recruiters are happy parents
Quarter 2	Cultural Literacy Night, Open House	334, 10	We count this as recruitment, because our best recruiters are happy parents
Quarter 3/4	Open House	14	Science/Math Night postponed
Totals		1067	

Activity: Off-Site Recruitment

(For example, school visits, brochures left at a business or school, fliers posted at community centers. Do not include District recruitment events)

Range	Activity	# Brochures/ rack cards distributed	# of responses	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	Sienna Ridge Community Festival	5	1	One family expressed an interest in visiting Bonillas. We plan on having a solid recruitment push at the beginning of the new quarter
Quarter 2	Visited 18 preschools and churches; YMCA; Dodge Middle School Open House	300	4	It was a little discouraging that we only had four families at the Open House, two of whom are already Bonillas families, but it underscores that we need to connect with families on THEIR terms, THEIR schedules so we will be stressing school tours.
Quarter 3/4	Visited 26 preschools, churches and libraries	500	6	Six new families contacted school
Totals		805	11	

Activity: Tours

(Record the number of potential applicants. For example, if one parent comes for a tour with two potential student applicants, count the number as 2. Include shadowing.)

Magnet Program



MAGNET 2019-20

SCHOOL LEVEL QUARTERLY REPORT

SCHOOL NAME: Booth-Fickett K-8 Math/Science Magnet School	MAGNET THEME(S): Math and Science
--	--

MAGNET LEADERSHIP TEAM MEMBERS	
NAME	TITLE
Dr. Demetra Oliver-Baxter	Principal
Rhonda Burnett	Instructional Data Intervention Specialist Magnet Coordinator coverage for QTR 2 and QTR 3
Ms. Silva	K-5 CSP
Ms. Perez	6-8 CSP
Aaron Hornbuckle	Asst Principal
Amy Cannon	Asst Principal
Tiffany Powers	MTSS Facilitator



MAGNET 2019-20

SCHOOL LEVEL QUARTERLY REPORT

MAGNET LEADERSHIP TEAM MEETINGS	
DATE	# MINUTES MET
QTR 1	60
8/13/19	
8/20/19	60
8/27/19	60
9/3/19	60
9/10/19	60
9/17/19	60
9/24/19	60
10/1/19	60
QTR 2	45
10/15/19	
10/22/19	45
10/28/19	45
11/4/19	30
11/12/19	30
11/18/19	30
11/25/19	30
12/2/19	30
12/9/19	30
12/16/19	30

MAGNET 2019-20**SCHOOL LEVEL QUARTERLY REPORT**

Magnet Program



QTR 3	45
1/13/20	
1/27/20	45
2/3/20	45
2/10/20	45
2/17/20	45
2/24/20	45
3/2/20	30
3/9/20	45
Schools closed during Spring Break due to Covid 19 pandemic	
4/7/20 Zoom meeting	45
4/13/20 Zoom meeting	30
4/21/20 Zoom meeting	30
4/28/20 Zoom meeting	30
5/5/20 Zoom meeting	30
5/12/20 Zoom meeting	30
5/19/20 Zoom meeting	30
Last day of 19/20 SY 5/22/20	

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report**INTEGRATION**

Magnet Program



Recruitment: Record actions taken this quarter to support your integration goal. Include tours, phone inquiries, mailings, school visits, other recruitment activities conducted by your site. Include District recruitment events and mailings that were specific to your magnet program. Insert additional lines as needed. Keep appropriate documentation (recruitment log) on site for review.

COMMUNICATION**Activity: Recruitment Mailings/Fliers**

(Record the # of school/district generated magnet mailings. Examples: 100 surveys to neighborhood parents, 500 open house postcards. Dropping off fliers at schools counts as mailings.)

Range	# Mailings/ Fliers	# of responses	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	600/Flyers	100	Flyers mailed out for Orchestra and Band concerts
Quarter 2	~250	~115	FOR THIS RECRUITMENT / RETENTION SECTION: Community Liaison data was used because Booth-Fickett did not have a Magnet Coordinator for QRT 2 Retention- mailings to families for Honor Roll, Most Improved, School Character Pillars – 115 parents showed up for these events.
Quarter 3/4	400	300	This recruitment event was MEGA Night and we had about 300-350 people attend.
Totals	1250	515	

Activity: Recruitment Related Phone Calls

Range	#	# ParentLink (recruitment)	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	25	25	
Quarter 2	15	0	Follow up phone calls for recruitment events.
Quarter 3/4	10	5	Follow up calls from MEGA Night inquiries and ParentLink calls related to registration process.
Totals	50	30	

Activity: Retention Related Phone Calls

Range	#	# ParentLink (retention)	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	60	60	Called families who had students enrolled last year but were not registered for 2019-20.
Quarter 2	0	200	Science information meeting, Veteran's Day Celebration, 35 families were called and received food and clothing support for the Holiday Season;

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report**INTEGRATION**

Magnet Program



Quarter 3/4	40	300	MEGA Night preparation with 30 different outside vendors; parent calls
Totals	100	560	

Activity: Recruitment - Electronic Communication

Range	Outgoing e-mails	Incoming e-mails	Social media (ie: # posts)	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	1500	975	50	
Quarter 2	0	0	~10	Scheduled Booth-Fickett events
Quarter 3/4	30	25	50	MEGA Night preparation; all school and sporting events put on social media
Totals	1530	1000	110	

Activity: Retention - Electronic Communication

Range	Outgoing e-mails	Incoming e-mails	Social media (ie: # posts)	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	750	325	25	
Quarter 2	613	0	~10	School Quality Survey for students and staff completed; Science Information Night; Holiday party for families to pick up food boxes, gifts, and clothes donated for the Holidays; scheduled Booth=Fickett events
Quarter 3/4	700	300	12	Teachers and staff primarily communicated with students and families through email once school was closed in mid-March 2020 through the end of school in May 2020 due to the COVID 19 pandemic
Totals	2063	625	47	

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

INTEGRATION

Magnet Program



RECRUITMENT ACTIVITIES AND EVENTS

Activity: **On-Site Recruitment**

(For example, open house, classes visiting from feeder schools, student shadowing)

Range	Activity	# of participants	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	Orchestra and Band Concerts, Parent Teacher Conferences, Home Basketball and Volleyball games	900	School informational materials are visible and available at any before, during or after school event.
Quarter 2	K-5 Winter Performance	307	Future Booth-Fickett families were invited
Quarter 3/4	MEGA Night	350	All current students and families were invited and families that registered for 2020-2021 school year
Totals		1557	

Activity: **Off-Site Recruitment**

(For example, school visits, brochures left at a business or school, fliers posted at community centers. **Do not include District recruitment events**)

Range	Activity	# Brochures/ rack cards distributed	# of responses	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	Generations Church, Park Place Mall, Boys & Girls Club, Cane's, In & Out Burger, Chipotle, Egees, Domino's	450	75	Brochures and school informational materials left at partner organizations and businesses. Flyers are also posted where applicable.
Quarter 2	0	0	0	Only participated in District organized events; Magnet Coordinator role not filled yet
Quarter 3/4	0	0	0	Magnet Coordinator role not filled; Last day students were in school was March 13 th , 2020 due to COVID 19 pandemic
Totals		450	75	

Activity: **Tours**

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

INTEGRATION

Magnet Program



(Record the number of potential applicants. For example, if one parent comes for a tour with two potential student applicants, count the number as 2. Include shadowing.)

Range	# Students	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	12	There was a total of 18 campus tours given during this quarter.
Quarter 2	10	Completed 5 campus tours.
Quarter 3/4	4	Completed campus tours for students transferring to BF this semester.
Totals	26	

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report**INTEGRATION**

Magnet Program



Retention: Access the Synergy report “U-STU-2: Daily Enrollment by Student Demographics.” Use your Snipping Tool to take a screen of Day 40 SY 2018-19, Day 100 SY 2018-19, Day 40 2019-20, and Day 100 SY 2019-20. Insert the screens in the space below, then fill out the reflection (HINT: Shrink the Synergy window to 75%. Capture the date on top of the table as well.)

40 Day Student Daily Enrollment by Student Demographics

Daily Enrollment by Grade, Gender and USP Ethnicity**510 - Booth-Fickett Math/Science K-8 Magnet**

On: 09/27/2018 (Day 40 SY 2018-19)

Grade	White/Anglo		African American		Hispanic		Native American		Asian American		Multi-racial		Total		Total
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	
KG	4	5	0	3	5	11	1	0	0	1	2	1	12	21	33
	12.1%	15.2%	0.0%	9.1%	15.2%	33.3%	3.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.0%	6.1%	3.0%	36.4%	63.6%	
01	3	4	5	1	3	15	2	0	0	0	0	3	13	23	36
	8.3%	11.1%	13.9%	2.8%	8.3%	41.7%	5.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.3%	36.1%	63.9%	
02	6	4	4	3	10	9	0	1	0	1	0	0	20	18	38
	15.8%	10.5%	10.5%	7.9%	26.3%	23.7%	0.0%	2.6%	0.0%	2.6%	0.0%	0.0%	52.6%	47.4%	
03	1	4	6	4	7	7	0	1	0	0	3	2	17	18	35
	2.9%	11.4%	17.1%	11.4%	20.0%	20.0%	0.0%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	8.6%	5.7%	48.6%	51.4%	
04	5	8	6	7	17	14	0	1	0	0	2	3	30	33	63
	7.9%	12.7%	9.5%	11.1%	27.0%	22.2%	0.0%	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	3.2%	4.8%	47.6%	52.4%	
05	3	6	9	4	15	19	0	0	0	1	2	0	29	30	59
	5.1%	10.2%	15.3%	6.8%	25.4%	32.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%	3.4%	0.0%	49.2%	50.8%	
06	15	16	10	9	30	29	1	2	2	0	2	5	60	61	121
	12.4%	13.2%	8.3%	7.4%	24.8%	24.0%	0.8%	1.7%	1.7%	0.0%	1.7%	4.1%	49.6%	50.4%	
07	19	19	14	13	31	34	3	1	0	0	3	7	70	74	144
	13.2%	13.2%	9.7%	9.0%	21.5%	23.6%	2.1%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%	4.9%	48.6%	51.4%	
08	22	14	10	10	38	42	0	4	0	3	2	3	72	76	148
	14.9%	9.5%	6.8%	6.8%	25.7%	28.4%	0.0%	2.7%	0.0%	2.0%	1.4%	2.0%	48.6%	51.4%	
Total	78	80	64	54	156	180	7	10	2	6	16	24	323	354	677
	11.5%	11.8%	9.5%	8.0%	23.0%	26.6%	1.0%	1.5%	0.3%	0.9%	2.4%	3.5%	47.7%	52.3%	
	158		118		336		17		8		40		677		

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report**INTEGRATION**

Magnet Program

**Daily Enrollment by Grade, Gender and USP Ethnicity****510 - Booth-Fickett Math/Science K-8 Magnet**

On: 09/26/2019 (Day 40 SY 2019-20)

Grade	White/Anglo		African American		Hispanic		Native American		Asian American		Multi-racial		Total		Total
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	
KG	2	4	7	3	10	9	0	2	0	0	3	0	22	18	40
	5.0%	10.0%	17.5%	7.5%	25.0%	22.5%	0.0%	5.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.5%	0.0%	55.0%	45.0%	
01	1	3	0	4	10	11	1	0	0	0	1	1	13	19	32
	3.1%	9.4%	0.0%	12.5%	31.3%	34.4%	3.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.1%	3.1%	40.6%	59.4%	
02	2	4	2	1	3	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	22	29
	6.9%	13.8%	6.9%	3.4%	10.3%	55.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%	24.1%	75.9%	
03	3	3	6	2	12	10	1	1	0	0	1	0	23	16	39
	7.7%	7.7%	15.4%	5.1%	30.8%	25.6%	2.6%	2.6%	0.0%	0.0%	2.6%	0.0%	59.0%	41.0%	
04	1	2	8	5	11	6	0	1	0	0	4	3	24	17	41
	2.4%	4.9%	19.5%	12.2%	26.8%	14.6%	0.0%	2.4%	0.0%	0.0%	9.8%	7.3%	58.5%	41.5%	
05	4	9	5	7	18	16	0	1	0	0	1	3	28	36	64
	6.3%	14.1%	7.8%	10.9%	28.1%	25.0%	0.0%	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	1.6%	4.7%	43.8%	56.3%	
06	12	4	19	15	30	30	1	0	1	3	2	1	65	53	118
	10.2%	3.4%	16.1%	12.7%	25.4%	25.4%	0.8%	0.0%	0.8%	2.5%	1.7%	0.8%	55.1%	44.9%	
07	10	18	13	10	24	33	2	3	2	0	3	4	54	68	122
	8.2%	14.8%	10.7%	8.2%	19.7%	27.0%	1.6%	2.5%	1.6%	0.0%	2.5%	3.3%	44.3%	55.7%	
08	13	20	16	15	38	36	3	1	0	1	2	4	72	77	149
	8.7%	13.4%	10.7%	10.1%	25.5%	24.2%	2.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.7%	1.3%	2.7%	48.3%	51.7%	
Total	48	67	76	62	156	167	8	9	3	4	17	17	308	326	634
	7.6%	10.6%	12.0%	9.8%	24.6%	26.3%	1.3%	1.4%	0.5%	0.6%	2.7%	2.7%	48.6%	51.4%	
	115		136		323		17		7		34		634		

100 Day Student Daily Enrollment by Student Demographics

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

INTEGRATION

Magnet Program



Daily Enrollment by Grade, Gender and USP Ethnicity

510 - Booth-Fickett Math/Science K-8 Magnet

On: 01/17/2019 (Day 100 SY 2018-19)

Grade	White/Anglo		African American		Hispanic		Native American		Asian American		Multi-racial		Total		Total
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	
KG	2	6	1	2	6	10	1	0	0	2	3	1	13	21	34
	5.9%	17.6%	2.9%	5.9%	17.6%	29.4%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	5.9%	8.8%	2.9%	38.2%	61.8%	
01	3	4	5	1	3	14	2	0	0	0	0	2	13	21	34
	8.8%	11.8%	14.7%	2.9%	8.8%	41.2%	5.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.9%	38.2%	61.8%	
02	6	2	5	3	10	9	0	1	0	1	0	0	21	16	37
	16.2%	5.4%	13.5%	8.1%	27.0%	24.3%	0.0%	2.7%	0.0%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	56.8%	43.2%	
03	2	5	6	4	8	8	0	1	0	0	4	2	20	20	40
	5.0%	12.5%	15.0%	10.0%	20.0%	20.0%	0.0%	2.5%	0.0%	0.0%	10.0%	5.0%	50.0%	50.0%	
04	5	8	4	7	17	15	0	3	0	0	1	4	27	37	64
	7.8%	12.5%	6.3%	10.9%	26.6%	23.4%	0.0%	4.7%	0.0%	0.0%	1.6%	6.3%	42.2%	57.8%	
05	5	7	9	6	18	18	0	0	0	1	1	1	33	33	66
	7.6%	10.6%	13.6%	9.1%	27.3%	27.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%	1.5%	1.5%	50.0%	50.0%	
06	16	16	10	12	25	35	1	3	2	0	2	4	56	70	126
	12.7%	12.7%	7.9%	9.5%	19.8%	27.8%	0.8%	2.4%	1.6%	0.0%	1.6%	3.2%	44.4%	55.6%	
07	15	20	14	12	32	35	3	2	0	0	5	7	69	76	145
	10.3%	13.8%	9.7%	8.3%	22.1%	24.1%	2.1%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%	4.8%	47.6%	52.4%	
08	20	13	10	10	35	38	0	4	0	2	2	4	67	71	138
	14.5%	9.4%	7.2%	7.2%	25.4%	27.5%	0.0%	2.9%	0.0%	1.4%	1.4%	2.9%	48.6%	51.4%	
Total	74	81	64	57	154	182	7	14	2	6	18	25	319	365	684
	10.8%	11.8%	9.4%	8.3%	22.5%	26.6%	1.0%	2.0%	0.3%	0.9%	2.6%	3.7%	46.6%	53.4%	
	155		121		336		21		8		43		504		

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

INTEGRATION

Magnet Program



Daily Enrollment by Grade, Gender and USP Ethnicity

510 - Booth-Fickett Math/Science K-8 Magnet

On: 01/16/2020 (Day 100 SY 2019-20)

Grade	White/Anglo		African American		Hispanic		Native American		Asian American		Multi-racial		Total		Total
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	
KG	1	4	7	3	10	9	0	2	0	0	3	0	21	18	39
	2.6%	10.3%	17.9%	7.7%	25.6%	23.1%	0.0%	5.1%	0.0%	0.0%	7.7%	0.0%	53.8%	46.2%	
01	1	3	0	2	10	10	1	0	0	0	1	1	13	16	29
	3.4%	10.3%	0.0%	6.9%	34.5%	34.5%	3.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%	3.4%	44.8%	55.2%	
02	2	4	2	1	2	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	22	28
	7.1%	14.3%	7.1%	3.6%	7.1%	57.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.6%	21.4%	78.6%	
03	4	3	5	2	12	9	1	1	0	0	0	0	22	15	37
	10.8%	8.1%	13.5%	5.4%	32.4%	24.3%	2.7%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	59.5%	40.5%	
04	1	2	8	2	10	9	0	1	0	0	4	3	23	17	40
	2.5%	5.0%	20.0%	5.0%	25.0%	22.5%	0.0%	2.5%	0.0%	0.0%	10.0%	7.5%	57.5%	42.5%	
05	4	10	4	8	18	13	0	1	0	0	1	3	27	35	62
	6.5%	16.1%	6.5%	12.9%	29.0%	21.0%	0.0%	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	1.6%	4.8%	43.5%	56.5%	
06	12	6	19	12	29	33	1	0	1	3	2	1	64	55	119
	10.1%	5.0%	16.0%	10.1%	24.4%	27.7%	0.8%	0.0%	0.8%	2.5%	1.7%	0.8%	53.8%	46.2%	
07	11	18	10	9	24	35	2	4	2	0	2	4	51	70	121
	9.1%	14.9%	8.3%	7.4%	19.8%	28.9%	1.7%	3.3%	1.7%	0.0%	1.7%	3.3%	42.1%	57.9%	
08	12	22	16	13	37	38	3	1	0	1	3	4	71	79	150
	8.0%	14.7%	10.7%	8.7%	24.7%	25.3%	2.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.7%	2.0%	2.7%	47.3%	52.7%	
Total	48	72	71	52	152	172	8	10	3	4	16	17	298	327	625
	7.7%	11.5%	11.4%	8.3%	24.3%	27.5%	1.3%	1.6%	0.5%	0.6%	2.6%	2.7%	47.7%	52.3%	
	120		123		324		18		7		33		625		

2018-2019 Daily Enrollment by Student Demographics – 40 and 100 day Comparison

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

INTEGRATION

Magnet Program



Daily Enrollment by Grade, Gender and USP Ethnicity

510 - Booth-Fickett Math/Science K-8 Magnet

On: 09/27/2018 (Day 40 SY 2018-19)

Grade	White/Anglo		African American		Hispanic		Native American		Asian American		Multi-racial		Total		Total
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	
KG	4	5	0	3	5	11	1	0	0	1	2	1	12	21	33
	12.1%	15.2%	0.0%	9.1%	15.2%	33.3%	3.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.0%	6.1%	3.0%	36.4%	63.6%	
01	3	4	5	1	3	15	2	0	0	0	0	3	13	23	36
	8.3%	11.1%	13.9%	2.8%	8.3%	41.7%	5.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.3%	36.1%	63.9%	
02	6	4	4	3	10	9	0	1	0	1	0	0	20	18	38
	15.8%	10.5%	10.5%	7.9%	26.3%	23.7%	0.0%	2.6%	0.0%	2.6%	0.0%	0.0%	52.6%	47.4%	
03	1	4	6	4	7	7	0	1	0	0	3	2	17	18	35
	2.9%	11.4%	17.1%	11.4%	20.0%	20.0%	0.0%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	8.6%	5.7%	48.6%	51.4%	
04	5	8	6	7	17	14	0	1	0	0	2	3	30	33	63
	7.9%	12.7%	9.5%	11.1%	27.0%	22.2%	0.0%	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	3.2%	4.8%	47.6%	52.4%	
05	3	6	9	4	15	19	0	0	0	1	2	0	29	30	59
	5.1%	10.2%	15.3%	6.8%	25.4%	32.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%	3.4%	0.0%	49.2%	50.8%	
06	15	16	10	9	30	29	1	2	2	0	2	5	60	61	121
	12.4%	13.2%	8.3%	7.4%	24.8%	24.0%	0.8%	1.7%	1.7%	0.0%	1.7%	4.1%	49.6%	50.4%	
07	19	19	14	13	31	34	3	1	0	0	3	7	70	74	144
	13.2%	13.2%	9.7%	9.0%	21.5%	23.6%	2.1%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%	4.9%	48.6%	51.4%	
08	22	14	10	10	38	42	0	4	0	3	2	3	72	76	148
	14.9%	9.5%	6.8%	6.8%	25.7%	28.4%	0.0%	2.7%	0.0%	2.0%	1.4%	2.0%	48.6%	51.4%	
Total	78	80	64	54	156	180	7	10	2	6	16	24	323	354	677
	11.5%	11.8%	9.5%	8.0%	23.0%	26.6%	1.0%	1.5%	0.3%	0.9%	2.4%	3.5%	47.7%	52.3%	
	158		118		336		17		8		40		677		

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

INTEGRATION

Magnet Program



Daily Enrollment by Grade, Gender and USP Ethnicity

510 - Booth-Fickett Math/Science K-8 Magnet

On: 01/17/2019 (Day 100 SY 2018-19)

Grade	White/Anglo		African American		Hispanic		Native American		Asian American		Multi-racial		Total		Total
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	
KG	2	6	1	2	6	10	1	0	0	2	3	1	13	21	34
	5.9%	17.6%	2.9%	5.9%	17.6%	29.4%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	5.9%	8.8%	2.9%	38.2%	61.8%	
01	3	4	5	1	3	14	2	0	0	0	0	2	13	21	34
	8.8%	11.8%	14.7%	2.9%	8.8%	41.2%	5.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.9%	38.2%	61.8%	
02	6	2	5	3	10	9	0	1	0	1	0	0	21	16	37
	16.2%	5.4%	13.5%	8.1%	27.0%	24.3%	0.0%	2.7%	0.0%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	56.8%	43.2%	
03	2	5	6	4	8	8	0	1	0	0	4	2	20	20	40
	5.0%	12.5%	15.0%	10.0%	20.0%	20.0%	0.0%	2.5%	0.0%	0.0%	10.0%	5.0%	50.0%	50.0%	
04	5	8	4	7	17	15	0	3	0	0	1	4	27	37	64
	7.8%	12.5%	6.3%	10.9%	26.6%	23.4%	0.0%	4.7%	0.0%	0.0%	1.6%	6.3%	42.2%	57.8%	
05	5	7	9	6	18	18	0	0	0	1	1	1	33	33	66
	7.6%	10.6%	13.6%	9.1%	27.3%	27.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%	1.5%	1.5%	50.0%	50.0%	
06	16	16	10	12	25	35	1	3	2	0	2	4	56	70	126
	12.7%	12.7%	7.9%	9.5%	19.8%	27.8%	0.8%	2.4%	1.6%	0.0%	1.6%	3.2%	44.4%	55.6%	
07	15	20	14	12	32	35	3	2	0	0	5	7	69	76	145
	10.3%	13.8%	9.7%	8.3%	22.1%	24.1%	2.1%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%	4.8%	47.6%	52.4%	
08	20	13	10	10	35	38	0	4	0	2	2	4	67	71	138
	14.5%	9.4%	7.2%	7.2%	25.4%	27.5%	0.0%	2.9%	0.0%	1.4%	1.4%	2.9%	48.6%	51.4%	
Total	74	81	64	57	154	182	7	14	2	6	18	25	319	365	684
	10.8%	11.8%	9.4%	8.3%	22.5%	26.6%	1.0%	2.0%	0.3%	0.9%	2.6%	3.7%	46.6%	53.4%	
	155		121		336		21		8		43		504		

2019-2020 Daily Enrollment by Student Demographics – 40 and 100 day Comparison



MAGNET 2019-20

SCHOOL LEVEL QUARTERLY REPORT

SCHOOL NAME: Borton Elementary Magnet	MAGNET THEME(S): Project Based Learning & Systems Thinking
--	---

MAGNET LEADERSHIP TEAM MEMBERS	
NAME	TITLE
Denice Contreras	Principal
Jessica Redondo	Magnet Coordinator
Jacqueline Wiseley	Kinder Teacher
Jenna Horist	1 st Grade Teacher
Metta Franklin	2 nd Grade Teacher
Katie Fouts	3 rd Grade Teacher
Tia Begay-Tsosie	4 th Grade Teacher
Leah Spencer	5 th Grade Teacher
Rachel Carpenter	5 th Grade Teacher
Rhonda Rhudy	Curriculum Service Provider
Mariana Vasquez-Maloney	Counselor

MAGNET LEADERSHIP TEAM MEETINGS	
DATE	# MINUTES MET
September 5, 2019	60
September 30, 2019	60
October 1, 2019	60
November 7, 2019	60
December 3, 2019	60
February 4, 2020	60
March 3, 2020	60



Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

INTEGRATION

Recruitment: Record actions taken this quarter to support your integration goal. Include tours, phone inquiries, mailings, school visits, other recruitment activities conducted by your site. Include District recruitment events and mailings that were specific to your magnet program. Insert additional lines as needed. Keep appropriate documentation (recruitment log) on site for review.

COMMUNICATION

Activity: Recruitment Mailings/Fliers

(Record the # of school/district generated magnet mailings. Examples: 100 surveys to neighborhood parents, 500 open house postcards. Dropping off fliers at schools counts as mailings.)

Range	# Mailings/ Fliers	# of responses	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	0	0	
Quarter 2	4486	0	Mailings/flyers were contained information about touring Borton and Open House.
Quarter 3/4	0	0	
Totals	4486	0	Goal is to generate a mailing this quarter, before the January lottery to increase tours.

Activity: Recruitment Related Phone Calls

Range	#	# ParentLink (recruitment)	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	1	0	Calling families that had interest in touring Borton at district recruitment events.
Quarter 2	3	0	
Quarter 3/4	0	0	
Totals	4	0	

Activity: Retention Related Phone Calls

Range	#	# ParentLink (retention)	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	0	11	
Quarter 2	0	4	Borton Events
Quarter 3/4	4	7	Borton Events
Totals	4	22	

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report**INTEGRATION**

Magnet Programs

**Activity: Recruitment - Electronic Communication**

Range	Outgoing e-mails	Incoming e-mails	Social media (ie: # posts)	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	3	0	90	Emailing families that had interest in touring Borton from recruitment events. Social media posts are on Facebook and Instagram.
Quarter 2	30	10	94	Emailing families that had interest in touring Borton from recruitment events. Social media posts are on Facebook and Instagram.
Quarter 3/4	19	19	86	Emailing families that had interest in touring Borton from recruitment events. Social media posts are on Facebook and Instagram.
Totals	52	29	270	

Activity: Retention - Electronic Communication

Range	Outgoing e-mails	Incoming e-mails	Social media (ie: # posts)	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	3	3	90	Social media posts are on Facebook and Instagram.
Quarter 2	2	0	94	Social media posts are on Facebook and Instagram.
Quarter 3/4	0	0	86	Social media posts are on Facebook and Instagram.
Totals	5	3	270	



Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

INTEGRATION

RECRUITMENT ACTIVITIES AND EVENTS

Activity: On-Site Recruitment

(For example, open house, classes visiting from feeder schools, student shadowing)

Range	Activity	# of participants	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	None	0	As an elementary school, we do not have classes visiting from feeder schools or student shadowing.
Quarter 2	None	0	
Quarter 3/4	1	0	Open House was scheduled for March 24 th and canceled due to pandemic.
Totals	1	0	

Activity: Off-Site Recruitment

(For example, school visits, brochures left at a business or school, fliers posted at community centers. **Do not include District recruitment events**)

Range	Activity	# Brochures/ rack cards distributed	# of responses	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	None	0		
Quarter 2	Brichta ELC	20	2	
Quarter 3/4	Schumaker ELC, Head Start	28	3	4 th quarter off-site recruitment was canceled due to pandemic.
Totals	3	48	5	Goal is to visit area preschools to increase tours/possible applicants.

Activity: Tours

(Record the number of potential applicants. For example, if one parent comes for a tour with two potential student applicants, count the number as 2. Include shadowing.)

Range	# Students	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	6	This is 7 less potential applicants compared to Q1 in 18.19SY.
Quarter 2	19	
Quarter 3/4	14	
Totals	39	Goal is to visit area preschools, before the January lottery to increase tours/possible applicants.



Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

INTEGRATION

Retention: Access the Synergy report “U-STU-2: Daily Enrollment by Student Demographics.” **ENTRY GRADE / ALL GRADES**

STUDENT RETENTION

Are there any noteworthy differences or trends that you notice when analyzing this data?

Reflection:

Our enrollment currently remains stable across all ethnicities. Enrollment went down by 14 students from the 40th day of school to the 100th day of school. This is less than our 100th day in 2019 when we dropped by 40 students. The decline in students had little effect on the percentage of each ethnicity. As of the 100th day of school, population of 354 students consists of 59.3% Hispanic, 25.1% White, 10.2% African American, 3.1% Native American, 0.3% Asian American and 2.0% Multi-racial.

Daily Enrollment by Grade, Gender and USP Ethnicity

143 - Borton Magnet Elementary

On: 09/27/2018 (Day 40 SY 2018-19)

Grade	White/Anglo		African American		Hispanic		Native American		Asian American		Multi-racial		Total		
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	Total
KG	3	16	6	4	15	22	0	0	0	2	1	1	25	45	70
	4.3%	22.9%	8.6%	5.7%	21.4%	31.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.9%	1.4%	1.4%	35.7%	64.3%	
01	9	8	2	2	15	19	1	2	1	0	0	0	28	31	59
	15.3%	13.6%	3.4%	3.4%	25.4%	32.2%	1.7%	3.4%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	47.5%	52.5%	
02	6	7	2	6	18	21	2	2	0	0	0	1	28	37	65
	9.2%	10.8%	3.1%	9.2%	27.7%	32.3%	3.1%	3.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%	43.1%	56.9%	
03	5	12	3	3	15	26	1	1	0	0	1	0	25	42	67
	7.5%	17.9%	4.5%	4.5%	22.4%	38.8%	1.5%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%	0.0%	37.3%	62.7%	
04	8	9	5	1	20	29	1	1	1	0	0	0	35	40	75
	10.7%	12.0%	6.7%	1.3%	26.7%	38.7%	1.3%	1.3%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	46.7%	53.3%	
05	15	3	3	2	21	23	1	0	0	0	3	1	43	29	72
	20.8%	4.2%	4.2%	2.8%	29.2%	31.9%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.2%	1.4%	59.7%	40.3%	
Total	46	55	21	18	104	140	6	6	2	2	5	3	184	224	408
	11.3%	13.5%	5.1%	4.4%	25.5%	34.3%	1.5%	1.5%	0.5%	0.5%	1.2%	0.7%	45.1%	54.9%	
	101		39		244		12		4		8		408		
	24.8%		9.6%		59.8%		2.9%		1.0%		2.0%		100.0%		

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report**INTEGRATION**

Magnet Programs

**Daily Enrollment by Grade, Gender and USP Ethnicity****143 - Borton Magnet Elementary**

On: 09/26/2019 (Day 40 SY 2019-20)

Grade	White/Anglo		African American		Hispanic		Native American		Asian American		Multi-racial		Total		Total
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	
KG	8	6	3	3	12	19	1	0	0	0	2	0	26	28	54
	14.8%	11.1%	5.6%	5.6%	22.2%	35.2%	1.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.7%	0.0%	48.1%	51.9%	
01	5	17	6	3	15	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	27	41	68
	7.4%	25.0%	8.8%	4.4%	22.1%	29.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%	1.5%	39.7%	60.3%	
02	7	6	2	3	16	15	1	1	0	0	0	0	26	25	51
	13.7%	11.8%	3.9%	5.9%	31.4%	29.4%	2.0%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	51.0%	49.0%	
03	8	7	1	4	17	22	2	2	0	0	0	1	28	36	64
	12.5%	10.9%	1.6%	6.3%	26.6%	34.4%	3.1%	3.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.6%	43.8%	56.3%	
04	4	9	3	3	15	27	1	1	0	0	1	0	24	40	64
	6.3%	14.1%	4.7%	4.7%	23.4%	42.2%	1.6%	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	1.6%	0.0%	37.5%	62.5%	
05	5	8	5	1	18	27	0	1	1	0	0	1	29	38	67
	7.5%	11.9%	7.5%	1.5%	26.9%	40.3%	0.0%	1.5%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%	43.3%	56.7%	
Total	37	53	20	17	93	130	5	5	1	0	4	3	160	208	368
	10.1%	14.4%	5.4%	4.6%	25.3%	35.3%	1.4%	1.4%	0.3%	0.0%	1.1%	0.8%	43.5%	56.5%	
	90		37		223		10		1		7		368		
	24.5%		10.1%		60.6%		2.7%		0.3%		1.9%		100.0%		



MAGNET 2019-20

SCHOOL LEVEL QUARTERLY REPORT

SCHOOL NAME: Carrillo K-5 Magnet School	MAGNET THEME(S): Communication and Creative Arts
--	---

MAGNET LEADERSHIP TEAM MEMBERS	
NAME	TITLE
Lori Conner	Principal
Robert Villanueva	Magnet Coordinator
Barbara De Lorenzo	5 th Grade Teacher
Monique Peralta	4 th Grade Teacher
Cynthia Maldonado	3 rd Grade Teacher
Carmen Barraza	2 nd Grade Teacher
Yvette Herrera	1 st Grade Teacher
Celina Morales	Kinder Teacher
Keira Espinosa	Exceptional Ed Teacher
Mary Kolsrud	Reading Specialist
Jon Matsushino	Technology Teacher
Savanna Herrera	Music Performance Teacher

MAGNET LEADERSHIP TEAM MEETINGS	
DATE	# MINUTES MET
10-23-19	30 min
11-13-19	30 min
11-27-19	30 min
12-4-19	30 min
1-8-20	30 min
1-22-20	30 min
2-5-20	30 min
2-19-20	30 min
3-4-20	30 min

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report**INTEGRATION**

Magnet Program



Recruitment: Record actions taken this quarter to support your integration goal. Include tours, phone inquiries, mailings, school visits, other recruitment activities conducted by your site. Include District recruitment events and mailings that were specific to your magnet program. Insert additional lines as needed. Keep appropriate documentation (recruitment log) on site for review.

COMMUNICATION**Activity: Recruitment Mailings/Fliers**

(Record the # of school/district generated mailings. Examples: 100 surveys to neighborhood parents, 500 open house postcards. Dropping off fliers at schools counts as mailings.

Range	# Mailings/ Fliers	# of responses	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	220	15	Daycares/Preschools parents scheduling tours from flyers dropped off at their centers.
Quarter 2	215	13	Daycares/Preschools parents scheduling tours from flyers dropped off at their centers.
Quarter 3/4	220	16	Daycares/Preschools parents scheduling tours from flyers dropped off at their centers.
Totals	655	44	

Activity: Recruitment Related Phone Calls

Range	#	# ParentLink (recruitment)	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	45		Calls went out to families who are interested in coming to Carrillo. Worked to schedule tours to our school.
Quarter 2	65		Calls went out to families who are interested in coming to Carrillo. Worked to schedule tours to our school.
Quarter 3/4	75		Calls went out to families who are interested in coming to Carrillo. Worked to schedule tours to our school.
Totals	185		

Activity: Retention Related Phone Calls

Range	#	# ParentLink (retention)	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	8		Parents had questions about having to reapply if there already accepted into Carrillo.
Quarter 2	11		Parents had questions about having to reapply if there already accepted into Carrillo.
Quarter 3/4	15		Parents had questions about having to reapply if there already accepted into Carrillo.

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report**INTEGRATION**

Magnet Program



Totals	34		
--------	----	--	--

Activity: Recruitment - Electronic Communication				
Range	Outgoing e-mails	Incoming e-mails	Social media (ie: # posts)	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	11	11	#literacynight #fallfestival #communicatioandcreativearts	Invited parents to attend Lit night and Fall festival. Had them follow us on social media.
Quarter 2	15	15	#createday #lasposadas #santacomestocarrillo #communicatioandcreativearts	Invited families to attend Create Day, Las Posadas, and Santa Comes to Carrillo. Had prospective families follow us on social media.
Quarter 3/4	20	20	#starparty #fitnessday #mathandsciencenight #communicatioandcreativearts	
Totals	46	46		
Activity: Retention - Electronic Communication				
Range	Outgoing e-mails	Incoming e-mails	Social media (ie: # posts)	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	4	4		Parents emailing about reapplication process.
Quarter 2	8	8		Parents emailing about reapplication process.
Quarter 3/4	14	14		Parents emailing about reapplication process.
Totals	26	26		

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

INTEGRATION

Magnet Program



RECRUITMENT ACTIVITIES AND EVENTS

Activity: On-Site Recruitment

(For example, open house, classes visiting from feeder schools, student shadowing)

Range	Activity	# of participants	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	Open House	525	Spoke to parents about referring families to Carrillo for the 2019-2020 school year.
Quarter 2	Fall Festival	185	Spoke to parents about referring families to Carrillo for the 2019-2020 school year.
Quarter 3/4	Kinder Roundup	52	Spoke to parents about referring families to Carrillo for the 2019-2020 school year.
Totals	3	762	

Activity: Off-Site Recruitment

(For example, school visits, brochures left at a business or school, fliers posted at community centers. Do not include District recruitment events)

Range	Activity	# Brochures/ rack cards distributed	# of responses	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	Daycare/Preschool Recruiting	220	15	Daycares/Preschools parents setting up tours from flyers dropped off at their centers.
Quarter 2	Daycare/Preschool Recruiting	215	13	Daycares/Preschools parents setting up tours from flyers dropped off at their centers.
Quarter 3/4	Daycare/Preschool Recruiting	210	15	
Totals	3	645	43	

Activity: Tours

(Record the number of potential applicants. For example, if one parent comes for a tour with two potential student applicants, count the number as 2. Include shadowing.)

Range	# Students	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	14	
Quarter 2	32	
Quarter 3/4	34	
Totals	80	

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

INTEGRATION

Magnet Program



Retention: Access the Synergy report “U-STU-2: Daily Enrollment by Student Demographics.” **ENTRY GRADE / ALL GRADES**

STUDENT RETENTION

Are there any noteworthy differences or trends that you notice when analyzing this data?

Reflection: We are a fully integrated school! Our recruiting plan began five years ago as we targeted incoming kindergarten students. Our goal was to reduce the Hispanic population to under 70%, which is currently at 64.9%. We have been successful in recruiting new families to Carrillo and retaining them. Our retention rate is 96% for students who enter Carrillo at the kindergarten level and remain until 5th grade promotion. We will continue to target incoming kindergarten families to keep our integration balanced by ethnicity.

CDaily Enrollment by Grade, Gender and USP Ethnicity

161 - Carrillo K-5 Magnet

On: 04/01/2020 (Day 145 SY 2019-20)

Grade	White/Anglo		African American		Hispanic		Native American		Asian American		Multi-racial		Total		
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	Total
KG	4	5	1	1	17	21	3	1	1	0	1	0	27	28	55
	7.3%	9.1%	1.8%	1.8%	30.9%	38.2%	5.5%	1.8%	1.8%	0.0%	1.8%	0.0%	49.1%	50.9%	
01	8	3	3	3	16	14	3	1	0	0	0	0	30	21	51
	15.7%	5.9%	5.9%	5.9%	31.4%	27.5%	5.9%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	58.8%	41.2%	
02	7	2	2	4	12	20	1	1	0	1	1	0	23	28	51
	13.7%	3.9%	3.9%	7.8%	23.5%	39.2%	2.0%	2.0%	0.0%	2.0%	2.0%	0.0%	45.1%	54.9%	
03	6	10	0	4	24	14	0	0	0	0	3	0	33	28	61
	9.8%	16.4%	0.0%	6.6%	39.3%	23.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.9%	0.0%	54.1%	45.9%	
04	4	5	2	1	15	14	0	2	1	0	0	1	22	23	45
	8.9%	11.1%	4.4%	2.2%	33.3%	31.1%	0.0%	4.4%	2.2%	0.0%	0.0%	2.2%	48.9%	51.1%	
05	6	3	0	4	20	17	3	0	0	0	0	1	29	25	54
	11.1%	5.6%	0.0%	7.4%	37.0%	31.5%	5.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%	53.7%	46.3%	
Total	35	28	8	17	104	100	10	5	2	1	5	2	164	153	317
	11.0%	8.8%	2.5%	5.4%	32.8%	31.5%	3.2%	1.6%	0.6%	0.3%	1.6%	0.6%	51.7%	48.3%	
	63		25		204		15		3		7		317		
	19.9%		7.9%		64.4%		4.7%		0.9%		2.2%		100.0%		

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

INTEGRATION

Magnet Program



Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

INTEGRATION

Magnet Program



Theme Visibility: Theme Visibility is not an emphasis area for SY 2019-20; however, it still plays an important role in establishing the culture and climate of each site.


THEME VISIBILITY

Review the components found in the table below. Shade the box for each quarter for components that are strengths for your site in **green**. In the non-shaded boxes, identify what steps will be taken to ensure that this is addressed. Goal: Increase theme visibility from Q1 to Q4.

Component	Q1	Q2	Q3/Q4	Goal for 2020/21
Current magnet theme is evident on exterior of building/grounds.	Complete	Complete	Complete	Continue displaying theme.
Magnet school name is given in phone greeting.	Complete	Complete	Complete	Continue displaying theme.
Magnet theme is evident in main office.	Complete	Complete	Complete	Continue displaying theme.
Magnet theme is evident in common areas.	Complete	Complete	Complete	Continue displaying theme.
Magnet theme is evident in hallways/display areas in posted student work	Complete	Complete	Complete	Continue displaying theme.
Magnet theme is noted in school communications/media.	Complete	Complete	Complete	Continue displaying theme.
Teachers have specific areas of the campus and facility for magnet activities/lessons/presentations	Complete	Complete	Complete	Continue displaying theme.
Magnet theme is incorporated into the school's mission/vision statement.	Complete	Complete	Complete	Continue displaying theme.
Evidence of family/community engagement/partnerships.	Complete	Complete	Complete	Continue displaying theme.



STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Directions: Use SchoolCity to access Report “**Summary**” data for each of the grade levels tested during Benchmark 1. Use the  Snipping Tool to take a screen shot of each grade level for Math and ELA, then fill out the Reflection box. Make sure to capture both Tucson Unified average scores and your school’s average scores for each grade level and subject area. Please delete any non-applicable grades from the table.

ELA – Q1 BENCHMARK

Are there any noteworthy differences or trends that you notice in comparing Benchmark achievement between your school and the District for ELA? What strategies or action steps are being employed to address these differences/trends (if applicable)?

- **Reflection:** All grade levels scored above TUSD. Percentages above district average are as follows: 2nd grade scored 14.3%, 3rd grade scored 4.8%, 4th grade scored 5.3 %, and 5th grade scored 16.7%. We will continue with our small group interventions, guided reading, Read Naturally Program and our whole group instructions. We will continue guided reading using Benchmark Advance combined with Harcourt. Our reading interventionist will continue Tier 3 interventions using the Wilson reading system.

ELA – Q1 Benchmark Data

Insert screen shots in the appropriate boxes below. Delete any rows that are not applicable to your site

1718.TUSD.ELA.02.Q1Benchmark

By Grade	# Tested	Participation Rate	Avg. RS	Avg. % Correct	Avg. TS	Minimally Proficient			Partially Proficient			Proficient			Highly Proficient	
						%	Avg. TS	#	%	Avg. TS	#	%	Avg. TS	#	%	
Tucson Unified School District	2606	80.0%	11.6	46.5%	33:47	36.1%	29:28	584	22.4%	34:38	726	27.9%	36:41	356	13.7%	
CARRILLO	48	92.3%	15.2	60.8%	40:30	6.3%	40:40	12	25%	42:53	24	50%	37:59	9	18.8%	
Grade 2	48	1.5%	15.2	60.8%	40:30	6.3%	40:40	12	25%	42:53	24	50%	37:59	9	18.8%	

1718.TUSD.ELA.03.Q1Benchmark

By Grade	# Tested	Participation Rate	Avg. RS	Avg. % Correct	Avg. TS	Minimally Proficient			Partially Proficient			Proficient			Highly Proficient	
						#	%	Avg. TS	#	%	Avg. TS	#	%	Avg. TS	#	%
Tucson Unified School District	2872	84.2%	11.9	39.5%	52:46	1033	36%	46:30	653	22.7%	54:26	832	29%	59:07	354	12.3%
CARRILLO	56	91.8%	13.3	44.3%	59:02	14	25%	57:55	12	21.4%	64:29	20	35.7%	59:36	10	17.9%
Grade 3	56	1.7%	13.3	44.3%	59:02	14	25%	57:55	12	21.4%	64:29	20	35.7%	59:36	10	17.9%

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT



1718.TUSD.ELA.04.Q1Benchmark																		
By Grade	# Tested	Participation Rate	Avg. RS	Avg. % Correct	Avg. TS	Minimally Proficient			Partially Proficient			Proficient			Highly Proficient			
						#	%	Avg. TS	#	%	Avg. TS	#	%	Avg. TS	#	%		
Tucson Unified School District	2786	84.4%	15.5	51.8%	52.03	1035	37.2%	49.08	590	21.2%	56.08	784	28.1%	54.29	377	13.5%		
CARRILLO	41	93.2%	17.1	57.1%	59.23	9	22%	71.16	10	24.4%	56.32	16	39%	54.47	6	14.6%		
Grade 4	41	1.3%	17.1	57.1%	59.23	9	22%	71.16	10	24.4%	56.32	16	39%	54.47	6	14.6%		

1718.TUSD.ELA.05.Q1Benchmark																		
By Grade	# Tested	Participation Rate	Avg. RS	Avg. % Correct	Avg. TS	Minimally Proficient			Partially Proficient			Proficient			Highly Proficient			
						#	%	Avg. TS	#	%	Avg. TS	#	%	Avg. TS	#	%		
Tucson Unified School District	3019	84.6%	17.5	58.2%	57.09	1145	37.9%	53.02	558	18.5%	62.53	1002	33.2%	59.35	314	10.4%		
CARRILLO	51	94.4%	22.5	74.9%	91.22	4	7.8%	146.05	9	17.6%	67.31	25	49%	94.41	13	25.5%		
Grade 5	51	1.4%	22.5	74.9%	91.22	4	7.8%	146.05	9	17.6%	67.31	25	49%	94.41	13	25.5%		

1718.TUSD.ELA.06.Q1Benchmark																		

1718.TUSD.ELA.07.Q1Benchmark																		

1718.TUSD.ELA.08.Q1Benchmark																		

1718.TUSD.ELA.09.Q1Benchmark																		

1718.TUSD.ELA.10.Q1Benchmark																		

ELA – Q2 BENCHMARK

Are there any noteworthy differences or trends that you notice in comparing Benchmark achievement between your school and the District for ELA? What strategies or action steps are being employed to address these differences/trends (if applicable)? Have these differences changed from the previous benchmark?

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT



Reflection: All grade levels scored above TUSD. Percentages above district average are as follows: 2nd grade scored 14.8%, 3rd grade scored 7.7%, 4th grade scored 9.3 %, and 5th grade scored 9.6%. We will continue with our small group interventions, guided reading, Read Naturally Program and our whole group instructions. We will continue guided reading using Benchmark Advance combined with Harcourt. Our reading interventionist will continue Tier 3 interventions using the Wilson reading system.

ELA – Q2 Benchmark Data

Insert screen shots in the appropriate boxes below. Delete any rows that are not applicable to your site

1718.TUSD.ELA.02.Q2Benchmark

By Grade ▲	# Tested ⚡	Participation Rate ⚡	Avg. RS ⚡	Avg. % Correct ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡	Proficient			Not Proficient		
						# ⚡	% ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡	# ⚡	% ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡
Tucson Unified School District	2548	77.5%	14.6	58.3%	28.54	1023	40.1%	29.45	1525	59.9%	28.20
CARRILLO	48	92.3%	18.1	72.5%	35.28	34	70.8%	34.31	14	29.2%	37.46
Grade 2	48	1.5%	18.1	72.5%	35.28	34	70.8%	34.31	14	29.2%	37.46

1718.TUSD.ELA.03.Q2Benchmark

By Grade ▲	# Tested ⚡	Participation Rate ⚡	Avg. RS ⚡	Avg. % Correct ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡	Proficient			Not Proficient		
						# ⚡	% ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡	# ⚡	% ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡
Tucson Unified School District	2863	84.1%	11.3	37.7%	59.19	1151	40.2%	64.40	1712	59.8%	55.44
CARRILLO	56	91.8%	14.8	49.5%	68.20	37	66.1%	66.09	19	33.9%	72.34
Grade 3	56	1.7%	14.8	49.5%	68.20	37	66.1%	66.09	19	33.9%	72.34

1718.TUSD.ELA.04.Q2Benchmark

By Grade ▲	# Tested ⚡	Participation Rate ⚡	Avg. RS ⚡	Avg. % Correct ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡	Proficient			Not Proficient		
						# ⚡	% ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡	# ⚡	% ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡
Tucson Unified School District	2784	83.9%	15.8	52.8%	58.57	1145	41.1%	58.25	1639	58.9%	59.20
CARRILLO	41	93.2%	17.1	57%	76.17	20	48.8%	77.59	21	51.2%	74.40
Grade 4	41	1.3%	17.1	57%	76.17	20	48.8%	77.59	21	51.2%	74.40

1718.TUSD.ELA.05.Q2Benchmark

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT



By Grade ▲	# Tested ▲	Participation Rate ▲	Avg. RS ▲	Avg. % Correct ▲	Proficient		Not Proficient	
					# ▲	% ▲	# ▲	% ▲
Tucson Unified School District	3016	84.8%	14.8	49.3%	1192	39.5%	1824	60.5%
CARRILLO	51	94.4%	18.8	62.8%	41	80.4%	10	19.6%
Grade 5	51	1.5%	18.8	62.8%	41	80.4%	10	19.6%
1718.TUSD.ELA.06.Q2Benchmark								
1718.TUSD.ELA.07.Q2Benchmark								
1718.TUSD.ELA.08.Q2Benchmark								
1718.TUSD.ELA.09.Q2Benchmark								
1718.TUSD.ELA.10.Q2Benchmark								

ELA – Q3 BENCHMARK

Are there any noteworthy differences or trends that you notice in comparing Benchmark achievement between your school and the District for ELA? What strategies or action steps are being employed to address these differences/trends (if applicable)? Have these differences changed from the previous benchmarks?

Reflection: All grade levels scored above TUSD. Percentages above district average are as follows: 2nd grade scored 9.5%, 3rd grade scored 4.5%, 4th grade scored 15.2%, and 5th grade scored 12.5%. We will continue with our small group interventions, guided reading, Read Naturally Program and our whole group instructions. We will continue guided reading using Benchmark Advance combined with Harcourt. Our reading interventionist will continue Tier 3 interventions using the Wilson reading system.

ELA – Q3 Benchmark Data

Insert screen shots in the appropriate boxes below. Delete any rows that are not applicable to your site

1718.TUSD.ELA.02.Q3Benchmark

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT



By Grade ▲	# Tested ⚡	Participation Rate ⚡	Avg. RS ⚡	Avg. % Correct ⚡	Proficient		Not Proficient	
					# ⚡	% ⚡	# ⚡	% ⚡
Tucson Unified School District	2816	86.1%	12.8	51.1% ■	1099	39% ■	1717	61% ■
CARRILLO	48	94.1%	15.1	60.6% ■	30	62.5% ■	18	37.5% ■
Grade 2	48	1.5%	15.1	60.6% ■	30	62.5% ■	18	37.5% ■

1718.TUSD.ELA.03.Q3Benchmark

By Grade ▲	# Tested ⚡	Participation Rate ⚡	Avg. RS ⚡	Avg. % Correct ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡	Avg. SS ⚡	Proficient			Not Proficient		
							# ⚡	% ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡	# ⚡	% ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡
Tucson Unified School District	3026	88.7%	13.3	44.5% ■	64.26	2502.4	1283	42.4% ■	66.20	1743	57.6% ■	63.02
CARRILLO	56	91.8%	14.7	49% ■	70.11	2507.9	26	46.4% ■	66.06	30	53.6% ■	73.44
Grade 3	56	1.7%	14.7	49% ■	70.11	2507.9	26	46.4% ■	66.06	30	53.6% ■	73.44

1718.TUSD.ELA.04.Q3Benchmark

By Grade ▲	# Tested ⚡	Participation Rate ⚡	Avg. RS ⚡	Avg. % Correct ⚡	Proficient		Not Proficient	
					# ⚡	% ⚡	# ⚡	% ⚡
Tucson Unified School District	2971	89.6%	13.9	46.4% ■	1188	40% ■	1783	60% ■
CARRILLO	41	91.1%	18.5	61.6% ■	28	68.3% ■	13	31.7% ■
Grade 4	41	1.3%	18.5	61.6% ■	28	68.3% ■	13	31.7% ■

1718.TUSD.ELA.05.Q3Benchmark

By Grade ▲	# Tested ⚡	Participation Rate ⚡	Avg. RS ⚡	Avg. % Correct ⚡	Proficient		Not Proficient	
					# ⚡	% ⚡	# ⚡	% ⚡
Tucson Unified School District	3183	89.3%	15.8	52.5% ■	1151	36.2% ■	2032	63.8% ■
CARRILLO	51	94.4%	19.5	65% ■	28	54.9% ■	23	45.1% ■
Grade 5	51	1.4%	19.5	65% ■	28	54.9% ■	23	45.1% ■

1718.TUSD.ELA.06.Q3Benchmark



Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

1718.TUSD.ELA.07.Q3Benchmark
1718.TUSD.ELA.08.Q3Benchmark
1718.TUSD.ELA.09.Q3Benchmark
1718.TUSD.ELA.10.Q3Benchmark

MATH – Q1 BENCHMARK

Are there any noteworthy differences or trends that you notice in comparing Benchmark achievement between your school and the District for Math? What strategies or action steps are being employed to address these differences/trends (if applicable)?

Reflection: All grade levels scored above TUSD. Percentages above district average are as follows: 2nd grade scored 7.7%, 3rd grade scored 12.3%, 4th grade scored 15.4%, and 5th grade scored 11.4%. We will continue to run our small group interventions, Simple Solutions, and whole groups instruction as scheduled with fidelity.

MATH – Q1 Benchmark Data

Insert screen shots in the appropriate boxes below. Delete any rows that are not applicable to your site

1718.TUSD.Math.02.Q1Benchmark

By Grade	# Tested	Participation Rate	Avg. RS	Avg. % Correct	Avg. TS	Minimally Proficient			Partially Proficient			Proficient			Highly Profi	
						#	%	Avg-TS	#	%	Avg-TS	#	%	Avg-TS	#	%
Tucson Unified School District	2831	86.9%	10.3	41.3%	40.03	1093	38.6%	35.49	679	24%	38.23	755	26.7%	43.19	304	10.7%
CARRILLO	51	98.1%	12.3	49%	68.36	11	21.6%	76.40	16	31.4%	60.39	15	29.4%	69.01	9	17.6%
Grade 2	51	1.6%	12.3	49%	68.36	11	21.6%	76.40	16	31.4%	60.39	15	29.4%	69.01	9	17.6%

1718.TUSD.Math.03.Q1Benchmark

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT



By Grade	# Tested	Participation Rate	Avg. RS	Avg. % Correct	Avg. TS	Minimally Proficient			Partially Proficient			Proficient			Highly Proficient	
						#	%	Avg. TS	#	%	Avg. TS	#	%	Avg. TS	#	%
Tucson Unified School District	3032	88.9%	12.8	42.7%	67.48	1141	37.6%	54.23	617	20.3%	67.18	903	29.8%	78.23	371	12.2%
CARRILLO	61	100.0%	16.5	55%	78.28	9	14.8%	67.41	15	24.6%	82.44	22	36.1%	81.19	15	24.6%
Grade 3	61	1.8%	16.5	55%	78.28	9	14.8%	67.41	15	24.6%	82.44	22	36.1%	81.19	15	24.6%

1718.TUSD.Math.04.Q1Benchmark

By Grade	# Tested	Participation Rate	Avg. RS	Avg. % Correct	Avg. TS	Minimally Proficient			Partially Proficient			Proficient			Highly Proficient	
						#	%	Avg. TS	#	%	Avg. TS	#	%	Avg. TS	#	%
Tucson Unified School District	2987	90.5%	15	50.1%	72.43	1079	36.1%	68.31	640	21.4%	75.27	927	31%	75.31	341	11.4%
CARRILLO	44	100.0%	19.7	65.5%	76.28	3	6.8%	61.35	9	20.5%	70.26	24	54.5%	82.34	8	18.2%
Grade 4	44	1.4%	19.7	65.5%	76.28	3	6.8%	61.35	9	20.5%	70.26	24	54.5%	82.34	8	18.2%

1718.TUSD.Math.05.Q1Benchmark

By Grade	# Tested	Participation Rate	Avg. RS	Avg. % Correct	Avg. TS	Minimally Proficient			Partially Proficient			Proficient			Highly Proficient	
						#	%	Avg. TS	#	%	Avg. TS	#	%	Avg. TS	#	%
Tucson Unified School District	3228	90.5%	14.1	46.9%	69.54	1160	35.9%	66.40	730	22.6%	78.09	977	30.3%	71.54	361	11.2%
CARRILLO	54	100.0%	17.5	58.3%	93.42	7	13%	82.09	9	16.7%	103.23	28	51.9%	95.03	10	18.5%
Grade 5	54	1.5%	17.5	58.3%	93.42	7	13%	82.09	9	16.7%	103.23	28	51.9%	95.03	10	18.5%

1718.TUSD.Math.06.Q1Benchmark

1718.TUSD.Math.07.Q1Benchmark

1718.TUSD.Math.08.Q1Benchmark

1718.TUSD.Algebra.HS.Q1Benchmark

1718.TUSD.Algebra2.HS.Q1Benchmark

1718.TUSD.Geometry.HS.Q1Benchmark

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT



MATH – Q2 BENCHMARK

Are there any noteworthy differences or trends that you notice in comparing Benchmark achievement between your school and the District for Math? What strategies or action steps are being employed to address these differences/trends (if applicable)? Have these differences changed from the previous benchmark?

Reflection: All grade levels scored above TUSD. Percentages above district average are as follows: 2nd grade scored 15.1%, 3rd grade scored 12%, 4th grade scored 10.1%, and 5th grade scored 13.5%. We will continue to run our small group interventions, Simple Solutions, and whole groups instruction as scheduled with fidelity.

MATH – Q2 Benchmark Data

Insert screen shots in the appropriate boxes below. Delete any rows that are not applicable to your site

1718.TUSD.Math.02.Q2Benchmark

By Grade ▲	# Tested ⚡	Participation Rate ⚡	Avg. RS ⚡	Avg. % Correct ⚡	Proficient		Not Proficient	
					# ⚡	% ⚡	# ⚡	% ⚡
Tucson Unified School District	2768	84.9%	12.5	50%	1186	42.8%	1582	57.2%
CARRILLO	52	100.0%	13.5	54%	29	55.8%	23	44.2%
Grade 2	52	1.6%	13.5	54%	29	55.8%	23	44.2%

1718.TUSD.Math.03.Q2Benchmark

By Grade ▲	# Tested ⚡	Participation Rate ⚡	Avg. RS ⚡	Avg. % Correct ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡	Proficient			Not Proficient		
						# ⚡	% ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡	# ⚡	% ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡
Tucson Unified School District	2995	88.0%	15.1	50.3%	70:27	1223	40.8%	74:26	1772	59.2%	67:42
CARRILLO	61	100.0%	18	60.2%	74:16	39	63.9%	74:03	22	36.1%	74:38
Grade 3	61	1.8%	18	60.2%	74:16	39	63.9%	74:03	22	36.1%	74:38

1718.TUSD.Math.04.Q2Benchmark

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Magnet Program



By Grade ▲	# Tested ▲	Participation Rate ▲	Avg. RS ▲	Avg. % Correct ▲	Avg. TS ▲	Minimally Proficient			Partially Proficient			Proficient	
						# ▲	% ▲	Avg. TS ▲	# ▲	% ▲	Avg. TS ▲	# ▲	% ▲
Tucson Unified School District	2957	85.4%	17	56.6%	76.55	1149	38.9%	73.09	540	18.3%	81.55	979	33.1%
CARRILLO	42	95.5%	21.5	71.8%	81.24	5	11.9%	78.18	5	11.9%	92.05	28	66.7%
Grade 4	42	1.3%	21.5	71.8%	81.24	5	11.9%	78.18	5	11.9%	92.05	28	66.7%

1718.TUSD.Math.05.Q2Benchmark

By Grade ▲	# Tested ▲	Participation Rate ▲	Avg. RS ▲	Avg. % Correct ▲	Avg. TS ▲	Proficient			Not Proficient		
						# ▲	% ▲	Avg. TS ▲	# ▲	% ▲	Avg. TS ▲
Tucson Unified School District	3187	86.5%	15	49.9%	89.26	1360	42.7%	93.18	1827	57.3%	86.33
CARRILLO	54	100.0%	20.6	68.6%	141.42	45	83.3%	145.40	9	16.7%	121.50
Grade 5	54	1.5%	20.6	68.6%	141.42	45	83.3%	145.40	9	16.7%	121.50

1718.TUSD.Math.06.Q2Benchmark

1718.TUSD.Math.07.Q2Benchmark

1718.TUSD.Math.08.Q2Benchmark

1718.TUSD.Algebra.HS.Q2Benchmark

1718.TUSD.Algebra2.HS.Q2Benchmark

1718.TUSD.Geometry.HS.Q2Benchmark

1718.TUSD.Algebra.HS.Q2Benchmark

1718.TUSD.Algebra2.HS.Q2Benchmark

1718.TUSD.Geometry.HS.Q2Benchmark

1718.TUSD.Geometry.HS.Q2Benchmark

1718.TUSD.Geometry.HS.Q2Benchmark

1718.TUSD.Geometry.HS.Q2Benchmark

MATH – Q3 BENCHMARK



Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Are there any noteworthy differences or trends that you notice in comparing Benchmark achievement between your school and the District for Math? What strategies or action steps are being employed to address these differences/trends (if applicable)? Have these differences changed from the previous benchmarks?

Reflection: All grade levels scored above TUSD. Percentages above district average are as follows: 2nd grade scored 12%, 3rd grade scored 15.1%, 4th grade scored 16.6%, and 5th grade scored 16%. We will continue to run our small group interventions, Simple Solutions, and whole groups instruction as scheduled with fidelity.

MATH – Q3 Benchmark Data

Insert screen shots in the appropriate boxes below. Delete any rows that are not applicable to your site

1718.TUSD.Math.02.Q3Benchmark

By Grade ▲	# Tested ⚡	Participation Rate ⚡	Avg. RS ⚡	Avg. % Correct ⚡	Proficient		Not Proficient	
					# ⚡	% ⚡	# ⚡	% ⚡
Tucson Unified School District	2831	94.2%	12.8	51.3%	1264	44.6%	1567	55.4%
CARRILLO	51	100.0%	15.8	63.3%	36	70.6%	15	29.4%
Grade 2	51	1.7%	15.8	63.3%	36	70.6%	15	29.4%

1718.TUSD.Math.03.Q3Benchmark

By Grade ▲	# Tested ⚡	Participation Rate ⚡	Avg. RS ⚡	Avg. % Correct ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡	Proficient			Not Proficient		
						# ⚡	% ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡	# ⚡	% ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡
Tucson Unified School District	2989	93.6%	15	49.9%	73.22	1298	43.4%	78.09	1691	56.6%	69.41
CARRILLO	59	96.7%	19.5	65%	64.11	47	79.7%	62.50	12	20.3%	69.31
Grade 3	59	1.9%	19.5	65%	64.11	47	79.7%	62.50	12	20.3%	69.31

1718.TUSD.Math.04.Q3Benchmark

By Grade ▲	# Tested ⚡	Participation Rate ⚡	Avg. RS ⚡	Avg. % Correct ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡	Proficient			Not Proficient		
						# ⚡	% ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡	# ⚡	% ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡
Tucson Unified School District	2939	95.8%	15.6	52%	79.32	1029	35%	77.51	1910	65%	80.27
CARRILLO	44	97.8%	20.6	68.6%	99.20	33	75%	93.09	11	25%	117.54
Grade 4	44	1.4%	20.6	68.6%	99.20	33	75%	93.09	11	25%	117.54

1718.TUSD.Math.05.Q3Benchmark

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Magnet Program




By Grade ▲	# Tested ⚡	Participation Rate ⚡	Avg. RS ⚡	Avg. % Correct ⚡	Proficient		Not Proficient	
					# ⚡	% ⚡	# ⚡	% ⚡
Tucson Unified School District	3177	95.7%	17.9	59.6%	1198	37.7%	1979	62.3%
CARRILLO	54	100.0%	22.7	75.6%	38	70.4%	16	29.6%
Grade 5	54	1.6%	22.7	75.6%	38	70.4%	16	29.6%
1718.TUSD.Math.06.Q3Benchmark								
1718.TUSD.Math.07.Q3Benchmark								
1718.TUSD.Math.08.Q3Benchmark								
1718.TUSD.Algebra.HS.Q3Benchmark								
1718.TUSD.Algebra2.HS.Q3Benchmark								
1718.TUSD.Geometry.HS.Q3Benchmark								

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Magnet Program



Directions: Use SchoolCity to access “Demographic Profile” for each of the grade levels tested during Benchmark 1. Use “Ethnicity Subgroups” in the “Profile Groups to Display” box. Click the “Proficient/Not Proficient” radial button. Use the  Snipping Tool to take a screen shot of each grade level for Math and ELA, then fill out the Reflection box:

ELA – Q1 ACHIEVEMENT GAP DATA

Are there any noteworthy differences or trends that you notice in comparing Benchmark achievement between ethnicities for ELA? What strategies or action steps are being employed to address these differences/trends (if applicable)?

Reflection: African Americans students performed higher than Whites and Hispanics in grade: 3. In 2nd grade African Americans scored 66.7%, Whites scored 66.7%, Hispanics scored 59.5%. In 3rd grade African Americans scored 68.4%, Whites scored 48.3%, Hispanics scored 41.9%. In 4th grade African Americans scored 50%, Whites scored 62.2%, Hispanics scored 55.8%. In 5th grade African Americans scored 80%, Whites scored 86.3%, Hispanics scored 72.1%. Our staff will meet during our PD and PLC times to discuss the strategies to help close the gaps. We will continue to use small group, targeted interventions before, during and after school. We have reached out to U of A African American and Native American Resource Centers to provide extra tutors for the students in their respective demographics.

Insert screen shots in the appropriate boxes below. Delete any rows that are not applicable to your site

1718.TUSD.ELA.02.Q1Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	48	100%	15.2	60.8%	33	68.8%	15	31.3%
Hispanic	30	62.5%	14.9	59.5%	21	70%	9	30%
White	9	18.8%	16.7	66.7%	7	77.8%	2	22.2%
African American	6	12.5%	14.2	56.7%	3	50%	3	50%
Native American	2	4.2%	16	64%	1	50%	1	50%
Asian Pacific American	1	2.1%	17	68%	1	100%	0	0%

1718.TUSD.ELA.03.Q1Benchmark

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT



Ethnicity Subgroups	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	56	100%	13.3	44.3%	30	53.6%	26	46.4%
Hispanic	35	62.5%	12.6	41.9%	16	45.7%	19	54.3%
White	16	28.6%	14.5	48.3%	11	68.8%	5	31.3%
Multi Racial	3	5.4%	10.3	34.4%	1	33.3%	2	66.7%
African American	2	3.6%	20.5	68.4%	2	100%	0	0%

1718.TUSD.ELA.04.Q1Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	41	100%	17.1	57.1%	22	53.7%	19	46.3%
Hispanic	26	63.4%	16.7	55.8%	13	50%	13	50%
White	9	22%	18.7	62.2%	6	66.7%	3	33.3%
African American	2	4.9%	15	50%	0	0%	2	100%
Native American	2	4.9%	16	53.3%	1	50%	1	50%
Asian Pacific American	1	2.4%	19	63.3%	1	100%	0	0%
Multi Racial	1	2.4%	18	60%	1	100%	0	0%

1718.TUSD.ELA.05.Q1Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	51	100%	22.5	74.9%	38	74.5%	13	25.5%
Hispanic	36	70.6%	21.6	72.1%	26	72.2%	10	27.8%
White	9	17.6%	25.9	86.3%	9	100%	0	0%
African American	3	5.9%	24	80%	2	66.7%	1	33.3%
Asian Pacific American	1	2%	28	93.3%	1	100%	0	0%
Multi Racial	1	2%	19	63.3%	0	0%	1	100%
Native American	1	2%	15	50%	0	0%	1	100%

1718.TUSD.ELA.06.Q1Benchmark

1718.TUSD.ELA.07.Q1Benchmark

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Magnet Program



1718.TUSD.ELA.08.Q1Benchmark
1718.TUSD.ELA.09.Q1Benchmark
1718.TUSD.ELA.10.Q1Benchmark

ELA – Q2 ACHIEVEMENT GAP DATA

Are there any noteworthy differences or trends that you notice in comparing Benchmark achievement between ethnicities for ELA? What strategies or action steps are being employed to address these differences/trends (if applicable)?

Reflection: African Americans students performed higher than Hispanics and Whites in grades: 2, 3, 4, 5. In grade 3, White students performed higher than African Americans and Hispanic students. In 2nd grade African Americans scored 72.7%, Whites scored 72.4%, Hispanics scored 71.6%. In 3rd grade African Americans scored 65%, Whites scored 54.6%, Hispanics scored 46.6%. In 4th grade African Americans scored 68.3%, Whites scored 68.8%, Hispanics scored 53.2%. In 5th grade African Americans scored 72.2%, Whites scored 70.7%, Hispanics scored 59.4%. Our staff will meet during our PD and PLC times to discuss the strategies to help close the gaps. We will continue to use small group, targeted interventions before, during and after school. We have reached out to U of A African American and Native American Resource Centers to provide extra tutors for the students in their respective demographics.

Insert screen shots in the appropriate boxes below. Delete any rows that are not applicable to your site

1718.TUSD.ELA.02.Q2Benchmark

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT



Ethnicity Subgroups ▲	Students Tested		Avg. RS ▲	Avg. Percent Correct ▲	Proficient		
	# ▼	% ▲			# ▲	% ▲	# ▲
All Test Takers	48	100%	18.1	72.5%	34	70.8%	14
Hispanic	30	62.5%	17.9	71.6%	21	70%	9
White	9	18.8%	18.1	72.4%	7	77.8%	2
African American	6	12.5%	18.2	72.7%	4	66.7%	2
Native American	2	4.2%	19.5	78%	1	50%	1
Asian Pacific American	1	2.1%	22	88%	1	100%	0

1718.TUSD.ELA.03.Q2Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups ▲	Students Tested		Avg. RS ▲	Avg. Percent Correct ▲	Minimally Proficient		Partially Proficient		Proficient		Highly Proficient	
	# ▼	% ▲			# ▲	% ▲	# ▲	% ▲	# ▲	% ▲	# ▲	% ▲
All Test Takers	56	100%	14.8	49.5%	8	14.3%	11	19.6%	23	41.1%	14	25%
Hispanic	35	62.5%	14	46.6%	4	11.4%	10	28.6%	16	45.7%	5	14.3%
White	16	28.6%	16.4	54.6%	3	18.8%	1	6.3%	5	31.3%	7	43.8%
Multi Racial	3	5.4%	13.7	45.6%	1	33.3%	0	0%	1	33.3%	1	33.3%
African American	2	3.6%	19.5	65%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%

1718.TU SD.ELA.04.Q2Benchmark

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT



Ethnicity Subgroups	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Minimally Proficient		Partially Proficient		Proficient		Highly Proficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	41	100%	17.1	57%	10	24.4%	11	26.8%	17	41.5%	3	7.3%
Hispanic	26	63.4%	16	53.2%	8	30.8%	8	30.8%	9	34.6%	1	3.8%
White	9	22%	19.4	64.8%	1	11.1%	2	22.2%	4	44.4%	2	22.2%
African American	2	4.9%	20.5	68.3%	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%
Native American	2	4.9%	16.5	55%	1	50%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%
Asian Pacific American	1	2.4%	20	66.7%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%
Multi Racial	1	2.4%	17	56.7%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%

1718.TUSD.ELA.05.Q2Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Minimally Proficient		Partially Proficient		Proficient		Highly Proficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	51	100%	18.8	62.8%	6	11.8%	4	7.8%	28	54.9%	13	25.5%
Hispanic	35	68.6%	17.8	59.4%	6	17.1%	3	8.6%	20	57.1%	6	17.1%
White	9	17.6%	21.2	70.7%	0	0%	1	11.1%	4	44.4%	4	44.4%
African American	3	5.9%	21.7	72.2%	0	0%	0	0%	1	33.3%	2	66.7%
Multi Racial	2	3.9%	21	70%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%
Native American	2	3.9%	19.5	65%	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%

1718.TUSD.ELA.06.Q2Benchmark

1718.TUSD.ELA.07.Q2Benchmark

1718.TUSD.ELA.08.Q2Benchmark

1718.TUSD.ELA.09.Q2Benchmark

1718.TUSD.ELA.10.Q2Benchmark

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT



ELA – Q3 ACHIEVEMENT GAP DATA

Are there any noteworthy differences or trends that you notice in comparing Benchmark achievement between ethnicities for ELA? What strategies or action steps are being employed to address these differences/trends (if applicable)?

Reflection: African Americans students performed higher than Hispanics and Whites in grades: 3 and 5 In 2nd grade African Americans scored 48%, Whites scored 66.7%, Hispanics scored 60.4%. In 3rd grade African Americans scored 78.4%, Whites scored 55%, Hispanics scored 45%. In 4th grade African Americans scored 63.4%, Whites scored 70.7%, Hispanics scored 58.6%. In 5th grade African Americans scored 75.6%, Whites scored 73.7%, Hispanics scored 61.2%. Our staff will meet during our PD and PLC times to discuss the strategies to help close the gaps. We will continue to use small group, targeted interventions before, during and after school. We have reached out to U of A African American and Native American Resource Centers to provide extra tutors for the students in their respective demographics.

Insert screen shots in the appropriate boxes below. Delete any rows that are not applicable to your site

1718.TUSD.ELA.02.Q3Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups ▲	Students Tested		Avg. RS ▼	Avg. Percent Correct ▼	Minimally Proficient		Partially Proficient		Proficient		Highly Proficient	
	# ▼	% ▼			# ▼	% ▼	# ▼	% ▼	# ▼	% ▼		
All Test Takers	48	100%	15.1	60.6%	11	22.9%	7	14.6%	24	50%	6	12.5%
African American	6	12.5%	12	48%	3	50%	0	0%	3	50%	0	0%
Asian Pacific American	1	2.1%	17	68%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%
Hispanic	30	62.5%	15.1	60.4%	7	23.3%	5	16.7%	14	46.7%	4	13.3%
Native American	2	4.2%	17.5	70%	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%
White	9	18.8%	16.7	66.7%	1	11.1%	2	22.2%	4	44.4%	2	22.2%

1718.TUSD.ELA.03.Q3Benchmark

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT



Ethnicity Subgroups ▲	Students Tested		Avg. RS ⚡	Avg. Percent Correct ⚡	Avg. SS ⚡	Minimally Proficient		Partially Proficient		Proficient		Highly Proficient	
	# ⚡	% ⚡				# ⚡	% ⚡	# ⚡	% ⚡	# ⚡	% ⚡	# ⚡	% ⚡
All Test Takers	56	100%	14.7	49%	2507.9	17	30.4%	13	23.2%	17	30.4%	9	16.1%
African American	2	3.6%	23.5	78.4%	2544	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%
Hispanic	35	62.5%	13.5	45%	2504.1	12	34.3%	10	28.6%	10	28.6%	3	8.6%
Multi Racial	3	5.4%	13.7	45.5%	2499.7	1	33.3%	1	33.3%	1	33.3%	0	0%
White	16	28.6%	16.5	55%	2513.2	4	25%	2	12.5%	6	37.5%	4	25%

1718.TUSD.ELA.04.Q3Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups ▲	Students Tested		Avg. RS ⚡	Avg. Percent Correct ⚡	Minimally Proficient		Partially Proficient		Proficient		Highly Proficient	
	# ⚡	% ⚡			# ⚡	% ⚡	# ⚡	% ⚡	# ⚡	% ⚡	# ⚡	% ⚡
All Test Takers	41	100%	18.5	61.6%	1	2.4%	12	29.3%	19	46.3%	9	22%
African American	2	4.9%	19	63.4%	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%
Asian Pacific American	1	2.4%	24	80%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%
Hispanic	26	63.4%	17.6	58.6%	1	3.8%	9	34.6%	12	46.2%	4	15.4%
Multi Racial	1	2.4%	17	56.7%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%
Native American	2	4.9%	15.5	51.7%	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%	0	0%
White	9	22%	21.2	70.7%	0	0%	2	22.2%	3	33.3%	4	44.4%

1718.TUSD.ELA.05.Q3Benchmark

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT



Ethnicity Subgroups ▲	Students Tested		Avg. RS ▲	Avg. Percent Correct ▲	Minimally Proficient		Partially Proficient		Proficient		Highly Proficient	
	# ▲	% ▲			# ▲	% ▲	# ▲	% ▲	# ▲	% ▲		
All Test Takers	51	100%	19.5	65%	3	5.9%	20	39.2%	21	41.2%	7	13.7%
African American	3	5.9%	22.7	75.6%	0	0%	0	0%	2	66.7%	1	33.3%
Hispanic	35	68.6%	18.4	61.2%	3	8.6%	17	48.6%	12	34.3%	3	8.6%
Multi Racial	2	3.9%	23.5	78.4%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%
Native American	2	3.9%	18.5	61.7%	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%	0	0%
White	9	17.6%	22.1	73.7%	0	0%	2	22.2%	5	55.6%	2	22.2%
1718.TUSD.ELA.06.Q3Benchmark												
1718.TUSD.ELA.07.Q3Benchmark												
1718.TUSD.ELA.08.Q3Benchmark												
1718.TUSD.ELA.09.Q3Benchmark												
1718.TUSD.ELA.10.Q3Benchmark												

MATH – Q1 ACHIEVEMENT GAP DATA

Are there any noteworthy differences or trends that you notice in comparing Benchmark achievement between ethnicities for MATH? What strategies or action steps are being employed to address these differences/trends (if applicable)?

Reflection: African Americans students performed higher than Whites and Hispanics in grades: 2, 3 and 4. In 2nd grade African Americans scored 54.7%, Whites scored 54.2%, Hispanics scored 45.5%. In 3rd grade African Americans scored 66.7%, Whites scored 60.6%, Hispanics scored 53%. In 4th grade African Americans scored 67%, Whites scored 67%, Hispanics scored 65%. In 5th grade African Americans scored 63.3%, Whites scored 74.8%, Hispanics scored 55.3%. Our staff will meet during our PD and PLC times to discuss the strategies to help close the gaps. We will continue to use small group, targeted interventions before, during and after school. We have reached out to U of A African American and Native American Resource Centers to provide extra tutors for the students in their respective demographics.

Insert screen shots in the appropriate boxes below. Delete any rows that are not applicable to your site

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Magnet Program



1718.TUSD.MATH.02.Q1Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	51	100%	12.3	49%	24	47.1%	27	52.9%
Hispanic	33	64.7%	11.4	45.5%	11	33.3%	22	66.7%
White	9	17.6%	13.6	54.2%	6	66.7%	3	33.3%
African American	6	11.8%	13.7	54.7%	4	66.7%	2	33.3%
Native American	2	3.9%	14.5	58%	2	100%	0	0%
Asian Pacific American	1	2%	17	68%	1	100%	0	0%

1718.TUSD.MATH.03.Q1Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	61	100%	16.5	55%	37	60.7%	24	39.3%
Hispanic	38	62.3%	15.9	53%	20	52.6%	18	47.4%
White	16	26.2%	18.2	60.6%	12	75%	4	25%
Multi Racial	5	8.2%	14.4	48%	3	60%	2	40%
African American	2	3.3%	20	66.7%	2	100%	0	0%

1718.TUSD.MATH.04.Q1Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	44	100%	19.7	65.5%	32	72.7%	12	27.3%
Hispanic	29	65.9%	19.5	65.1%	22	75.9%	7	24.1%
White	9	20.5%	20.1	67%	6	66.7%	3	33.3%
African American	2	4.5%	24.5	81.7%	2	100%	0	0%
Native American	2	4.5%	14.5	48.3%	1	50%	1	50%
Asian Pacific American	1	2.3%	25	83.3%	1	100%	0	0%
Multi Racial	1	2.3%	15	50%	0	0%	1	100%

1718.TUSD.MATH.05.Q1Benchmark

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT



Ethnicity Subgroups	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	54	100%	17.5	58.3%	38	70.4%	16	29.6%
Hispanic	38	70.4%	16.6	55.3%	24	63.2%	14	36.8%
White	9	16.7%	22.4	74.8%	9	100%	0	0%
African American	3	5.6%	19	63.3%	3	100%	0	0%
Native American	2	3.7%	10.5	35%	0	0%	2	100%
Asian Pacific American	1	1.9%	19	63.3%	1	100%	0	0%
Multi Racial	1	1.9%	15	50%	1	100%	0	0%
1718.TUSD.MATH.06.Q1Benchmark								
1718.TUSD.MATH.07.Q1Benchmark								
1718.TUSD.MATH.08.Q1Benchmark								
1718.TUSD.Algebra.HS.Q3Benchmark								
1718.TUSD.Algebra2.HS.Q3Benchmark								
1718.TUSD.Geometry.HS.Q3Benchmark								

MATH – Q2 ACHIEVEMENT GAP DATA

Are there any noteworthy differences or trends that you notice in comparing Benchmark achievement between ethnicities for MATH? What strategies or action steps are being employed to address these differences/trends (if applicable)?

Reflection: African Americans students performed higher than Hispanics and Whites in grades: 3 and 5. In 2nd grade African Americans scored 61.3%, Whites scored 62.7%, Hispanics scored 49.3%. In 3rd grade African Americans scored 76.7%, Whites scored 62.7%, Hispanics scored 57.5%. In 4th grade African Americans scored 75%, Whites 78.3%, Hispanics scored 69.9%. In 5th grade African Americans scored 84.5%, Whites scored 78.5%, Hispanics scored 65.3%. Our staff will meet during our PD and PLC times to discuss the strategies to help close the gaps. We will

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Magnet Program



continue to use small group, targeted interventions before, during and after school. We have reached out to U of A African American and Native American Resource Centers to provide extra tutors for the students in their respective demographics.

Insert screen shots in the appropriate boxes below. Delete any rows that are not applicable to your site

1718.TUSD.MATH.02.Q2Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	52	100%	13.5	54%	29	55.8%	23	44.2%
Hispanic	34	65.4%	12.3	49.3%	16	47.1%	18	52.9%
White	9	17.3%	15.7	62.7%	6	66.7%	3	33.3%
African American	6	11.5%	15.3	61.3%	4	66.7%	2	33.3%
Native American	2	3.8%	15	60%	2	100%	0	0%
Asian Pacific American	1	1.9%	20	80%	1	100%	0	0%

1718.TUSD.MATH.03.Q2Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Minimally Proficient		Partially Proficient		Proficient		Highly Proficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	61	100%	18	60.2%	10	16.4%	12	19.7%	28	45.9%	11	18%
Hispanic	38	62.3%	17.2	57.5%	8	21.1%	6	15.8%	19	50%	5	13.2%
White	16	26.2%	18.8	62.7%	2	12.5%	5	31.3%	4	25%	5	31.3%
Multi Racial	5	8.2%	19.8	66%	0	0%	1	20%	4	80%	0	0%
African American	2	3.3%	23	76.7%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%

1718.TUSD.MATH.04.Q2Benchmark

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Magnet Program



Ethnicity Subgroups ▲	Students Tested		Avg. RS ▼	Avg. Percent Correct ▼	Minimally Proficient		Partially Proficient		Proficient		Highly Proficient	
	# ▼	% ▲			# ▲	% ▲	# ▲	% ▲	# ▲	% ▲	# ▲	% ▲
All Test Takers	42	100%	21.5	71.8%	5	11.9%	5	11.9%	28	66.7%	4	9.5%
Hispanic	28	66.7%	21	69.9%	4	14.3%	5	17.9%	16	57.1%	3	10.7%
White	8	19%	23.5	78.3%	0	0%	0	0%	7	87.5%	1	12.5%
African American	2	4.8%	22.5	75%	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%
Native American	2	4.8%	17.5	58.4%	1	50%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%
Asian Pacific American	1	2.4%	26	86.7%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%
Multi Racial	1	2.4%	24	80%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%
1718.TUSD.MATH.05.Q2Benchmark												
Ethnicity Subgroups ▲	Students Tested		Avg. RS ▼	Avg. Percent Correct ▼	Minimally Proficient		Partially Proficient		Proficient		Highly Proficient	
	# ▼	% ▲			# ▲	% ▲	# ▲	% ▲	# ▲	% ▲	# ▲	% ▲
All Test Takers	54	100%	20.6	68.6%	3	5.6%	6	11.1%	33	61.1%	12	22.2%
Hispanic	37	68.5%	19.6	65.3%	3	8.1%	5	13.5%	24	64.9%	5	13.5%
White	9	16.7%	23.6	78.5%	0	0%	0	0%	5	55.6%	4	44.4%
African American	3	5.6%	25.3	84.5%	0	0%	0	0%	1	33.3%	2	66.7%
Native American	3	5.6%	17	56.6%	0	0%	1	33.3%	2	66.7%	0	0%
Multi Racial	2	3.7%	24	80%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%
1718.TUSD.MATH.06.Q2Benchmark												
1718.TUSD.MATH.07.Q2Benchmark												
1718.TUSD.MATH.08.Q2Benchmark												
1718.TUSD.Algebra.HS.Q3Benchmark												
1718.TUSD.Algebra2.HS.Q3Benchmark												

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Magnet Program



1718.TUSD.Geometry.HS.Q3Benchmark

MATH – Q3 ACHIEVEMENT GAP DATA

Are there any noteworthy differences or trends that you notice in comparing Benchmark achievement between ethnicities for MATH? What strategies or action steps are being employed to address these differences/trends (if applicable)?

Reflection: African Americans students performed higher than Hispanics and Whites in grade: 3. Hispanic students performed higher than African Americans and Whites in grade: 5. In 2nd grade African Americans scored 66%, Whites scored 67.1%, Hispanics scored 61.2%. In 3rd grade African Americans scored 85%, Whites scored 69.6%, Hispanics scored 62.9%. In 4th grade African Americans scored 63.4%, Whites scored 74.8%, Hispanics scored 66.3%. In 5th grade African Americans scored 85.6%, Whites scored 72.5%, Hispanics scored 85.9%. Our staff will meet during our PD and PLC times to discuss the strategies to help close the gaps. We will continue to use small group, targeted interventions before, during and after school. We have reached out to U of A African American and Native American Resource Centers to provide extra tutors for the students in their respective demographics.

Insert screen shots in the appropriate boxes below. Delete any rows that are not applicable to your site

1718.TUSD.MATH.02.Q3Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	51	100%	15.8	63.3%	36	70.6%	15	29.4%
African American	6	11.8%	16.5	66%	4	66.7%	2	33.3%
Asian Pacific American	1	2%	20	80%	1	100%	0	0%
Hispanic	33	64.7%	15.3	61.2%	23	69.7%	10	30.3%
Native American	2	3.9%	16	64%	2	100%	0	0%
White	9	17.6%	16.8	67.1%	6	66.7%	3	33.3%

1718.TUSD.MATH.03.Q3Benchmark

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT



Ethnicity Subgroups	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	59	100%	19.5	65%	47	79.7%	12	20.3%
African American	2	3.4%	25.5	85%	2	100%	0	0%
Hispanic	37	62.7%	18.9	62.9%	28	75.7%	9	24.3%
Multi Racial	5	8.5%	17.6	58.7%	4	80%	1	20%
White	15	25.4%	20.9	69.6%	13	86.7%	2	13.3%

1718.TUSD.MATH.04.Q3Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Minimally Proficient		Partially Proficient		Proficient		Highly Proficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	44	100%	20.6	68.6%	5	11.4%	6	13.6%	28	63.6%	5	11.4%
African American	2	4.5%	19	63.4%	1	50%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%
Asian Pacific American	1	2.3%	28	93.3%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%
Hispanic	29	65.9%	19.9	66.3%	3	10.3%	4	13.8%	20	69%	2	6.9%
Multi Racial	1	2.3%	21	70%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%
Native American	2	4.5%	19.5	65%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%
White	9	20.5%	22.4	74.8%	0	0%	2	22.2%	6	66.7%	1	11.1%

1718.TUSD.MATH.05.Q3Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Minimally Proficient		Partially Proficient		Proficient		Highly Proficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	54	100%	22.7	75.6%	4	7.4%	12	22.2%	31	57.4%	7	13%
African American	3	5.6%	25.7	85.6%	0	0%	0	0%	3	100%	0	0%
Hispanic	37	68.5%	21.8	72.5%	3	8.1%	11	29.7%	19	51.4%	4	10.8%
Multi Racial	2	3.7%	25.5	85%	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%
Native American	3	5.6%	19.7	65.5%	1	33.3%	1	33.3%	1	33.3%	0	0%
White	9	16.7%	25.8	85.9%	0	0%	0	0%	6	66.7%	3	33.3%

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Magnet Program



1718.TUSD.MATH.06.Q3Benchmark
1718.TUSD.MATH.07.Q3Benchmark
1718.TUSD.MATH.08.Q3Benchmark
1718.TUSD.Algebra.HS.Q3Benchmark
1718.TUSD.Algebra2.HS.Q3Benchmark
1718.TUSD.Geometry.HS.Q3Benchmark

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report**STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT**

Magnet Program



Directions: Choose the top 5 attended intervention/enrichment classes at your school.

Before/after school INTERVENTION classes	Type of intervention offered (example: 6 th grade ELA tutoring)	How were students placed in program? (example: progress report grades, teacher recommendation)	Number of students who participated in program.
Targeted tutoring (Before & After school)	Math/ELA	Based on teacher weekly assessment and school city data	73
Extended Day (After school)	Math/ELA	Based on teacher weekly assessment and school city data	24
Total enrollment for above classes			97
Grand Total of ALL intervention classes			97

Before/after school ENRICHMENT classes	Type of enrichment offered (example: Robotics)	How were students placed in program? (example: progress report grades, teacher recommendation)	Number of students who participated in program.
Art/ Sonoran Glass	Visual Art	Parent Choice	12
Music	Performance Art	Parent Choice	10
Technology	Communication	Parent Choice	19
Total enrollment for above classes			41
Grand Total of ALL enrichment classes (High Schools: Only include MAGNET themed enrichment classes)			41



Magnet – School Level Quarterly Report

2019-20

PROFESSIONAL LEARNING COMMUNITIES

Directions: Use the District rubric to rate a minimum of four of your PLCs.

COLLABORATIVE CULTURE			
Educators work together in collaborative teams to achieve student learning.			
Learning	Literal	Refined	Internalized
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team meets regularly (weekly/biweekly/monthly) during the school day. Team members attend for compliance purposes only; team members may be unprepared and/or disorganized. No evidence that school goals, collective commitments and team norms are followed. Team is unclear regarding PLC focus and processes. Team does not use the <i>Guiding Questions for the PLC Team Cycle of Inquiry</i> to frame PLC discussions. Team meets only when required on the district designated Wednesday PD for PLC times (Team Cycle of Inquiry is not followed). Team does not turn in <i>Agenda and Minutes</i> log or log does not reflect analysis of student learning or teacher practice and growth. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team develops written norms and establishes learning goals that clarify expectations and commitments. Team members arrive prepared & participate. Team adheres to school goals, collective commitments, and team norms. Team shows evidence that the focus of PLC is curriculum instruction. Team is inconsistent in its use of the <i>Guiding Questions</i> or engages only shallowly with this tool. Some individual team members meet at least twice per month to attempt Team Cycle of Inquiry. Team <i>Agenda and Minutes</i> logs reflect limited understanding of PLC process and/or limited rigor with regard to reflections about course content knowledge and effective teaching practice. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team focuses on prearranged topics that impact student learning and makes revisions to goals to improve team effectiveness. Team members are committed to the inquiry process and share openly. Team reflects on alignment of their work with school goals, collective commitments, and team norms. Team focuses PLC work on curriculum and instruction via cycles of collective inquiry. Team regularly frames PLC work with the use of the <i>Guiding Questions</i>. Most team members coordinate time each week to meet to maintain Team Cycle of Inquiry. Team <i>Agenda and Minutes</i> logs indicate that some members engage in reflection on their own instructional effectiveness as well as analysis of student learning outcomes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team honors their collective commitments to each other and their students in order to maximize learning. Team members push themselves and one another to grow and deepen in their practice. Team norms and site commitments are reviewed regularly and members actively use the existence of norms to address challenges in team dynamics as they arise. Team engages in robust exploration of curriculum content, instructional practice, and student learning via rigorous collaborative inquiry. Team ensures that the <i>Guiding Questions</i> always frame the discussion and thinking of PLC meetings; for many team members the <i>Guiding Questions</i> have become internalized habits of mind. Team takes initiative to coordinate with one another (and with site administration if needed) to ensure that all team members meet weekly to maximize the benefits of Team Cycle of Inquiry. Team <i>Agenda and Minutes</i> logs clearly show strong commitment to ensuring that all team members understand content standards and are rigorous in reflecting on their own needs for growth.

3	Learning = 1	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
	Literal = 2							
	Refined = 3							
	Internalized = 4							
4	Learning = 1							#DIV/O!
	Literal = 2							
	Refined = 3							
	Internalized = 4							



Magnet – School Level Quarterly Report

2019-20

PROFESSIONAL LEARNING COMMUNITIES

GUARANTEED CURRICULUM			
Educators establish what we want our students to learn.			
Learning	Literal	Refined	Internalized
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team uses district developed curriculum guide resources. Team does not identify an essential learning for the current inquiry cycle. Team does not discuss whether the essential learning is understood by team members at the level of task analysis. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team works together to define the essential learning and establish pacing. Team selects an essential learning for the current inquiry cycle but does not ensure that it is drawn directly from the District Curriculum. Team members engage in limited or inconsistent discussion regarding the sub-skills inherent in the essential learning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team builds shared knowledge of current content standards, unpacks high-stakes assessments to clarify essential learning, and adjusts instruction based on formative assessments. Team always draws its essential learning from the current scope and sequence in the District Curriculum. Team ensures that each team member is confident in their understanding of the sub-skills inherent in the essential learning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team continually refines essential learning and guarantees a viable instructional program for all students. Team ensures that the essential learning comes only from designated, highly-leveraged standards in the current scope and sequence in the District Curriculum. Team uses their collective understanding of the task analysis of the essential learning in order to increase the rigor and accuracy of Tier 1 differentiation, common formative assessments, and to develop/refine pacing guides.

Quarter	Levels of Performance	Team A	Team B	Team C	Team D	Team E	Team F	Average
1	Learning = 1 Literal = 2 Refined = 3 Internalized = 4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
2	Learning = 1 Literal = 2 Refined = 3 Internalized = 4	3	3	3	3	4	3	3.166666667
3	Learning = 1 Literal = 2 Refined = 3 Internalized = 4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
4	Learning = 1 Literal = 2 Refined = 3 Internalized = 4							#DIV/0!



Magnet – School Level Quarterly Report

2019-20

PROFESSIONAL LEARNING COMMUNITIES

COMMON ASSESSMENT

Educators determine if each student has learned what we want them to learn.

Learning	Literal	Refined	Internalized
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Team uses benchmark assessments several times throughout the year. ▪ Team does not review or make reference to specific benchmark data that relates to the essential learning focus. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Team analyzes student work and assessments and discusses common criteria. ▪ Some team members administer common assessment tools based on team discussions of common criteria. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Team consistently applies common criteria to assess student work and discuss formative instructional practices. ▪ Team discusses common formative assessments at the Focus stage of the Inquiry Cycle; administers CFA in the Teach stage of the Inquiry Cycle; analyzes results together at the Assess stage of the Inquiry Cycle; and implements targeted re-teaching or enrichment based on collective data analysis in the Respond stage of the Inquiry Cycle. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Team consistently utilizes formative instructional practices, including common assessments, to gather evidence of student learning. ▪ Team consistently uses assessment results to reflect on teacher's own strengths and areas for refinement as practitioners. ▪ Team consistently uses assessment results for the purpose of continually refining equitable access to curriculum for all learners.

3	Learning = 1	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
	Literal = 2							
	Refined = 3							
	Internalized = 4							
4	Learning = 1							
	Literal = 2							#DIV/0!
	Refined = 3							
	Internalized = 4							



Magnet – School Level Quarterly Report

2019-20

PROFESSIONAL LEARNING COMMUNITIES

ENSURING LEARNING			
Educators respond when some students have not learned it.			
Learning	Literal	Refined	Internalized
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team does not collectively discuss potential specific difficulties in student understanding of the essential learning. Team uses school/district classes, established “pull out” or afterschool programs, and curriculum resources when students are identified for intervention. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team usually waits until after Tier 1 instruction to determine appropriate response to students struggling to understand the essential learning. Team provides students with additional time and support that does not remove students from new direct instruction when they experience difficulty. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At the Focus stage of the Inquiry Cycle, team discusses in specific terms the demands of the essential learning, anticipates the needs of current students, and plans for differentiated groups in the course of Tier 1 instruction. Team develops and utilizes a timely, directive, and systemic plan for students when they experience difficulty. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team members analyze patterns in content challenges and student difficulties that are specific to current students in order to ensure equitable supports and access to curriculum. Team coordinates a flexible, supportive, and proactive system of intervention for students who experience difficulty.

Quarter	Levels of Performance	Team A	Team B	Team C	Team D	Team E	Team F	Average
1	Learning = 1 Literal = 2 Refined = 3 Internalized = 4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
2	Learning = 1 Literal = 2 Refined = 3 Internalized = 4	3	3	3	3	4	3	3.166666667
3	Learning = 1 Literal = 2 Refined = 3 Internalized = 4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
4	Learning = 1 Literal = 2 Refined = 3 Internalized = 4							#DIV/0!



Magnet – School Level Quarterly Report

2019-20

PROFESSIONAL LEARNING COMMUNITIES

ENRICHING LEARNING			
Educators extend and enrich the learning for students who have demonstrated mastery.			
Learning	Literal	Refined	Internalized
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team does not collectively discuss anticipated differences in the rates of student understanding of the essential learning. Team uses school/district classes, established “pull out” or afterschool programs, and curriculum resources for identified students. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team usually waits until after Tier 1 instruction to determine appropriate response to students who already understand the essential learning. Team provides students with additional time and support for enrichment during the school day for those who have moved beyond the essential learning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At the Focus stage of the Inquiry Cycle, team discusses in specific terms the demands of the essential learning, anticipates the needs of current students, and plans for differentiated groups in the course of Tier 1 instruction. Team develops and utilizes a timely, directive, and systemic plan for students who have moved beyond the essential learning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team members analyze patterns specific to current students in order to ensure opportunities to advance in the curriculum. Team coordinates a flexible, supportive, and proactive system of intervention for students who have moved beyond the essential learning.

3	Learning = 1	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
	Literal = 2							
	Refined = 3							
	Internalized = 4							
4	Learning = 1							#DIV/O!
	Literal = 2							
	Refined = 3							
	Internalized = 4							



Magnet – School Level Quarterly Report

2019-20

PROFESSIONAL LEARNING COMMUNITIES

PLCS: ANALYSIS OF NEEDS AND PROGRESS

PLC – Phases of Development

Component	Quarter 1 Average Phase of Development	Quarter 2 Average Phase of Development	Quarter 3 Average Phase of Development
Collaborative Culture	3	3.16	4
Guaranteed Curriculum	3	3.16	4
Common Assessment	3	3.16	4
Ensuring Learning	3	3.16	4
Enriching Learning	3	3.16	4

PLC – Needs Analysis

What additional PLC resources, information, or PD activities would most benefit you in supporting the work of Professional Learning Communities at your site? List at least three. (Example: protocols for analyzing student data; protocols for analyzing student work; how to make an action plan; how to work collaboratively as a team, ideas for intervention/enrichment opportunities, etc. Name at least 3)

- 1. New Benchmark Advanced Adoption**
- 2. Ideas for high enrichment opportunities**
- 3. Data analysis to drive instruction**

PLC – Planning Next Steps

Review the “Critical Focus Area: High Functioning Professional Learning Communities” and the accompanying “Critical Focus Area Action Steps” section of your school’s 2017-18 Magnet School Plan.

Reflect on the progress (if any) that has been made in achieving these action steps. Identify next steps.

Quarter 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers will engage in the PLC process weekly to clarify the essential learning for each units of instruction as determine by the TUSD Curriculum 5.0 and scope and sequence, to participate in data analysis, to create common formative assessments and to determine and plan for needed interventions and re-teaching. <p>Action Step: Principal and Magnet Coordinator will meet with grade level PLC to determine if teachers are incorporating the schoolwide PLC goal.</p>
Quarter 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers will engage in the PLC process weekly to clarify the essential learning for each units of instruction as determine by the TUSD Curriculum 5.0 and scope and sequence, to participate in data analysis, to create common formative assessments and to determine and plan for needed interventions and re-teaching. <p>Action Step: Principal and Magnet Coordinator will meet with grade level PLC to determine if teachers are incorporating the schoolwide PLC goal.</p>
Quarter 3/4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers will engage in the PLC process weekly to clarify the essential learning for each units of instruction as determine by the TUSD



Magnet – School Level Quarterly Report

2019-20

PROFESSIONAL LEARNING COMMUNITIES

	<p>Curriculum 5.0 and scope and sequence, to participate in data analysis, to create common formative assessments and to determine and plan for needed interventions and re-teaching.</p> <p>Action Step: Principal and Magnet Coordinator will meet with grade level PLC to determine if teachers are incorporating the schoolwide PLC goal.</p>
<p>For 2020/21</p>	<p>Conitnue to set goals for student adamica success.</p>



Magnet – School Level Quarterly Report

2019-20

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Directions: Each school is allocated opportunities for Site Focused PD for the 2019-20 school year. If additional opportunities for PD have been offered (such as Saturday PD), please add additional rows.

SITE SPECIFIC PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT			
Date	Title of PD	Focus of PD	Rationale
9-18-19	Exceptional Education	New strategies to use with SPED students	These strategies are able to be implemented with all grade levels and students to help improve academics. Reviewed our Inclusion program and the needs to remain successful.
9-25-19	Culturally Relevant Curriculum	Incorporate culture into curriculum	Important to understand the different cultures that are students possess at our school. Staff reviewed biases and how to respond to negative actions/remarks that demeans a culture within the workplace. Promoted the use of literacy to incorporate all cultures in the classroom.
10-2-19	K-12 Literacy	Benchmark Advance	We took time to investigate the new ELA adoption. Teachers took time to meet within their grade levels and let us know what is working and what they still have questions about when meeting the scope and sequence of the district versus incorporating the new curriculum with fidelity.
10-6-19	Benchmark Analysis	Review data from School City	View results from the data to drive our curriculum. Staff reviewed the outcomes in terms of proficiency according to USP ethnic breakdown, grade level, and classroom level. Teachers identified CUSP students and monitored student growth. Teachers will use this information to reform small groups for interventions.
11-6-19	Culturally Relevant Curriculum 2	Incorporate culture into curriculum	Important to understand the different cultures that are students possess at our school. Teachers shared out the various strategies, activities, and lesson plans that they use to create an inclusive environment in the classroom.
11-13-20	Successmaker Training	Using Successmaker for student success	Teachers reviewed the various reports in Successmaker and how to use the data, using it as another indicator of student

Magnet – School Level Quarterly Report**2019-20****PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

			learning. Teachers shared their successes and challenges in using this program this year.
12-4-20	Exceptional Education 2	New strategies to use with SPED students	Carrillo Ex Ed teachers shared many different strategies that can be used with students with a learning disability. Collaboration time was used for Inclusion/Gen Ed. Teachers to review data and plan for future lessons in order to support students within the classroom.
12-11-19	Writing	Incorporating new writing strategies	Teachers learned new strategies to use in their classrooms. Teachers reviewed common language that will be used when teaching writing to students as they use new techniques. Teachers began working on a creating a grade level student friendly rubric. Vertical teaming included in the process to allow for articulation between the grades in regard to standards and expectations in writing.
12-18-19	PBIS/Restorative Practices		
1-8-20	Score Writing Benchmarks	Grade student benchmarks	Staff reviewed the outcomes in terms of proficiency according to USP ethnic breakdown, grade level, and classroom level. Teachers identified CUSP students and monitored student growth. Teachers will use this information to reform small groups for interventions.
1-15-20	Benchmark Data Analysis	Review data from School City	View results from the data to drive our curriculum. Staff reviewed the outcomes in terms of proficiency according to USP ethnic breakdown, grade level, and classroom level. Teachers identified CUSP students and monitored student growth. Teachers will use this information to reform small groups for interventions.
1-22-20	Writing	Incorporating new writing strategies	Teachers learned new strategies to use in their classrooms. Teachers reviewed common language that will be used when teaching writing to students as they use new techniques. Teachers began working on a creating a grade level student friendly rubric. Vertical teaming included in the process to

Magnet – School Level Quarterly Report**2019-20****PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

Magnet Program



			allow for articulation between the grades in regard to standards and expectations in writing.
1-29-20	PLCs	Teachers split up into PLC groups	View results from the data to drive our curriculum. Staff reviewed the outcomes in terms of proficiency according to USP ethnic breakdown, grade level, and classroom level. Teachers identified CUSP students and monitored student growth. Teachers will use this information to reform small groups for interventions.
2-5-20	Code of Conduct	Review of TUSD procedures	Teachers learned how to create and maintain a safe, supportive, and nurturing learning environment for every student at Carrillo.
2-12-20	Exceptional Education 3	New strategies to use with SPED students	These strategies are able to be implemented with all grade levels and students to help improve academics. Reviewed our Inclusion program and the needs to remain successful.
2-26-20	Writing	Incorporating new writing strategies	Teachers learned new strategies to use in their classrooms. Teachers reviewed common language that will be used when teaching writing to students as they use new techniques. Teachers began working on a creating a grade level student friendly rubric. Vertical teaming included in the process to allow for articulation between the grades in regard to standards and expectations in writing.
3-4-20	Culturally Relevant Curriculum 3	Incorporate culture into curriculum	Important to understand the different cultures that are students possess at our school. Teachers shared out the various strategies, activities, and lesson plans that they use to create an inclusive environment in the classroom.
3-11-20	AZ MERIT Testing Protocol	Incorporate testing protocol	Staff became familiar with administering the test learning to use the testing tools, and the accommodations available on AZ MERIT.
Summary/Reflection: Write a paragraph summarizing the professional development opportunities provided to staff during Quarter 1. During Quarter 2 and 3/4, update this paragraph as needed. During Quarter 3/4, include goals for 2020/21.			



Magnet – School Level Quarterly Report

2019-20

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

In Quarter 1, we were able to provide our staff with new learning strategies to use through the Exceptional Education, Culturally Relevant Curriculum, and the Benchmark Advance PDs. During Benchmark Analysis, teachers were able to look at data and create targeted interventions for their students. Teachers discussed PD information during grade level PLCs to help improve student learning.

During Quarter 2, we were able to provide our staff with new learning strategies to use in SuccessMaker and writing. We reviewed and learned new strategies to use in Exceptional Education and Culturally Relevant Curriculum. Teachers discussed PD information during grade level PLCs to help improve student learning.

During Quarter 3, we were able to provide our staff with new strategies to unify Carrillo's writing process from Kinder to 5th grade. We continued to new learn new strategies in incorporate view the Exceptional Education and Culturally Relevant Curriculum. During teacher PLC time, teachers discussed way to incorporate new strategies that were learned during PD time.

Magnet – School Level Quarterly Report

2019-20

FAMILY/COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

Magnet Program



FAMILY/COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT				
	Q1	Q2	Q3/Q4	Total
# Family/community events	13	14	12	39
# Participants in family/community events	1,272	2,223	1,578	5,073
Summary: List one example of parent/community engagement for each of Epstein's Six Types of Involvement below. Need more information? https://www.sps186.org/downloads/table/13040/6TypesJ.Epstein.pdf				
	Name of Activity	Brief Description		
Type 1: Parenting	Kinder Roundup	Incoming families learn about school programs, events, and policies. They learn about the different ways to communicate with our school and staff.		
Type 2: Communicating	Family Engagement Meeting	Parents learn about school programs, events, and policies. Parents were able to give feedback about programs and events.		
Type 3: Volunteering	PTO Meeting	Parents learn about school programs, events, and policies. They learn about the different ways to communicate with our school and staff.		
Type 4: Learning at Home	Student of the Month Celebrations	Carrillo staff celebrate students who have continued to use strategies in class and at home throughout the month. Parents are invited to celebrate their child's hard work.		
Type 5: Decision Making	Site Council Meeting	Parents learn about school programs, events, and policies. They look at budget and help make decisions for the school.		
Type 6: Collaborating with Community	Math and Science Night	Students learn new strategies to excite them about the subjects of math and science. Groups from the university and Tucson community participate in running hands on booths for our families.		
Reflection: Family involvement is key at our school. We are fortunate to have approximately 350 students. Our parents and students enjoy participating in our events, which builds a positive, family-like environment at Carrillo.				



Magnet – School Level Quarterly Report

2019-20

PARTNERSHIPS

Directions: List the partnerships at your school that support your magnet program. For schools with more than 10 partnerships, please list the 10 partners that are the most involved with your magnet program.

PARTNERSHIPS				
	Partnership	New or Established?	Letter of Support on File at Site (Yes/No)?	Description of Partnership – How does it support your magnet program?
1.	Sonora Glass	E	Y	Supports our fine arts curriculum.
2.	Quarles and Brady Law Firm	E	Y	They come and read to our students on a biweekly basis. They also help our school by donating funds and supplies.
3.	El Presidio	E	Y	Bring real-life experience of historic Tucson. Students act out role of living in the frontier days and participate in Las Posadas at El Presidio.
4.	Children’s Museum	E	Y	Students head over to museum once a week and participate in innovative science curriculum. Our teachers also attend to receive training in science for their classrooms.
5.	Pima Community College	E	Y	Pima participated in our Literacy Night and their athletic department came out for our Fitness Night. They will participate in our Math/Science Night this year. Guest speakers come and talk about career choices.
6.	TPD	E	Y	TPD participates in Love of Reading Week, Community Kinder Lessons, and Career Day.
7.	Pima County Health Prevention	E	Y	Pima County provides SWAT Staff with training on health and nutrition. They also help staff train SWAT member into becoming leaders of the school.
8.	TCC	E	N	We use the Leo Rich Theater at the TCC for our Winter Concert and for our end of the year 5 th grade and kinder promotion.
9.	University of Arizona	E	Y	Various clubs from the university help with tutoring, our family nights (Math/Science, Literacy, Fitness, and Culture), and our after school programs.



Magnet – School Level Quarterly Report

2019-20

PARTNERSHIPS

10.	UA Community and School Garden Program School of Geography and Development	E	Y	Provide leadership gardening tips and strategies for our teachers and students.
-----	---	---	---	---



Magnet – School Level Quarterly Report

2019-20

CELEBRATIONS AND CHALLENGES

Directions: Record your Celebrations and Challenges below. Please help us easily find information by highlighting **AWARDS** that your campus has applied for or received in blue, **GRANTS** that your campus has applied for or received in green. Highlight **SCHOLARSHIPS/COLLEGE ACCEPTANCES** in pink. (Short bullet points only, please)

SITE LEVEL CELEBRATIONS	SITE LEVEL CHALLENGES
Quarter 1	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All our grade levels scored higher than the district in both ELA and Math through the TUSD benchmarks. We received A status through the state of Arizona. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintaining A status with the state.
Q1 Reflection: We continue to be fully integrated school! We received national certification and the merits award through Magnet Schools of America.	
Quarter 2	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We continue to be fully integrated school. Our principal, Lori Conner, has been nominated for National Principal of the Year through Magnet Schools of America. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporating the new TUSD literacy program, Benchmark Advance, into our daily curriculum.
Q2 Reflection: Quarter 2 has been incredibly productive. We have worked to unify the way we teach writing at Carrillo across all grade levels. We continue to use our PDs and PICs to examine data to guide our instruction. Our students continue to outperform the district in the TUSD quarterly benchmarks.	
Quarter 3/4	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All our grade levels scored higher than the district in both ELA and Math through the TUSD benchmarks. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporating schoolwide writing program through all of our grade levels.
Q3 Reflection: Our principal, Lori Conner, received the distinction of National Principal of the Year through Magnet Schools of America.	
Annual Summary	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall, we had a great year! We received A statuses from the state. Our family events were well attended by the Carrillo community. Students performed well on the School City Benchmarks. Carrillo continues to be an integrated school. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> With our principal retiring, we will have the challenge of working with a new principal for the 2020-2021 school year.

Magnet Program



Magnet – School Level Quarterly Report

2019-20

CELEBRATIONS AND CHALLENGES

Q4/Annual Reflection: NA



MAGNET 2019-20

SCHOOL LEVEL QUARTERLY REPORT

SCHOOL NAME: Davis Bilingual Magnet Elementary	MAGNET THEME(S): Dual Language Immersion
---	---

MAGNET LEADERSHIP TEAM MEMBERS	
NAME	TITLE
Jose Olivas	Principal
Cate Arnquist	Magnet Coordinator
Brenda Maytorena	CSP
Mercedes Vella	Librarian/ MTSS
Anel Castro Green	EXED/ MTSS
Adriana Boyd	3 rd grade teacher
Julian Barcelo	1 st grade teacher
Reyna Vazquez	Community Liaison

MAGNET LEADERSHIP TEAM MEETINGS	
DATE	# MINUTES MET
8-28-19	70 minutes
9-25-19	45 minutes
10-30-19	60 minutes
11-3-19	90 minutes
11-13-19	60 minutes
11-14-19	90 minutes
11-20-19	90 minutes
12-11-19	90 minutes
12-17-19	5 hours
12-18-19	60 minutes
1-23-20	60 minutes
2-5-20	30 minutes
2-26-20	60 minutes
3-31-20	60 minutes



Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

INTEGRATION

Recruitment: Record actions taken this quarter to support your integration goal. Include tours, phone inquiries, mailings, school visits, other recruitment activities conducted by your site. Include District recruitment events and mailings that were specific to your magnet program. Insert additional lines as needed. Keep appropriate documentation (recruitment log) on site for review.

COMMUNICATION

Activity: Recruitment Mailings/Fliers

(Record the # of school/district generated magnet mailings. Examples: 100 surveys to neighborhood parents, 500 open house postcards. Dropping off fliers at schools counts as mailings.)

Range	# Mailings/ Fliers	# of responses	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	0	0	Mailing scheduled for Q2 to advertise Kinder Info Night in November,
Quarter 2	965/ 46		Mailed invitations to Kinder Open House for Prospective Incoming Kinders. Fliers left at Desert Spring, Tucson Community School, 2 nd Street Children's Center
Quarter 3/4			
Totals			

Activity: Recruitment Related Phone Calls

Range	#	# ParentLink (recruitment)	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	29	0	
Quarter 2	22	0	Tour scheduling
Quarter 3/4	10	0	Tour scheduling and inquiries
Totals	61	0	

Activity: Retention Related Phone Calls

Range	#	# ParentLink (retention)	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	0	5	
Quarter 2	0	5	
Quarter 3/4	0	20	
Totals		30	

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report**INTEGRATION**

Magnet Programs



Activity: Recruitment - Electronic Communication				
Range	Outgoing e-mails	Incoming e-mails	Social media (ie: # posts)	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	19	5	2	Tour inquiries and follow ups
Quarter 2	19	14	3	Tour inquiries and follow ups, Kinder Open house communication, Posts for recruiting events and Kinder Open House
Quarter 3/4	11+34	13	1	Advertising the Kinder Welcome event, which was later canceled due to school closure (covid 19). 34 emails to cancel invitation for Kinder Welcome
Totals	83	32	6	
Activity: Retention - Electronic Communication				
Range	Outgoing e-mails	Incoming e-mails	Social media (ie: # posts)	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	13 (parentlink)	0	10	Posts to advertise events and share enthusiasm for Davis.
Quarter 2	10		18	
Quarter 3/4	12+ 10 (parentlink)	1	6	Emails regarding science fair winners, 1 email regarding class placement for next year, Facebook posts about love of reading week, Davis Run, video message during school closure, fundraisers, free Grab'n'Go lunch during closure, updates regarding school closure. Voice parentlinks regarding important events and updates for the community.
Totals	45	1	34	



Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

INTEGRATION

RECRUITMENT ACTIVITIES AND EVENTS

Activity: On-Site Recruitment

(For example, open house, classes visiting from feeder schools, student shadowing)

Range	Activity	# of participants	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	New Family Welcome (8/1/19)	11	
Quarter 2	Kinder Open House	26	
Quarter 3/4	Kinder Welcome was canceled	0	
Totals		37	

Activity: Off-Site Recruitment

(For example, school visits, brochures left at a business or school, fliers posted at community centers. **Do not include District recruitment events**)

Range	Activity	# Brochures/ rack cards distributed	# of responses	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	Visits are planned for early in Q2	0	0	
Quarter 2	Brichta event, 2 nd street children's center event	2 nd street- 10 Brichta- 12	5	
Quarter 3/4	None-			Following lottery there are no more available spaces at Davis so recruiting was limited. After COVID 19, more events were cancelled
Totals		22	5	

Activity: Tours

(Record the number of potential applicants. For example, if one parent comes for a tour with two potential student applicants, count the number as 2. Include shadowing.)

Range	# Students	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	15	Tours on Aug 19, Sept 9,23,30

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

INTEGRATION

Magnet Programs



Quarter 2	28	Tours on Oct. 14, 21, 28, 30, Nov 12, 25, Dec 2, 6, 11, 16
Quarter 3/4	7	Jan 6, Jan 13, Jan 23, Feb 3
Totals	50	



MAGNET 2019-20

SCHOOL LEVEL QUARTERLY REPORT

SCHOOL NAME: Dodge Traditional Magnet Middle School	MAGNET THEME(S): Traditional 5R
--	--

MAGNET LEADERSHIP TEAM MEMBERS	
NAME	TITLE
McGlory, Dinah	Principal
Swanson, Apryl	Magnet Coordinator
Arvayo, Natasha	Dean
Bennett, Tara	Family Liaison
Davis, Ben	Intervention Specialist
Haley, Tonya	Counselor
Hubbard, Sherry	Office Manager
Kent, Andrea	Grade Level PLCs, Math Intervention
Kruszewski, Daniel	Elective, Testing Coordinator
Mckechnie, Maura	Math PLC, Sports
Regole, Shirley	ELD, ELA PLC

MEETING TIMES	
DATE	# MINUTES MET
8/16/19	60 min
8/23/19	60 min
8/30/19	60 min
9/6/19	60 min
9/13/19	60 min
9/20/19	60 min
9/27/19	60 min
10/4/19	60 min
10/18/19	60 min
10/25/19	60 min
11/1/19	60 min
11/7/19	30 min
11/15/19	60 min
11/22/19	60 min
11/27/19	60 min
12/12/19	60 min
12/16/19	60 min
1/10/20	60 min
1/17/20	60 min
1/24/20	60 min
1/31/20	60 min

Magnet Program



MAGNET 2019-20

SCHOOL LEVEL QUARTERLY REPORT

2/2/20	60min
2/14/20	60min
2/28/20	60 min
3/6/20	60 min
3/13/20	60 min

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report**INTEGRATION**

Magnet Program



Recruitment: Record actions taken this quarter to support your integration goal. Include tours, phone inquiries, mailings, school visits, other recruitment activities conducted by your site. Include District recruitment events and mailings that were specific to your magnet program. Insert additional lines as needed. Keep appropriate documentation (recruitment log) on site for review.

COMMUNICATION**Activity: Recruitment Mailings/Fliers**

(Record the # of school/district generated mailings. Examples: 100 surveys to neighborhood parents, 500 open house postcards. Dropping off fliers at schools counts as mailings.)

Range	# Mailings/ Fliers	# of responses	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	1650	unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hand delivered invites to Fruchthendler, Holiday Elementary to join Dodge's Orchestra/Band Concert. Hand delivered postcards to TUSD, Basis, Adventure elementary schools and numerous area business to Middle School Night to take place 10/24/19
Quarter 2	68	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Handed out brochures about Dodge Middle School TMC & Encompass
Quarter 3/4	155	135	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mailings to parents of upcoming orientation for first lottery acceptance
Totals	1873	135	

Activity: Recruitment Related Phone Calls

Range	#	# Parent Link (recruitment)	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	21	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inviting families & friends to Dodge Orchestra/Band concert Invites to upcoming Middle School Recruitment night on 10/24/19 Securing food trucks for events
Quarter 2	18	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contacted parents about open enrollment Fielded calls regarding tour appointments and student shadows
Quarter 3/4	20	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Calls to parents that had yet to respond to lottery selection to confirm their acceptance to Dodge Parent link letters to let parents know of upcoming 6th grade orientation

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report**INTEGRATION**

Magnet Program



			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parent link letter to let parents know about the rescheduling of the 6th grade orientation due to COVID-19
Totals	59	12	
Activity: Retention Related Phone Calls			
Range	#	# Parent Link (retention)	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	0	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assurance of child safety after an investigation of a possible gun threat Inviting parents to orchestra/band concert Honor Awards Assembly,
Quarter 2	0	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Counselor and Principal met with one family who withdrew from Dodge and enrolled at Safford because of discipline issues with student
Totals	8	9	
Quarter 3/4	8	6	Responses to emails and phone calls regarding enrollment in the fall

Activity: Recruitment - Electronic Communication				
Range	Outgoing e-mails	Incoming e-mails	Social media (i.e.: # posts)	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	17	17	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emails regarding upcoming events invites Scheduling of tours Answering questions about the lottery process for opening of enrollment. Contact Mrs. Swanson for Tours
Quarter 2	13	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Updated website regarding scheduling tours, enrollment dates, and lottery process Parent Link-newsletter with information about open enrollment
Quarter 3/4	6	6	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parent Link – Newsletter, Dodge Dispatch regarding online learning and COVID - 19
Totals	36	36	3	
Activity: Retention - Electronic Communication				

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

INTEGRATION



Range	Outgoing e-mails	Incoming e-mails	Social media (i.e.: # posts)	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	0	0	3	Dodge Dispatch Parent Newsletter
Quarter 2	0	0	3	Dodge Dispatch Parent Newsletter and upcoming events announcements
Quarter 3/4	0	0	4	Dodge Dispatch Parent Newsletter
Totals	0	0	10	Dodge Dispatch Parent Newsletter

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

INTEGRATION

Magnet Program



RECRUITMENT ACTIVITIES AND EVENTS

Activity: **On-Site Recruitment**

(For example, open house, classes visiting from feeder schools, student shadowing)

Range	Activity	# of participants	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	Band/Orchestra concert	450	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Invited outside elementary schools' families and friends to attend Dodge's school concert along with existing Dodge families/friends
Quarter 2	Tours	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tours
Quarter 3/4	Tours	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tours
Totals	Tours/Concerts	71	

Activity: **Off-Site Recruitment**(For example, school visits, brochures left at a business or school, fliers posted at community centers. **Do not include District recruitment events**)

Range	Activity	# Brochures/ rack cards distributed	# of responses	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	Middle School Night at Cabrillo, African American Student Services Trick or Treat Magnet Meet	1620	unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delivered invitations to Holiday & Fruchthendler to attend Dodge Orchestra/Band concert. Delivered postcards to TUSD schools, Basis, Adventure Elementary School and area businesses (Trader Joes, Walmart, Long Horn Steak House, Vantage Credit Union) to attend Dodge's Middle School Night on October 24, 2019. Attended Middle School Night at Carrillo Middle School Night 10/17/19 Attended the African American Student Services Trick or Treat Magnet Meet 10/16/19
Quarter 2	Visited Area Businesses	116	unknown	Went to fast food businesses/Credit Unions
3/4	Visited Area Businesses	212	unknown	Passed out rack cards/brochures at Encompass, TMC Hospital, St. Joseph Hospital, Social Security Office, Post Office, DMV
Totals		1948	unknown	

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

INTEGRATION

Magnet Program



Activity: Tours		
(Record the number of potential applicants. For example, if one parent comes for a tour with two potential student applicants, count the number as 2. Include shadowing.)		
Range	# Students	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	3	One Asian father who was transferred by Raytheon to Tucson from Florida and was looking for a school for his 7 th grade son, One white couple who had a 5 th grade son that was presently taking an 8 th grade math class, One white mom whose daughter wanted to go to Vail School District but mom wanted her to go to Dodge
Quarter 2	9	African American and Bi-racial parents were very interested in touring our school, all wanted to know their chances of getting in our school since they were a minority. I told them that a computer algorithm selects the students and that race is part of the equation. So, they have a good chance since there were only 8% African Americans in our school.
Quarter 3/4	2	-Right before Spring Break, I had two families that wanted a tour despite lottery selections had already been made. TUSD schools never reopened after Spring Break.
Totals		

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

INTEGRATION

Magnet Program



Retention: Access the Synergy report “U-STU-2: Daily Enrollment by Student Demographics.

STUDENT RETENTION

Are there any noteworthy differences or trends that you notice when analyzing this data?

Reflection: There are three times as many Hispanics as there are white students. The number of black students is quite miniscule in comparison with only 8.7%. Students are admitted to Dodge via a lottery process that is selected by a computer program. Preference goes to siblings already attending the school. The second preference goes to our feeder school which is Bonillas Elementary. Bonillas has pretty much the same percentages of ethnic groups as Dodge. To ensure continued integration, I need to focus on recruiting African Americans and White/Anglo students making sure they enroll before the cutoff date.

Theme Visibility: Theme Visibility is not an emphasis area for SY 2019-20; however, it still plays an important role in establishing the culture and climate of each site.

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report**INTEGRATION**

Magnet Program

**Daily Enrollment by Grade, Gender and USP Ethnicity****502 - Dodge Traditional Magnet Middle**

On: 10/18/2019 (Day 50 SY 2019-20)

Grade	White/Anglo		African American		Hispanic		Native American		Asian American		Multi-racial		Total		
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	Total
06	15	12	8	9	47	38	3	2	1	1	7	3	81	65	146
	10.3%	8.2%	5.5%	6.2%	32.2%	26.0%	2.1%	1.4%	0.7%	0.7%	4.8%	2.1%	55.5%	44.5%	
07	19	12	2	8	48	40	0	4	3	2	1	6	73	72	145
	13.1%	8.3%	1.4%	5.5%	33.1%	27.6%	0.0%	2.8%	2.1%	1.4%	0.7%	4.1%	50.3%	49.7%	
08	11	15	7	3	44	41	2	1	3	1	5	0	72	61	133
	8.3%	11.3%	5.3%	2.3%	33.1%	30.8%	1.5%	0.8%	2.3%	0.8%	3.8%	0.0%	54.1%	45.9%	
Total	45	39	17	20	139	119	5	7	7	4	13	9	226	198	424
	10.6%	9.2%	4.0%	4.7%	32.8%	28.1%	1.2%	1.7%	1.7%	0.9%	3.1%	2.1%	53.3%	46.7%	
	84		37		258		12		11		22		424		
	19.8%		8.7%		60.8%		2.8%		2.6%		5.2%		100.0%		

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report**INTEGRATION**

Magnet Program

**502 - Dodge Traditional Magnet Middle**

On: 01/16/2020 (Day 100 SY 2019-20)

Grade	White/Anglo		African American		Hispanic		Native American		Asian American		Multi-racial		Total		
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	Total
06	15	12	8	9	46	38	3	2	1	1	7	3	80	65	145
	10.3%	8.3%	5.5%	6.2%	31.7%	26.2%	2.1%	1.4%	0.7%	0.7%	4.8%	2.1%	55.2%	44.8%	
07	19	12	2	7	48	40	0	4	3	2	1	6	73	71	144
	13.2%	8.3%	1.4%	4.9%	33.3%	27.8%	0.0%	2.8%	2.1%	1.4%	0.7%	4.2%	50.7%	49.3%	
08	11	14	7	3	44	39	2	1	3	1	5	0	72	58	130
	8.5%	10.8%	5.4%	2.3%	33.8%	30.0%	1.5%	0.8%	2.3%	0.8%	3.8%	0.0%	55.4%	44.6%	
Total	45	38	17	19	138	117	5	7	7	4	13	9	225	194	419
	10.7%	9.1%	4.1%	4.5%	32.9%	27.9%	1.2%	1.7%	1.7%	1.0%	3.1%	2.1%	53.7%	46.3%	
	83		36		255		12		11		22		419		
	19.8%		8.6%		60.9%		2.9%		2.6%		5.3%		100.0%		

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report**INTEGRATION**

Magnet Program

**Daily Enrollment by Grade, Gender and USP Ethnicity****502 - Dodge Traditional Magnet Middle**

On: 03/24/2020 (Day 139 SY 2019-20)

Grade	White/Anglo		African American		Hispanic		Native American		Asian American		Multi-racial		Total		
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	Total
06	15	12	8	9	46	36	3	2	1	1	7	3	80	63	143
	10.5%	8.4%	5.6%	6.3%	32.2%	25.2%	2.1%	1.4%	0.7%	0.7%	4.9%	2.1%	55.9%	44.1%	
07	19	12	2	7	48	40	0	4	3	2	1	6	73	71	144
	13.2%	8.3%	1.4%	4.9%	33.3%	27.8%	0.0%	2.8%	2.1%	1.4%	0.7%	4.2%	50.7%	49.3%	
08	11	14	7	3	44	38	2	1	3	1	5	0	72	57	129
	8.5%	10.9%	5.4%	2.3%	34.1%	29.5%	1.6%	0.8%	2.3%	0.8%	3.9%	0.0%	55.8%	44.2%	
Total	45	38	17	19	138	114	5	7	7	4	13	9	225	191	416
	10.8%	9.1%	4.1%	4.6%	33.2%	27.4%	1.2%	1.7%	1.7%	1.0%	3.1%	2.2%	54.1%	45.9%	
	83		36		252		12		11		22		416		
	20.0%		8.7%		60.6%		2.9%		2.6%		5.3%		100.0%		

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

INTEGRATION



THEME VISIBILITY

Review the components found in the table below. Shade the box for each quarter for components that are strengths for your site in **green**. In the non-shaded boxes, identify what steps will be taken to ensure that this is addressed. Goal: Increase theme visibility from Q1 to Q4.

Component	Q1	Q2	Q3/Q4	Goal for 2020/21
Current magnet theme is evident on exterior of building/grounds.				
Magnet school name is given in phone greeting.				
Magnet theme is evident in main office.				
Magnet theme is evident in common areas.				
Magnet theme is evident in hallways/display areas in posted student work				
Magnet theme is noted in school communications/media.				
Teachers have specific areas of the campus and facility for magnet activities/lessons/presentations	We have a very small campus for small groups to meet outside of the library and the library and cafeteria is sometimes used for			

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

INTEGRATION



	presentations & activities.			
Magnet theme is incorporated into the school's mission/vision statement.				
Evidence of family/community engagement/partnerships.				

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT



Directions: Use SchoolCity to access Report “**Summary**” data for each of the grade levels tested during Benchmark 1. Use the Snipping Tool to take a screen shot of each grade level for Math and ELA, then fill out the Reflection box. Make sure to capture both Tucson Unified average scores and your school’s average scores for each grade level and subject area. Please delete any non-applicable grades from the table.

ELA – Q1 BENCHMARK

Are there any noteworthy differences or trends that you notice in comparing Benchmark achievement between your school and the District for ELA? What strategies or action steps are being employed to address these differences/trends (if applicable)?

Reflection: Based on Benchmark scores, all grade levels showed a minor gain, still outperforming the District average.

ELA – Q1 Benchmark Data

Insert screen shots in the appropriate boxes below. Delete any rows that are not applicable to your site

1718.TUSD.ELA.06.Q1Benchmark

By Grade ▲	# Tested ⬆	Participation Rate ⬆	Avg. RS ⬆	Avg. % Correct ⬆	Avg. TS ⬆	Proficient			Not Proficient		
						# ⬆	% ⬆	Avg. TS ⬆	# ⬆	% ⬆	Avg. TS ⬆
Tucson Unified School District	2982	88.5%	11.8	39.3% ■	58.33	1268	42.5% ■	59.52	1714	57.5% ■	57.36
DODGE	140	95.9%	14.9	49.7% ■	47.14	89	63.6% ■	45.38	51	36.4% ■	50.02
Grade 6	140	4.2%	14.9	49.7% ■	47.14	89	63.6% ■	45.38	51	36.4% ■	50.02

1718.TUSD.ELA.07.Q1Benchmark

By Grade ▲	# Tested ⬆	Participation Rate ⬆	Avg. RS ⬆	Avg. % Correct ⬆	Avg. TS ⬆	Proficient			Not Proficient		
						# ⬆	% ⬆	Avg. TS ⬆	# ⬆	% ⬆	Avg. TS ⬆
Tucson Unified School District	3034	87.9%	16.1	53.7% ■	42.03	1213	40% ■	41.53	1821	60% ■	42.10
DODGE	135	93.1%	19.5	65.1% ■	33.49	91	67.4% ■	31.36	44	32.6% ■	38.24
Grade 7	135	4.0%	19.5	65.1% ■	33.49	91	67.4% ■	31.36	44	32.6% ■	38.24

1718.TUSD.ELA.08.Q1Benchmark

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT



By Grade ▲	# Tested ⚡	Participation Rate ⚡	Avg. RS ⚡	Avg. % Correct ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡	Proficient			Not Proficient		
						# ⚡	% ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡	# ⚡	% ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡
Tucson Unified School District	2896	86.2%	13.7	45.5%	49.26	1286	44.4%	49.12	1610	55.6%	49.38
DODGE	129	97.0%	16.9	56.2%	41.55	88	68.2%	39.41	41	31.8%	46.41
Grade 8	129	3.9%	16.9	56.2%	41.55	88	68.2%	39.41	41	31.8%	46.41

ELA – Q2 BENCHMARK

Reflection: Noteworthy changes were that the scores dropped 5.1% from first quarter to second quarter. However, it's like comparing apples to oranges because students were tested on completely different new competencies that were not tested on the previous benchmarks. Dodge continued to outperform many middle schools within TUSD and outperformed the District as a whole. District proficiency level is 37% and Dodge performed at 56.9%

ELA – Q2 Benchmark Data

Insert screen shots in the appropriate boxes below. Delete any rows that are not applicable to your site

1718.TUSD.ELA.06.Q2Benchmark

By Grade ▲	# Tested ⚡	Participation Rate ⚡	Avg. RS ⚡	Avg. % Correct ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡	Proficient			Not Proficient		
						# ⚡	% ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡	# ⚡	% ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡
Tucson Unified School District	2830	84.8%	12.9	43.1%	57.53	1048	37%	61.11	1782	63%	55.56
DODGE	144	100.0%	15.3	51.1%	44.32	82	56.9%	43.50	62	43.1%	45.28
Filtered Students Average	144	100.0%	15.3	51.1%	44.32	82	56.9%	43.50	62	43.1%	45.28
Grade 6	144	4.4%	15.3	51.1%	44.32	82	56.9%	43.50	62	43.1%	45.28

1718.TUSD.ELA.07.Q2Benchmark

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT



By Grade ▲	# Tested ⚡	Participation Rate ⚡	Avg. RS ⚡	Avg. % Correct ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡	Proficient			Not Proficient		
						# ⚡	% ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡	# ⚡	% ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡
Tucson Unified School District	2909	84.4%	15.1	50.5%	42.22	1292	44.4%	44.31	1617	55.6%	40.39
DODGE	144	100.0%	18	60.2%	32.12	92	63.9%	31.42	52	36.1%	33.05
Grade 7	144	4.2%	18	60.2%	32.12	92	63.9%	31.42	52	36.1%	33.05

1718.TUSD.ELA.08.Q2Benchmark

By Grade ▲	# Tested ⚡	Participation Rate ⚡	Avg. RS ⚡	Avg. % Correct ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡	Proficient			Not Proficient		
						# ⚡	% ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡	# ⚡	% ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡
Tucson Unified School District	2827	84.1%	14.8	49.5%	57.59	1140	40.3%	57.36	1687	59.7%	58.15
DODGE	129	100.0%	17.8	59.5%	51.29	82	63.6%	47.37	47	36.4%	58.13
Filtered Students Average	129	100.0%	17.8	59.5%	51.29	82	63.6%	47.37	47	36.4%	58.13
Grade 8	129	3.9%	17.8	59.5%	51.29	82	63.6%	47.37	47	36.4%	58.13

ELA – Q3 BENCHMARK

Are there any noteworthy differences or trends that you notice in comparing Benchmark achievement between your school and the District for ELA? What strategies or action steps are being employed to address these differences/trends (if applicable)? Have these differences changed from the previous benchmarks?

Reflection: During the 3rd quarter Dodge’s 6th graders’ ELA Benchmark Data proficiency rate was 18.8% more proficient than the Tucson Unified School District’s average. In the 7th grade, Dodge’s 3rd quarter ELA proficiency rate was 26.7% higher than the District’s proficiency rate. In the 8th grade, Dodge’s 3rd quarter proficiency rate is 15.6% more proficient than the District of the same grade level. Dodge ELA Benchmark scores were higher in all grade levels in the District.

ELA – Q3 Benchmark Data
 Insert screen shots in the appropriate boxes below. Delete any rows that are not applicable to your site

1718.TUSD.ELA.06.Q3Benchmark

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT



By Grade ▲	# Tested ▼	Participation Rate ▼	Avg. RS ▼	Avg. % Correct ▼	Avg. TS ▼	Proficient			Not Proficient	
						# ▼	% ▼	Avg. TS ▼	# ▼	% ▼
Tucson Unified School District	2597	88.5%	14.6	48.8%	62.30	1052	40.5%	66.24	1545	59.5%
DODGE	123	98.4%	17.2	57.3%	49.49	73	59.3%	50.45	50	40.7%
Filtered Students Average	123	98.4%	17.2	57.3%	49.49	73	59.3%	50.45	50	40.7%
Grade 6	123	4.2%	17.2	57.3%	49.49	73	59.3%	50.45	50	40.7%

1718.TUSD.ELA.07.Q3Benchmark

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Magnet Program



By Grade ▲	# Tested ▼	Participation Rate ▼	Avg. RS ▼	Avg. % Correct ▼	Avg. TS ▼	Proficient			Not Proficient	
						# ▼	% ▼	Avg. TS ▼	# ▼	% ▼
Tucson Unified School District	2712	88.8%	12.9	43.1%	55:13	1161	42.8%	55:23	1551	57.2%
DODGE	131	100.0%	16.3	54.2%	40:45	91	69.5%	38:53	40	30.5%
Filtered Students Average	131	100.0%	16.3	54.2%	40:45	91	69.5%	38:53	40	30.5%
Grade 7	131	4.3%	16.3	54.2%	40:45	91	69.5%	38:53	40	30.5%

1718.TUSD.ELA.08.Q3Benchmark

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT



By Grade ▲	# Tested ▲	Participation Rate ▲	Avg. RS ▲	Avg. % Correct ▲	Avg. TS ▲	Proficient			Not Proficient	
						# ▲	% ▲	Avg. TS ▲	# ▲	% ▲
Tucson Unified School District	2591	87.0%	16.3	54.5%	58:50	925	35.7%	58:16	1666	64.3%
DODGE	115	98.3%	19.2	64%	49:44	59	51.3%	50:06	56	48.7%
Filtered Students Average	115	98.3%	19.2	64%	49:44	59	51.3%	50:06	56	48.7%
Grade 8	115	3.9%	19.2	64%	49:44	59	51.3%	50:06	56	48.7%

MATH – Q1 BENCHMARK

Are there any noteworthy differences or trends that you notice in comparing Benchmark achievement between your school and the District for Math? What strategies or action steps are being employed to address these differences/trends (if applicable)?

Reflection: Based on the Benchmark Scores, 7th grade math had a 17% increase and all other grade levels outperformed the District.

MATH – Q1 Benchmark Data

Insert screen shots in the appropriate boxes below. Delete any rows that are not applicable to your site

1718.TUSD.Math.06.Q1Benchmark

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT



By Grade ▲	# Tested ⚡	Participation Rate ⚡	Avg. RS ⚡	Avg. % Correct ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡	Proficient			Not Proficient		
						# ⚡	% ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡	# ⚡	% ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡
Tucson Unified School District	2679	79.5%	14.3	47.8% ■	60:53	1201	44.8% ■	63:18	1478	55.2% ■	58:56
DODGE	87	59.6%	15.5	51.8% ■	42:35	50	57.5% ■	42:07	37	42.5% ■	43:13
Grade 6	87	2.6%	15.5	51.8% ■	42:35	50	57.5% ■	42:07	37	42.5% ■	43:13

1718.TUSD.Math.07.Q1Benchmark

By Grade ▲	# Tested ⚡	Participation Rate ⚡	Avg. RS ⚡	Avg. % Correct ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡	Proficient			Not Proficient		
						# ⚡	% ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡	# ⚡	% ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡
Tucson Unified School District	2697	78.2%	9	29.9% ■	61:58	1161	43% ■	70:05	1536	57% ■	55:49
DODGE	145	100.0%	13.9	46.3% ■	58:43	111	76.6% ■	59:31	34	23.4% ■	56:06
Grade 7	145	4.3%	13.9	46.3% ■	58:43	111	76.6% ■	59:31	34	23.4% ■	56:06

1718.TUSD.Math.08.Q1Benchmark

By Grade ▲	# Tested ⚡	Participation Rate ⚡	Avg. RS ⚡	Avg. % Correct ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡	Proficient			Not Proficient		
						# ⚡	% ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡	# ⚡	% ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡
Tucson Unified School District	2818	82.9%	12.2	40.7% ■	56:29	1145	40.6% ■	63:46	1673	59.4% ■	51:30
DODGE	131	98.5%	16.2	53.9% ■	43:04	103	78.6% ■	43:21	28	21.4% ■	42:04
Grade 8	131	3.9%	16.2	53.9% ■	43:04	103	78.6% ■	43:21	28	21.4% ■	42:04

MATH – Q2 BENCHMARK

Reflection: Scores went down since the first quarter in both the District (32.4%) and at Dodge (46.1%), however, it should be noted that students were tested on new material, not the same material as in first quarter therefore, the comparison is incompatible. Students were given a 4 part question; getting 3 parts right and because 1 of the 3 was incorrect, the test question was marked wrong making it seem like the student didn't know any of the material. It also should be noted that the 6th grade, math scores went up from 57.5% up to 69.2%. Dodge score higher than the District in all grade levels by more than 20%!

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Magnet Program



MATH – Q2 Benchmark Data

Insert screen shots in the appropriate boxes below. Delete any rows that are not applicable to your site

1718.TUSD.Math.06.Q2Benchmark

By Grade ▲	# Tested ⚡	Participation Rate ⚡	Avg. RS ⚡	Avg. % Correct ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡	Proficient			Not Proficient		
						# ⚡	% ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡	# ⚡	% ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡
Tucson Unified School District	2665	75.6%	14.9	49.6%	59:50	1093	41%	59:54	1572	59%	59:48
DODGE	143	99.3%	19	63.2%	41:16	99	69.2%	40:45	44	30.8%	42:26
Grade 6	143	4.4%	19	63.2%	41:16	99	69.2%	40:45	44	30.8%	42:26

1718.TUSD.Math.07.Q2Benchmark

By Grade ▲	# Tested ⚡	Participation Rate ⚡	Avg. RS ⚡	Avg. % Correct ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡	Proficient			Not Proficient		
						# ⚡	% ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡	# ⚡	% ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡
Tucson Unified School District	2585	51.0%	9.7	32.4%	71:25	1070	41.4%	78:37	1515	58.6%	66:19
DODGE	144	75.0%	13.8	46.1%	57:25	103	71.5%	58:57	41	28.5%	53:33
Filtered Students Average	144	100.0%	13.8	46.1%	57:25	103	71.5%	58:57	41	28.5%	53:33
Grade 7	144	4.2%	13.8	46.1%	57:25	103	71.5%	58:57	41	28.5%	53:33

1718.TUSD.Math.08.Q2Benchmark

By Grade ▲	# Tested ⚡	Participation Rate ⚡	Avg. RS ⚡	Avg. % Correct ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡	Proficient			Not Proficient		
						# ⚡	% ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡	# ⚡	% ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡
Tucson Unified School District	2740	74.6%	11.7	39%	62:07	1128	41.2%	67:56	1612	58.8%	58:03
DODGE	129	66.8%	15.5	51.8%	47:03	92	71.3%	47:18	37	28.7%	46:27
Filtered Students Average	129	100.0%	15.5	51.8%	47:03	92	71.3%	47:18	37	28.7%	46:27
Grade 8	129	3.9%	15.5	51.8%	47:03	92	71.3%	47:18	37	28.7%	46:27

MATH – Q3 BENCHMARK

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT



Are there any noteworthy differences or trends that you notice in comparing Benchmark achievement between your school and the District for Math? What strategies or action steps are being employed to address these differences/trends (if applicable)? Have these differences changed from the previous benchmarks?

Reflection: Dodge's 6th grade benchmark data shows that Dodge's proficiency rate is 20.6 % higher than the 6th grade District average. In the 7th grade, Dodge's proficiency rate is 38.4% higher than the District and in the 8th grade, Dodge's proficiency rate is 33.9% higher than the District average. I believe the proficiency rate is much higher due to the fact that Dodge has awesome dedicated teachers that work collaboratively to help the students who are struggling. Teachers meet with students in the mornings, during their lunch hour and after school. Students are tutored and pulled from electives in order to help them reach their goals of achievement. Additionally, Dodge students have the use of IXL, a computer program that helps in assessing their shortcomings, letting the teachers know which students may need differentiated instruction.

MATH – Q3 Benchmark Data

Insert screen shots in the appropriate boxes below. Delete any rows that are not applicable to your site

1718.TUSD.Math.06.Q3Benchmark

By Grade ▲	# Tested ▲	Participation Rate ▲	Avg. RS ▲	Avg. % Correct ▲	Avg. TS ▲	Proficient			Not Proficient			
						# ▲	% ▲	Avg. TS ▲	# ▲	% ▲		
Tucson Unified School District	2448	83.4%	13.1	43.6%	65:23	1028	42%		69:07	1420	58%	
DODGE	123	98.4%	16.3	54.3%	43:23	77	62.6%		44:47	46	37.4%	
Filtered Students Average	123	98.4%	16.3	54.3%	43:23	77	62.6%		44:47	46	37.4%	
Grade 6	123	4.2%	16.3	54.3%	43:23	77	62.6%		44:47	46	37.4%	

1718.TUSD.Math.07.Q3Benchmark

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Magnet Program



By Grade ▲	# Tested ▲	Participation Rate ▲	Avg. RS ▲	Avg. % Correct ▲	Avg. TS ▲	Proficient			Not Proficient	
						# ▲	% ▲	Avg. TS ▲	# ▲	% ▲
Tucson Unified School District	2460	80.5%	12	39.9%	68:12	972	39.5%	74:23	1488	60.5%
DODGE	131	100.0%	16.8	56%	61:28	102	77.9%	62:35	29	22.1%
Filtered Students Average	131	100.0%	16.8	56%	61:28	102	77.9%	62:35	29	22.1%
Grade 7	131	4.3%	16.8	56%	61:28	102	77.9%	62:35	29	22.1%

1718.TUSD.Math.08.Q3Benchmark

By Grade ▲	# Tested ▲	Participation Rate ▲	Avg. RS ▲	Avg. % Correct ▲	Avg. TS ▲	Proficient			Not Proficient	
						# ▲	% ▲	Avg. TS ▲	# ▲	% ▲
Tucson Unified School District	2565	86.2%	15.4	51.2%	60:16	959	37.4%	62:00	1606	62.6%
DODGE	115	98.3%	19.2	64.1%	35:36	82	71.3%	34:32	33	28.7%
Filtered Students Average	115	98.3%	19.2	64.1%	35:36	82	71.3%	34:32	33	28.7%
Grade 8	115	3.9%	19.2	64.1%	35:36	82	71.3%	34:32	33	28.7%

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Magnet Program





STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Directions: Use SchoolCity to access “Demographic Profile” for each of the grade levels tested during Benchmark 1. Use “Ethnicity Subgroups” in the “Profile Groups to Display” box. Click the “Proficient/Not Proficient” radial button. Use the Snipping Tool to take a screen shot of each grade level for Math and ELA, then fill out the Reflection box:

ELA – Q1 ACHIEVEMENT GAP DATA

Are there any noteworthy differences or trends that you notice in comparing Benchmark achievement between ethnicities for ELA? What strategies or action steps are being employed to address these differences/trends (if applicable)?

Reflection: Anglo students outperformed Hispanic students by 10% and African American students outperformed Hispanic students by approximately 6 percent. However, all ethnic groups outperformed the District average.

Insert screen shots in the appropriate boxes below. Delete any rows that are not applicable to your site

1718.TUSD.ELA.06.Q1Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	123	100%	14.8	49.2%	77	62.6%	46	37.4%
Hispanic	88	71.5%	14.1	46.9%	53	60.2%	35	39.8%
White	25	20.3%	16.8	56.1%	18	72%	7	28%
African American	10	8.1%	15.7	52.3%	6	60%	4	40%

1718.TUSD.ELA.07.Q1Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	123	100%	19.5	65%	85	69.1%	38	30.9%
Hispanic	89	72.4%	19.4	64.5%	58	65.2%	31	34.8%
White	30	24.4%	20.1	66.9%	24	80%	6	20%
African American	4	3.3%	18.5	61.7%	3	75%	1	25%

1718.TUSD.ELA.08.Q1Benchmark

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Magnet Program



Ethnicity Subgroups ▲	Students Tested		Avg. RS ⚡	Avg. Percent Correct ⚡	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	# ▼	% ⚡			# ⚡	% ⚡	# ⚡	% ⚡
All Test Takers	117	100%	16.9	56.4%	80	68.4%	37	31.6%
Hispanic	86	73.5%	17	56.5%	59	68.6%	27	31.4%
White	25	21.4%	17.3	57.6%	19	76%	6	24%
African American	6	5.1%	15	50%	2	33.3%	4	66.7%

ELA – Q2 ACHIEVEMENT GAP DATA

Are there any noteworthy differences or trends that you notice in comparing Benchmark achievement between ethnicities for ELA? What strategies or action steps are being employed to address these differences/trends (if applicable)?

Reflection: 6th grader African American Students outperformed (54.5%) Hispanics (51.1%) by 3.4%. 7th and 8th African American students(33.3% and 42.95%) scored lower than White and Hispanic students. Strategies include Talking to the test with all students, individual goal set, MTSS referral for low performing students, tutoring for low performing students, and TLS classroom placement.

Insert screen shots in the appropriate boxes below. Delete any rows that are not applicable to your site

1718.TUSD.ELA.06.Q2Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups ▲	Students Tested		Avg. RS ⚡	Avg. Percent Correct ⚡	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	# ▼	% ⚡			# ⚡	% ⚡	# ⚡	% ⚡
All Test Takers	126	100%	15.2	50.6%	71	56.3%	55	43.7%
Hispanic	88	69.8%	14.3	47.7%	45	51.1%	43	48.9%
White	27	21.4%	17.7	59.1%	20	74.1%	7	25.9%
African American	11	8.7%	15.8	52.7%	6	54.5%	5	45.5%

1718.TUSD.ELA.07.Q2Benchmark

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT



Ethnicity Subgroups ▲	Students Tested		Avg. RS ⬆	Avg. Percent Correct ⬆	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	# ▼	% ⬆			# ⬆	% ⬆	# ⬆	% ⬆
All Test Takers	131	100%	17.9	59.6%	81	61.8%	50	38.2%
Hispanic	94	71.8%	17.7	59.1%	56	59.6%	38	40.4%
White	31	23.7%	18.9	63.1%	23	74.2%	8	25.8%
African American	6	4.6%	14.8	49.4%	2	33.3%	4	66.7%

1718.TUSD.ELA.08.Q2Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups ▲	Students Tested		Avg. RS ⬆	Avg. Percent Correct ⬆	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	# ▼	% ⬆			# ⬆	% ⬆	# ⬆	% ⬆
All Test Takers	117	100%	17.8	59.5%	75	64.1%	42	35.9%
Hispanic	85	72.6%	17.7	58.9%	54	63.5%	31	36.5%
White	25	21.4%	19.2	64%	18	72%	7	28%
African American	7	6%	15.3	51%	3	42.9%	4	57.1%

ELA – Q3 ACHIEVEMENT GAP DATA

Are there any noteworthy differences or trends that you notice in comparing Benchmark achievement between ethnicities for ELA? What strategies or action steps are being employed to address these differences/trends (if applicable)?

Reflection: At Dodge 100% of our students took the Benchmark test. The 6th grade African Americans were 63.6% proficient which was 8.3% more proficient than the 6th grade Hispanic students. However, White students in the 6th grade had a ELA proficiency rate of 70.4% which was 6.8% more proficient than the African American students and 15.1% higher than the 6th grade Hispanic students. I believe that there is a wider gap between the white and Hispanic students because of a possible language barrier in some households. There may even be a gap due to the different cultures which can limit the understanding of some of the test questions. This however only holds true in the 6th grade and similar in the 7th grade. However, in the 8th grade, Hispanics were 26.8% more proficient than the African American students and 11.4% higher than the 8th grade white students.

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Magnet Program



Action steps are to continue classroom observations with a review of teaching styles for each grade level relative to the African American students and Hispanic students. We will also continue to look at cultural relevation pedigogy and hands on activities.

1718.TUSD.ELA.06.Q3Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups ▲	Students Tested		Avg. RS ◆	Avg. Percent Correct ◆	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	# ◆	% ◆			# ◆	% ◆	# ◆	% ◆
All Test Takers	123	100%	17.2	57.3%	73	59.3%	50	40.7%
African American	11	8.9%	16.5	54.9%	7	63.6%	4	36.4%
Hispanic	85	69.1%	16.7	55.7%	47	55.3%	38	44.7%
White	27	22%	19	63.2%	19	70.4%	8	29.6%

1718.TUSD.ELA.07.Q3Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups ▲	Students Tested		Avg. RS ◆	Avg. Percent Correct ◆	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	# ◆	% ◆			# ◆	% ◆	# ◆	% ◆
All Test Takers	131	100%	16.3	54.2%	91	69.5%	40	30.5%
African American	6	4.6%	11.5	38.3%	2	33.3%	4	66.7%
Hispanic	94	71.8%	15.9	52.8%	64	68.1%	30	31.9%
White	31	23.7%	18.4	61.3%	25	80.6%	6	19.4%

1718.TUSD.ELA.08.Q3Benchmark

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT



Ethnicity Subgroups ▲	Students Tested		Avg. RS ▲	Avg. Percent Correct ▲	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	# ▲	% ▲			# ▲	% ▲	# ▲	% ▲
All Test Takers	115	100%	19.2	64%	59	51.3%	56	48.7%
African American	7	6.1%	16.1	53.8%	2	28.6%	5	71.4%
Hispanic	83	72.2%	19.5	65%	46	55.4%	37	44.6%
White	25	21.7%	19.1	63.6%	11	44%	14	56%

MATH – Q1 ACHIEVEMENT GAP DATA

Are there any noteworthy differences or trends that you notice in comparing Benchmark achievement between ethnicities for MATH? What strategies or action steps are being employed to address these differences/trends (if applicable)?

Reflection: In the 6th grade the proficiency rate between the White students and Hispanic students has an achievement gap of only about .6% whereas the gap between the African American students and the Hispanics and White students is more than 10%.

1718.TUSD.MATH.06.Q1Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups ▲	Students Tested		Avg. RS ▲	Avg. Percent Correct ▲	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	# ▼	% ▲			# ▲	% ▲	# ▲	% ▲
All Test Takers	77	100%	15.6	51.9%	44	57.1%	33	42.9%
Hispanic	56	72.7%	15.7	52.3%	33	58.9%	23	41.1%
White	12	15.6%	15.3	51.1%	7	58.3%	5	41.7%
African American	9	11.7%	15	50%	4	44.4%	5	55.6%

1718.TUSD.MATH.07.Q1Benchmark

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT



Ethnicity Subgroups ▲	Students Tested		Avg. RS ⬆	Avg. Percent Correct ⬆	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	# ▼	% ⬆			# ⬆	% ⬆	# ⬆	% ⬆
All Test Takers	132	100%	13.8	45.9%	100	75.8%	32	24.2%
Hispanic	94	71.2%	13.3	44.3%	69	73.4%	25	26.6%
White	31	23.5%	16.4	54.7%	28	90.3%	3	9.7%
African American	7	5.3%	8.3	27.6%	3	42.9%	4	57.1%

1718.TUSD.MATH.08.Q1Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups ▲	Students Tested		Avg. RS ⬆	Avg. Percent Correct ⬆	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	# ▼	% ⬆			# ⬆	% ⬆	# ⬆	% ⬆
All Test Takers	120	100%	16.3	54.2%	95	79.2%	25	20.8%
Hispanic	87	72.5%	16.2	54.1%	70	80.5%	17	19.5%
White	26	21.7%	16.8	56%	20	76.9%	6	23.1%
African American	7	5.8%	14.7	49%	5	71.4%	2	28.6%

MATH – Q2 ACHIEVEMENT GAP DATA

Are there any noteworthy differences or trends that you notice in comparing Benchmark achievement between ethnicities for MATH? What strategies or action steps are being employed to address these differences/trends (if applicable)?

Reflection: There is a very wide achievement gap between African American students and the Hispanic and White students. African American students fall 40%+ lower than Hispanic and White students in the 7th grade. However, in the 6th grade, African American students scored about 4% higher than the Hispanic and White students. Action steps are classroom observations with a review of teaching styles for each grade level relative to the African American students. Also, looking at cultural relevation pedigogy and hands on activities.

Insert screen shots in the appropriate boxes below. Delete any rows that are not applicable to your site

1718.TUSD.MATH.06.Q2Benchmark

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT



Ethnicity Subgroups	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	46	100%	14.6	48.6%	21	45.7%	25	54.3%
Hispanic	29	63%	14.7	49.1%	13	44.8%	16	55.2%
White	15	32.6%	14.3	47.8%	7	46.7%	8	53.3%
African American	2	4.3%	14	46.7%	1	50%	1	50%

1718.TUSD.MATH.07.Q2Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	131	100%	13.6	45.3%	91	69.5%	40	30.5%
Hispanic	94	71.8%	13.3	44.4%	64	68.1%	30	31.9%
White	31	23.7%	15.6	52.1%	26	83.9%	5	16.1%
African American	6	4.6%	7.7	25.6%	1	16.7%	5	83.3%

1718.TUSD.MATH.08.Q2Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	117	100%	15.4	51.4%	85	72.6%	32	27.4%
Hispanic	85	72.6%	15.3	50.9%	62	72.9%	23	27.1%
White	25	21.4%	16.9	56.4%	20	80%	5	20%
African American	7	6%	11.9	39.5%	3	42.9%	4	57.1%

MATH – Q3 ACHIEVEMENT GAP DATA

Are there any noteworthy differences or trends that you notice in comparing Benchmark achievement between ethnicities for MATH? What strategies or action steps are being employed to address these differences/trends (if applicable)?

Reflection: In the 6th grade, Dodge's benchmark data in Math shows that the white students scored 37.7% higher than the African American students and only 11.7% higher than the 6th grade Hispanic students. Continued assessments, differentiated instructions along with small group and one on one tutoring will be ongoing to help lessen the achievement gap between students.

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Magnet Program



Insert screen shots in the appropriate boxes below. Delete any rows that are not applicable to your site

1718.TUSD.MATH.06.Q3Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups ▲	Students Tested		Avg. RS ▼	Avg. Percent Correct ▼	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	# ▼	% ▼			# ▼	% ▼	# ▼	% ▼
All Test Takers	123	100%	16.3	54.3%	77	62.6%	46	37.4%
African American	11	8.9%	13.8	46%	4	36.4%	7	63.6%
Hispanic	85	69.1%	16.1	53.6%	53	62.4%	32	37.6%
White	27	22%	18	59.9%	20	74.1%	7	25.9%

1718.TUSD.MATH.07.Q3Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups ▲	Students Tested		Avg. RS ▼	Avg. Percent Correct ▼	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	# ▼	% ▼			# ▼	% ▼	# ▼	% ▼
All Test Takers	131	100%	16.8	56%	102	77.9%	29	22.1%
African American	6	4.6%	13.7	45.6%	3	50%	3	50%
Hispanic	94	71.8%	16.4	54.5%	72	76.6%	22	23.4%
White	31	23.7%	18.7	62.5%	27	87.1%	4	12.9%

1718.TUSD.MATH.08.Q3Benchmark

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT



Ethnicity Subgroups ▲	Students Tested		Avg. RS ▲	Avg. Percent Correct ▲	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	# ▲	% ▲			# ▲	% ▲	# ▲	% ▲
All Test Takers	115	100%	19.2	64.1%	82	71.3%	33	28.7%
African American	7	6.1%	17.7	59%	4	57.1%	3	42.9%
Hispanic	83	72.2%	19	63.3%	56	67.5%	27	32.5%
White	25	21.7%	20.4	68.1%	22	88%	3	12%

Directions: Choose the top 5 attended intervention/enrichment classes at your school.

Before/after school INTERVENTION classes	Type of intervention offered (example: 6 th grade ELA tutoring)	How were students placed in program? (example: progress report grades, teacher recommendation)	Number of students who participated in program.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dodge only has an official tutoring class after Teachers tutor students before school and during their lunch time. Teachers push-in and pull-out during PLCs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IXL Edgenuity TLS ELA and Math tutoring Resource classes Study skills 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teacher recommendations Based on mastery levels CFAs data IXL data TLS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 15 to 20 students per day
Total enrollment for above classes			20
Grand Total of ALL intervention classes			20

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Magnet Program



Before/afterschool ENRICHMENT classes	Type of enrichment offered (example: Robotics)	How were students placed in program? (example: progress report grades, teacher recommendation)	Number of students who participated in program.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dodge does not have any enrichment classes at this time however we have many enrichment clubs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chess Club Gamers Club Travel Club Student Council Builders Club NJHS STEAM Club Bike Club 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student choice 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 25-40 students
Total enrollment for above classes			40
Grand Total of ALL enrichment classes (High Schools: Only include MAGNET themed enrichment classes)			40



Magnet – School Level Quarterly Report

2019-20

PROFESSIONAL LEARNING COMMUNITIES

Directions: Use the District rubric to rate a minimum of four of your PLCs.

COLLABORATIVE CULTURE			
Educators work together in collaborative teams to achieve student learning.			
Learning	Literal	Refined	Internalized
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team meets regularly (weekly/biweekly/monthly) during the school day. Team members attend for compliance purposes only; team members may be unprepared and/or disorganized. No evidence that school goals, collective commitments and team norms are followed. Team is unclear regarding PLC focus and processes. Team does not use the <i>Guiding Questions for the PLC Team Cycle of Inquiry</i> to frame PLC discussions. Team meets only when required on the district designated Wednesday PD for PLC times (Team Cycle of Inquiry is not followed). Team does not turn in <i>Agenda and Minutes</i> log or log does not reflect analysis of student learning or teacher practice and growth. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team develops written norms and establishes learning goals that clarify expectations and commitments. Team members arrive prepared & participate. Team adheres to school goals, collective commitments, and team norms. Team shows evidence that the focus of PLC is curriculum instruction. Team is inconsistent in its use of the <i>Guiding Questions</i> or engages only shallowly with this tool. Some individual team members meet at least twice per month to attempt Team Cycle of Inquiry. Team <i>Agenda and Minutes</i> logs reflect limited understanding of PLC process and/or limited rigor with regard to reflections about course content knowledge and effective teaching practice. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team focuses on prearranged topics that impact student learning and makes revisions to goals to improve team effectiveness. Team members are committed to the inquiry process and share openly. Team reflects on alignment of their work with school goals, collective commitments, and team norms. Team focuses PLC work on curriculum and instruction via cycles of collective inquiry. Team regularly frames PLC work with the use of the <i>Guiding Questions</i>. Most team members coordinate time each week to meet to maintain Team Cycle of Inquiry. Team <i>Agenda and Minutes</i> logs indicate that some members engage in reflection on their own instructional effectiveness as well as analysis of student learning outcomes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team honors their collective commitments to each other and their students in order to maximize learning. Team members push themselves and one another to grow and deepen in their practice. Team norms and site commitments are reviewed regularly, and members actively use the existence of norms to address challenges in team dynamics as they arise. Team engages in robust exploration of curriculum content, instructional practice, and student learning via rigorous collaborative inquiry. Team ensures that the <i>Guiding Questions</i> always frame the discussion and thinking of PLC meetings; for many team members the <i>Guiding Questions</i> have become internalized habits of mind. Team takes initiative to coordinate with one another (and with site administration if needed) to ensure that all team members meet weekly to maximize the benefits of Team Cycle of Inquiry. Team <i>Agenda and Minutes</i> logs clearly show strong commitment to ensuring that all team members understand content standards and are rigorous in reflecting on their own needs for growth.

1	Refined = 3					
	Internalized = 4					
2	Learning = 1					
	Literal = 2	2	3	3		
	Refined = 3					
	Internalized = 4					
3	Learning = 1	3	3	3		
	Literal = 2					
	Refined = 3					



Magnet – School Level Quarterly Report

2019-20

PROFESSIONAL LEARNING COMMUNITIES

GUARANTEED CURRICULUM

Educators establish what we want our students to learn.

Learning	Literal	Refined	Internalized
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team uses district developed curriculum guide resources. Team does not identify an essential learning for the current inquiry cycle. Team does not discuss whether the essential learning is understood by team members at the level of task analysis. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team works together to define the essential learning and establish pacing. Team selects an essential learning for the current inquiry cycle but does not ensure that it is drawn directly from the District Curriculum. Team members engage in limited or inconsistent discussion regarding the sub-skills inherent in the essential learning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team builds shared knowledge of current content standards, unpacks high-stakes assessments to clarify essential learning, and adjusts instruction based on formative assessments. Team always draws its essential learning from the current scope and sequence in the District Curriculum. Team ensures that each team member is confident in their understanding of the sub-skills inherent in the essential learning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team continually refines essential learning and guarantees a viable instructional program for all students. Team ensures that the essential learning comes only from designated, highly-leveraged standards in the current scope and sequence in the District Curriculum. Team uses their collective understanding of the task analysis of the essential learning in order to increase the rigor and accuracy of Tier 1 differentiation, common formative assessments, and to develop/refine pacing guides.

Quarter	Levels of Performance	Team A	Team B	Team C	Team D	Team E	Team F	Average
1	Learning = 1 Literal = 2 Refined = 3 Internalized = 4	3	3	3				3
2	Learning = 1 Literal = 2 Refined = 3 Internalized = 4	3	3	3				3
3	Learning = 1 Literal = 2 Refined = 3 Internalized = 4	3	3	3				3
4	Learning = 1 Literal = 2 Refined = 3 Internalized = 4							#DIV/0!



Magnet – School Level Quarterly Report

2019-20

PROFESSIONAL LEARNING COMMUNITIES

COMMON ASSESSMENT			
Educators determine if each student has learned what we want them to learn.			
Learning	Literal	Refined	Internalized
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team uses benchmark assessments several times throughout the year. Team does not review or make reference to specific benchmark data that relates to the essential learning focus. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team analyzes student work and assessments and discusses common criteria. Some team members administer common assessment tools based on team discussions of common criteria. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team consistently applies common criteria to assess student work and discuss formative instructional practices. Team discusses common formative assessments at the Focus stage of the Inquiry Cycle; administers CFA in the Teach stage of the Inquiry Cycle; analyzes results together at the Assess stage of the Inquiry Cycle; and implements targeted re-teaching or enrichment based on collective data analysis in the Respond stage of the Inquiry Cycle. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team consistently utilizes formative instructional practices, including common assessments, to gather evidence of student learning. Team consistently uses assessment results to reflect on teacher's own strengths and areas for refinement as practitioners. Team consistently uses assessment results for the purpose of continually refining equitable access to curriculum for all learners.

Quarter	Levels of Performance	Team A	Team B	Team C	Team D	Team E	Team F	Average
1	Learning = 1 Literal = 2 Refined = 3 Internalized = 4	2	4	1				2.333333333
2	Learning = 1 Literal = 2 Refined = 3 Internalized = 4	2	4	2				2.666666667
3	Learning = 1 Literal = 2 Refined = 3 Internalized = 4	3	4	2				3
4	Learning = 1 Literal = 2 Refined = 3 Internalized = 4							#DIV/0!



Magnet – School Level Quarterly Report

2019-20

PROFESSIONAL LEARNING COMMUNITIES

ENSURING LEARNING			
Educators respond when some students have not learned it.			
Learning	Literal	Refined	Internalized
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Team does not collectively discuss potential specific difficulties in student understanding of the essential learning. ▪ Team uses school/district classes, established “pull out” or afterschool programs, and curriculum resources when students are identified for intervention. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Team usually waits until after Tier 1 instruction to determine appropriate response to students struggling to understand the essential learning. ▪ Team provides students with additional time and support that does not remove students from new direct instruction when they experience difficulty. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ At the Focus stage of the Inquiry Cycle, team discusses in specific terms the demands of the essential learning, anticipates the needs of current students, and plans for differentiated groups in the course of Tier 1 instruction. ▪ Team develops and utilizes a timely, directive, and systemic plan for students when they experience difficulty. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Team members analyze patterns in content challenges and student difficulties that are specific to current students in order to ensure equitable supports and access to curriculum. ▪ Team coordinates a flexible, supportive, and proactive system of intervention for students who experience difficulty.



Magnet – School Level Quarterly Report

2019-20

PROFESSIONAL LEARNING COMMUNITIES

ENRICHING LEARNING			
Educators extend and enrich the learning for students who have demonstrated mastery.			
Learning	Literal	Refined	Internalized
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team does not collectively discuss anticipated differences in the rates of student understanding of the essential learning. Team uses school/district classes, established “pull out” or afterschool programs, and curriculum resources for identified students. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team usually waits until after Tier 1 instruction to determine appropriate response to students who already understand the essential learning. Team provides students with additional time and support for enrichment during the school day for those who have moved beyond the essential learning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At the Focus stage of the Inquiry Cycle, team discusses in specific terms the demands of the essential learning, anticipates the needs of current students, and plans for differentiated groups in the course of Tier 1 instruction. Team develops and utilizes a timely, directive, and systemic plan for students who have moved beyond the essential learning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team members analyze patterns specific to current students in order to ensure opportunities to advance in the curriculum. Team coordinates a flexible, supportive, and proactive system of intervention for students who have moved beyond the essential learning.

Quarter	Levels of Performance	Team A	Team B	Team C	Team D	Team E	Team F	Average
1	Learning = 1 Literal = 2 Refined = 3 Internalized = 4	1	3	2				2
2	Learning = 1 Literal = 2 Refined = 3 Internalized = 4	2	3	2				2.333333333
3	Learning = 1 Literal = 2 Refined = 3 Internalized = 4	2	3	2				2.333333333
4	Learning = 1 Literal = 2 Refined = 3 Internalized = 4							#DIV/0!



Magnet – School Level Quarterly Report

2019-20

PROFESSIONAL LEARNING COMMUNITIES

PLCS: ANALYSIS OF NEEDS AND PROGRESS

PLC – Phases of Development

Component	Quarter 1 Average Phase of Development	Quarter 2 Average Phase of Development	Quarter 3 Average Phase of Development
Collaborative Culture	2.7	3	3
Guaranteed Curriculum	3	3	3
Common Assessment	2.3	2.6	2.6
Ensuring Learning	3	3	3
Enriching Learning	2	2.3	2.3

PLC – Needs Analysis

What additional PLC resources, information, or PD activities would most benefit you in supporting the work of Professional Learning Communities at your site? List at least three. (Example: protocols for analyzing student data; protocols for analyzing student work; how to make an action plan; how to work collaboratively as a team, ideas for intervention/enrichment opportunities, etc. Name at least 3)

- 1. Information on how to make an action plan**
- 2. Additional content area training**
- 3. Rubric for analyzing student work across grade levels**
- 4. Ideas to support inventions for students who refuse to participate in classroom instruction**
- 5. Enrichment opportunities to increase rigor for excelling students.**

PLC – Planning Next Steps

Review the “Critical Focus Area: High Functioning Professional Learning Communities” and the accompanying “Critical Focus Area Action Steps” section of your school’s 2017-18 Magnet School Plan.

Reflect on the progress (if any) that has been made in achieving these action steps. Identify next steps.

Quarter 1	Teams will engage in robust exploration of curriculum content, instructional practice, and student learning via rigorous collaborative inquiry by the end of the second quarter. This will be measured by teacher walkthroughs and student CFA’s.
Quarter 2	Teams will engage in robust exploration of curriculum content, instructional practice, and student learning via rigorous collaborative inquiry by the end of the second quarter. This will be measured by teacher walkthroughs and student CFA’s
Quarter 3/4	Teams will engage in robust exploration of curriculum content, instructional practice, and student learning via rigorous collaborative inquiry by the end of the third quarter. This will be measured by teacher walk throughs and student CFAs if school resumes after COVID - 19
For 2020/21	Teams will continue to engage in robust exploration of curriculum content, instructional practice and student learning via rigorous collaborative inquiry. A Curriculum Service Provider will be hired during the 2020/21 school year to aid and give guidance during the PLC team meetings. It is hoped that the addition of this staff person will help Dodge in accomplishing and maintaining these goals.

Magnet – School Level Quarterly Report**2019-20****PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

Magnet Program



Directions: Each school is allocated opportunities for Site Focused PD for the 2019-20 school year. If additional opportunities for PD have been offered (such as Saturday PD), please add additional rows.

SITE SPECIFIC PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT			
Date	Title of PD	Focus of PD	Rationale
8/29/19	PETS Training	Training for staff on PETS (Parent Engagement Tablets)	The District requires an accurate count of Family Engagement of events and participants. The tablets were new to the District
7/30/19	McKinney Vento Training	Homeless Assistance Act and how to identify a student	So teachers can identify students in need.
8/14/19	School City-Introduction-Formative Assessments	CFA's	Student Achievement
8/21/19	Letter Grade Presentation	Gains and losses	School improvement and improve student learning
10/2/19	PLC Meetings/Committee Meetings	School Safety/Parking, Common Lesson Plan Template, Building School Community/Social Committee, Teacher Recognition,	Equity of voice for stakeholders
10/16/19	Talking to the Test/Benchmark Reflection and Action Plan	Improving student academic performance	Prepare students for high school and college readiness
10/23/19	School Letter Grade Review	Review student performances and how the school can move the letter grade	Laser focus on how to help students, improve teaching strategies to reach the L25 students.
10/30/19	Ex Ed presentation	Discussed Ex Ed strategies	Worked in groups Vienn Diagram, Word list, and compare and contrast-effective teaching strategies
12/11/19	Peer Classroom Walkthrough Training	Peer walkthroughs and Danielson Practices	Provide teacher with observations and feedback on instructional strategies observed by their peers
Summary/Reflection: Write a paragraph summarizing the professional development opportunities provided to staff during			

Magnet – School Level Quarterly Report

2019-20

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Magnet Program



Quarter 1:

- Professional development provides teachers the opportunity to analyze data, reflect on practices, establish smart goals and work in PLCs with efficacy.

Quarter 2:

- Professional development provides teachers the opportunity to analyze data, reflect on practices, establish smart goals and work in PLCs with efficacy.
- Professional development increased teacher's knowledge in effective teaching strategies for Ex Ed students
- Teachers learned how to complete peer observations with feedback

Quarter 3/4:

- Professional development on Culturally Relevant Pedagogy and Instruction
- Professional development on AZM2 ADE training
- Professional development on Special Ed/Autism
- Professional development on McKinney Veto

Magnet – School Level Quarterly Report**2019-20****FAMILY/COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT**

Magnet Program



4

FAMILY/COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT				
	Q1	Q2	Q3/Q4	Total
# Family/community events	2	1	2	5
# Participants in family/community events	1100	45	362	1507
Summary: List one example of parent/community engagement for each of Epstein's Six Types of Involvement below. Need more information? https://www.sps186.org/downloads/table/13040/6TypesJ.Epstein.pdf				
	Name of Activity	Brief Description		
Type 1: Parenting	PAC Meeting	Committee discussed coordination of yearly carnival		
Type 2: Communicating	Dodge Dispatch Monthly Newsletter	Keeps our families in the know as to upcoming events		
Type 3: Volunteering	Teachers Assistant	Parents (Karent Garcia) Assisting teachers with student projects (Fred Niegocki) tutoring in math		
Type 4: Learning at Home				
Type 5: Decision Making	Site Council	Parent and staff partnership overseeing tax credit dollars		
Type 6: Collaborating with Community	SOAR	College students from the U of A volunteer to help mentor Dodge students with career goals and insight of college bound		
Reflection:				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase recruit of more Magnet programs related to our Magnet theme. • Increase community partnerships 				



Magnet – School Level Quarterly Report

2019-20

PARTNERSHIPS

Directions: List the partnerships at your school that support your magnet program. For schools with more than 10 partnerships, please list the 10 partners that are the most involved with your magnet program.

PARTNERSHIPS				
	Partnership	New or Established?	Letter of Support on File at Site (Yes/No)?	Description of Partnership – How does it support your magnet program?
1.	SOAR	Established	Yes	Students at the U of A mentor students at Dodge relative to career choices and college readiness
2.	Kiwanis Jewish Center	Established	Yes	Community Organization that helps with the school's Builders Club.
3.	NextCare	New	No	Company sets up information table at every event and supplied gift basket for fundraiser
4.	Jason Deli	New	No	Fundraising Dinner
5.	BJ's on Broadway	New	No	Fundraising Dinner
6.	Pima County Bike Program	New	Yes	Teaches students at Dodge bike safety
7.	Chick-fil-A	New	No	Provides coffee and food at events
8.	Tumble Weed Landscaping	New	No	Helps with school's landscaping
9.	Raising Cane's Chicken Fingers	New	Yes	Company provides gift certificates, recognition certificates, fundraiser days, Free food for cultural night
10.	Solid Grindz Hawaiian BBQ	New	No	Company provided food for Cultural Event

Magnet – School Level Quarterly Report

2019-20

CELEBRATIONS AND CHALLENGES



Directions: Record your Celebrations and Challenges below. Please help us easily find information by highlighting **AWARDS** that your campus has applied for or received in blue, **GRANTS** that your campus has applied for or received in green. Highlight **SCHOLARSHIPS/COLLEGE ACCEPTANCES** in pink. (Short bullet points only, please)

SITE LEVEL CELEBRATIONS	SITE LEVEL CHALLENGES
Quarter 1	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Honor’s Award Assembly • School Dance (award for good behavior showing respect & responsibility) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To plan further in advance for events and re
<p>Q1 Reflection: During the first quarter Dodge focused on establishing rules and getting into the rigorous routine of learning expectations . We need to apply for more grants and possible scholarships for middle school children.</p>	
Quarter 2	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Honors Award Assembly • “Harriet” the movie • Classroom Grants for Art and LA • School Carnival • 7th grade celebration for PBIS • Veteran’s Day Celebration • School Spirit Week 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time constraints • Funding • Space limitations
<p>Q2 Reflection:</p>	
Quarter 3/4	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cultural Night • STEAM Night 	
<p>Q3 Reflection:</p>	
Annual Summary	



Magnet – School Level Quarterly Report

2019-20

CELEBRATIONS AND CHALLENGES

<p>Dodge had a lot of growth this year in terms of adding events that were not previously held in years past such as the Cultural Night, Veteran’s Breakfast, and extended evening hours for events, allowing more working parents the opportunity to participate. We had a new principal and magnet coordinator along with a few new teachers. Everyone (teachers, students and parents) were distant at the beginning of the school year. However, I feel we have all become more of a cohesive unit, a family.</p>	
---	--

<p>Q4/Annual Reflection: In addition to the above statement, Dodge/the District had many challenges to overcome with the COVID-19. Schools were closed early in order to prevent the further spread of a deadly virus. However, learning continued. Teachers taught and communicated with their students online. The District provided laptops to all students and learning packets. It was a big adjustment.</p>	
---	--



MAGNET 2019-20

SCHOOL LEVEL QUARTERLY REPORT

SCHOOL NAME: Drachman K-8 Montessori Magnet	MAGNET THEME(S): Montessori
--	------------------------------------

MAGNET LEADERSHIP TEAM MEMBERS	
NAME	TITLE
Jesús Celaya	Principal
Wendy Gordon Weeks	Magnet Coordinator
Chloe de Masi	Montessori Lead Teacher
Adriana Manrique	Montessori Lead Teacher
Lucy Tapia	ELD Resource

MAGNET LEADERSHIP TEAM MEETINGS	
DATE	# MINUTES MET
8/9/2019	60
8/21/2019	60
9/4/2019	60
9/18/2019	60
10/2/2019	60
10/23/2019	60
11/06/2019	60
11/20/2019	60
12/11/2019	60
12/18/2019	60
1/8/2020	60
1/22/2020	60
2/5/2020	60
2/26/2020	60
3/4/2020	60
4/1/2020	60
Planned remotely for 4/8, 4/22,	
5/6, and 5/20	



INTEGRATION

Recruitment: Record actions taken this quarter to support your integration goal. Include tours, phone inquiries, mailings, school visits, other recruitment activities conducted by your site. Include District recruitment events and mailings that were specific to your magnet program. Insert additional lines as needed. Keep appropriate documentation (recruitment log) on site for review.

COMMUNICATION

Activity: Recruitment Mailings/Fliers

(Record the # of school/district generated mailings. Examples: 100 surveys to neighborhood parents, 500 open house postcards. Dropping off fliers at schools counts as mailings.)

Range	# Mailings/ Fliers	# of responses	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	0	0	Because a successful Montessori program relies on students at each level having been in the previous Montessori levels, our recruitment focus is on kindergarten. Of our 60 kindergarten places, 40 are available for magnet placement (with the remaining places being neighborhood placements), which we have historically filled quickly and easily. Therefore, recruitment mailings are not an area of focus for our school.
Quarter 2	0	0	See above
Quarter 3/4	0	0	See above
Totals	0	0	

Activity: Recruitment Related Phone Calls

Range	#	# ParentLink (recruitment)	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	4	0	Parents have called to ask about our program and to set a date for tours.
Quarter 2	10	0	Parents have called to ask about our program and to set a date for tours.
Quarter 3/4	7	0	Parents have called to ask about our program and to set a date for tours.
Totals	21	0	

Activity: Retention Related Phone Calls

Range	#	# ParentLink (retention)	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	0	1900	Dr. Celaya highlighted important events and accomplishments on Parent Link Calls during the first quarter. (5 calls x 380 students)

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report**INTEGRATION**

Magnet Program



Quarter 2	0	1140	Dr. Celaya highlighted important events and accomplishments on Parent Link Calls during the second quarter. (3 calls x 380 students)
Quarter 3/4	0	1520	Dr. Celaya highlighted important events and accomplishments on Parent Link Calls during the third quarter. (4 calls x 380 students)
Totals	0	4560	

Activity: Recruitment - Electronic Communication

Range	Outgoing e-mails	Incoming e-mails	Social media (ie: # posts)	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	3	4	50	<p>Dr. Celaya sent 3 emails inviting families to tour who visited our Quarter 1 marketing events to tour.</p> <p>Dr. Celaya responded to 15 emails from families who wanted to schedule tours.</p> <p>Dr. Celaya and Mrs. Weeks made 28 posts to Drachman's Facebook page, 12 posts to Drachman's Twitter feed, and 10 posts to Drachman's Instagram page highlighting the school.</p>
Quarter 2	21	18	45	<p>Dr. Celaya sent 21 emails inviting families who visited our Quarter 2 marketing events to tour.</p> <p>Dr. Celaya and Mrs. Weeks responded to 18 emails from families who wanted to schedule tours.</p> <p>Dr. Celaya and Mrs. Weeks made 23 posts to Drachman's Facebook page, 12 posts to Drachman's Twitter feed, and 10 posts to Drachman's Instagram page highlighting the school.</p>
Quarter 3/4	19	20	47	<p>Dr. Celaya sent 12 emails inviting families who visited our Quarter 3 marketing events to tour. Mrs. Weeks sent 7 emails inviting families of accepted students to our Literacy Night event.</p>

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report**INTEGRATION**

Magnet Program



				Dr. Celaya and Mrs. Weeks responded to 20 emails from families who wanted to schedule tours. Dr. Celaya and Mrs. Weeks made 27 posts to Drachman’s Facebook page, 16 posts to Drachman’s Twitter feed, and 14 posts to Drachman’s Instagram page highlighting the school.
Totals	36	42	142	
Activity: Retention - Electronic Communication				
Range	Outgoing e-mails	Incoming e-mails	Social media (ie: # posts)	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	1900	0	50	Dr. Celaya highlighted important events and accomplishments on Parent Link Emails during the first quarter. (5 emails via Parent Link x 380 students) Dr. Celaya and Mrs. Weeks made 28 posts to Drachman’s Facebook page, 12 posts to Drachman’s Twitter feed, and 10 posts to Drachman’s Instagram page highlighting the school. Dr. Celaya also livestreamed Drachman’s PTA meetings in August and September on Facebook Live.
Quarter 2	1140	0	45	Dr. Celaya highlighted important events and accomplishments on Parent Link Emails during the second quarter. (3 emails via Parent Link x 380 students) Dr. Celaya and Mrs. Weeks made 23 posts to Drachman’s Facebook page, 12 posts to Drachman’s Twitter feed, and 10 posts to Drachman’s Instagram page highlighting the school. Dr. Celaya also livestreamed Drachman’s PTA meetings in October and November and the Violin Promotion Ceremony in December on Facebook Live.
Quarter 3/4	1520	5	49	Dr. Celaya highlighted important events and accomplishments on Parent Link Emails during the second quarter. (4 emails via Parent Link x 380 students)

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

INTEGRATION

Magnet Program



				<p>Dr. Celaya and Mrs. Weeks made 23 posts to Drachman’s Facebook page, 12 posts to Drachman’s Twitter feed, and 10 posts to Drachman’s Instagram page highlighting the school.</p> <p>Dr. Celaya also livestreamed Drachman’s PTA meeting in February and a mariachi performance in February, as well as two live Q & A sessions in March to answer parent questions related to the COVID-19 school closure.</p>
Totals	4560	5	144	

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report**INTEGRATION**

Magnet Program

**RECRUITMENT ACTIVITIES AND EVENTS****Activity: On-Site Recruitment**

(For example, open house, classes visiting from feeder schools, student shadowing)

Range	Activity	# of participants	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	Open House	77 adults 76 students	At August Open House, Dr. Celaya notified current families of word-of-mouth recruitment efforts they could take to notify families of potential Drachman students about enrolling in our school or scheduling a tour.
Quarter 2	Fall Festival	~200	Mrs. Weeks had an outreach booth at the entrance to our Fall Festival to reach out to current and prospective families.
Quarter 3/4	Literacy Night	80	Prospective families were invited to take part in our schoolwide Literacy Night event.
Totals		433	

Activity: Off-Site Recruitment(For example, school visits, brochures left at a business or school, fliers posted at community centers. **Do not include District recruitment events**)

Range	Activity	# Brochures/ rack cards distributed	# of responses	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1		0	0	Again, because a successful Montessori program relies on students at each level having been in the previous Montessori levels, our recruitment focus is on kindergarten. Of our 60 kindergarten places, 40 are available for magnet placement (with the remaining places being neighborhood placements), which we have historically filled quickly and easily. Therefore, recruitment events are not an area of focus for our school.
Quarter 2		0	0	See above
Quarter 3/4		0	0	See above
Totals		0	0	

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report**INTEGRATION**

Magnet Program


**Activity: Tours**

(Record the number of potential applicants. For example, if one parent comes for a tour with two potential student applicants, count the number as 2. Include shadowing.)

Range	# Students	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	5	Dr. Celaya provided tours of 6 adults and 3 children for 5 prospective students for 2020-2021.
Quarter 2	18	Dr. Celaya and Mrs. Weeks provided tours of 20 adults and 5 children for 18 prospective students for 2020-2021.
Quarter 3/4	20	Dr. Celaya and Mrs. Weeks provided 11 tours of 23 adults and 4 children for 20 prospective students for 2020-2021.
Totals	43	

INTEGRATION



Retention: Access the Synergy report “U-STU-2: Daily Enrollment by Student Demographics.” Use your  Snipping Tool to take a screen shot of **Day 40 SY 2017-18, Day 100 SY 2017-18, Day 40 SY 2018-19, and Day 100 SY 2018-19.** Insert the screens in the space below, then fill out the reflection. [HINT: Shrink the Synergy window to 75%. Capture the date on top of the table as well.]

Daily Enrollment by Grade, Gender and USP Ethnicity
203 - Drachman K-8 Montessori Magnet
 On: 09/27/2018 (Day 40 SY 2018-19)

Grade	White/Anglo		African American		Hispanic		Native American		Asian American		Multi-racial		Total		Total
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	
KG	7	8	2	1	18	17	1	0	0	0	2	4	30	30	60
	11.7%	13.3%	3.3%	1.7%	30.0%	28.3%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.3%	6.7%	50.0%	50.0%	
01	8	9	1	3	10	16	1	1	0	2	1	0	21	31	52
	15.4%	17.3%	1.9%	5.8%	19.2%	30.8%	1.9%	1.9%	0.0%	3.8%	1.9%	0.0%	40.4%	59.6%	
02	2	3	3	3	17	9	0	2	0	0	1	2	23	19	42
	4.8%	7.1%	7.1%	7.1%	40.5%	21.4%	0.0%	4.8%	0.0%	0.0%	2.4%	4.8%	54.8%	45.2%	
03	6	7	5	2	18	17	1	0	0	0	1	1	31	27	58
	10.3%	12.1%	8.6%	3.4%	31.0%	29.3%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%	1.7%	53.4%	46.6%	
04	6	4	0	0	19	14	1	2	1	0	1	1	28	21	49
	12.2%	8.2%	0.0%	0.0%	38.8%	28.6%	2.0%	4.1%	2.0%	0.0%	2.0%	2.0%	57.1%	42.9%	
05	4	2	3	2	13	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	21	41
	9.8%	4.9%	7.3%	4.9%	31.7%	39.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.4%	48.8%	51.2%	
06	0	1	2	1	9	12	2	2	0	0	2	1	15	17	32
	0.0%	3.1%	6.3%	3.1%	28.1%	37.5%	6.3%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	6.3%	3.1%	46.9%	53.1%	
07	1	1	1	0	7	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	11	20
	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	0.0%	35.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	45.0%	55.0%	
08	2	0	1	0	7	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	7	18
	11.1%	0.0%	5.6%	0.0%	38.9%	38.9%	5.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	61.1%	38.9%	
Total	36	35	18	12	118	118	7	7	1	2	8	10	188	184	372
	9.7%	9.4%	4.8%	3.2%	31.7%	31.7%	1.9%	1.9%	0.3%	0.5%	2.2%	2.7%	50.5%	49.5%	
	71		30		236		14		3		18		372		
	19.1%		8.1%		63.4%		3.8%		0.8%		4.8%		100.0%		

INTEGRATION



Daily Enrollment by Grade, Gender and USP Ethnicity
203 - Drachman K-8 Montessori Magnet
 On: 01/17/2019 (Day 100 SY 2018-19)

Grade	White/Anglo		African American		Hispanic		Native American		Asian American		Multi-racial		Total		
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	Total
KG	6	8	2	1	17	16	1	0	0	0	2	3	28	28	56
	10.7%	14.3%	3.6%	1.8%	30.4%	28.6%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.6%	5.4%	50.0%	50.0%	
01	8	9	1	2	9	16	1	1	0	2	1	0	20	30	50
	16.0%	18.0%	2.0%	4.0%	18.0%	32.0%	2.0%	2.0%	0.0%	4.0%	2.0%	0.0%	40.0%	60.0%	
02	2	3	3	3	17	8	0	2	0	0	1	2	23	18	41
	4.9%	7.3%	7.3%	7.3%	41.5%	19.5%	0.0%	4.9%	0.0%	0.0%	2.4%	4.9%	56.1%	43.9%	
03	6	7	5	2	20	18	1	0	0	0	1	1	33	28	61
	9.8%	11.5%	8.2%	3.3%	32.8%	29.5%	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.6%	1.6%	54.1%	45.9%	
04	6	4	0	0	18	15	2	2	1	0	1	1	28	22	50
	12.0%	8.0%	0.0%	0.0%	36.0%	30.0%	4.0%	4.0%	2.0%	0.0%	2.0%	2.0%	56.0%	44.0%	
05	4	2	3	2	12	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	20	23	43
	9.3%	4.7%	7.0%	4.7%	27.9%	41.9%	2.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.3%	46.5%	53.5%	
06	0	1	2	1	9	12	1	2	0	0	2	1	14	17	31
	0.0%	3.2%	6.5%	3.2%	29.0%	38.7%	3.2%	6.5%	0.0%	0.0%	6.5%	3.2%	45.2%	54.8%	
07	1	1	1	0	6	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	11	19
	5.3%	5.3%	5.3%	0.0%	31.6%	52.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	42.1%	57.9%	
08	2	0	1	0	7	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	7	18
	11.1%	0.0%	5.6%	0.0%	38.9%	38.9%	5.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	61.1%	38.9%	
Total	35	35	18	11	115	120	8	7	1	2	8	9	185	184	369
	9.5%	9.5%	4.9%	3.0%	31.2%	32.5%	2.2%	1.9%	0.3%	0.5%	2.2%	2.4%	50.1%	49.9%	
	70		29		235		15		3		17		369		
	19.0%		7.9%		63.7%		4.1%		0.8%		4.6%		100.0%		



MAGNET 2019-20

SCHOOL LEVEL QUARTERLY REPORT

SCHOOL NAME: Holladay Fine Arts Magnet ES	MAGNET THEME(S): Visual and Performing Arts
--	--

MAGNET LEADERSHIP TEAM MEMBERS	
NAME	TITLE
Tonya Strozier	Principal
Trevor Salago	Magnet Coordinator
Mauria Terry	Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Facilitator
Patty Cooper	Visual Arts Teacher
Jennifer Draper	Performing Arts Teacher
Denise Cipolla	Reading Specialist
Kristi Rucker	Instructional Data Intervention Specialist (IDIS)
Karyn White	2 nd Grade Teacher
Kim Kunnie	5 th Grade Teacher

MAGNET LEADERSHIP TEAM MEETINGS	
DATE	# MINUTES MET
08-16-2019	30 minutes
08-23-2019	30 minutes
08-30-2019	30 minutes
09-27-2019	45 minutes



INTEGRATION

Recruitment: Record actions taken this quarter to support your integration goal. Include tours, phone inquiries, mailings, school visits, other recruitment activities conducted by your site. Include District recruitment events and mailings that were specific to your magnet program. Insert additional lines as needed. Keep appropriate documentation (recruitment log) on site for review.

COMMUNICATION

Activity: Recruitment Mailings/Fliers

(Record the # of school/district generated magnet mailings. Examples: 100 surveys to neighborhood parents, 500 open house postcards. Dropping off fliers at schools counts as mailings.

Range	# Mailings/ Fliers	# of responses	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	0	0	As a new Magnet Coordinator, I was transitioning into the role and did not send out fliers or delivered to sites. I will select preschools or daycare centers to drop fliers off at for 11/1 and 12/2.
Quarter 2	0	0	Frozen District and Site budgets for Q2 resulted in no outgoing mail/fliers
Quarter 3/4	500	15	Holladay created new postcards that were mailed to the 85719, 85716, 85711, and 85712 zip codes.
Totals	500	15	

Activity: Recruitment Related Phone Calls

Range	#	# Parent Link (recruitment)	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	0	0	As a new Magnet Coordinator, I will have to seek out additional events outside of the TUSD events and continue ways to reach out for recruitment to ensure I am targeting more potential students.
Quarter 2	4	0	Guardians/parents have been in contact with the principal and magnet coordinator.
Quarter 3/4	11	0	Holladay's B rating has been an attention grabber for potential parents.
Totals	15	0	

Activity: Retention Related Phone Calls

Range	#	# Parent Link (retention)	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	0	0	As a new Magnet Coordinator, I will seek out our student populations that ensure we maintain our magnet status. I plan to make phone calls to ensure school quality and student needs are being met.

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report**INTEGRATION**

Magnet Program



Quarter 2	4	0	Phone calls were made to new students who started in Q2 for a check-in and maintain communication for retention.
Quarter 3/4	15	0	Phone calls were made for Holladay's enrollment to potential parents who showed interest in Holladay.
Totals	19	0	

Activity: Recruitment - Electronic Communication

Range	Outgoing e-mails	Incoming e-mails	Social media (i.e.: # posts)	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	0	0	12	As a new Magnet Coordinator, I received Inquiry into Holladay's magnet theme and enrollment process from visitors to our updated website and Facebook page.
Quarter 2	10	6	2	Holladay's B letter grade release brought in guardians/parents interested in the academic success.
Quarter 3/4	20	15	24	Holladay's B letter grade postcards and Exemplary School posting brought in potential parents.
Totals	30	21	36	

Activity: Retention - Electronic Communication

Range	Outgoing e-mails	Incoming e-mails	Social media (i.e.: # posts)	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	0	0	0	As a new Magnet Coordinator, I will create best practices with making phone calls. I will conduct retention with electronic communication along with phone calls.
Quarter 2	6	2	10	Electronic communication seems to be easier and pushing Holladay's academic improvements has made Holladay an easier selling point to keep children at Holladay.
Quarter 3/4	2	0	12	Social Media posting is Holladay's best and most effective ways to show interest and communicate retention.
Totals	8	2	22	

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report**INTEGRATION**

Magnet Program

**RECRUITMENT ACTIVITIES AND EVENTS****Activity: On-Site Recruitment**

(For example, open house, classes visiting from feeder schools, student shadowing)

Range	Activity	# of participants	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	0	0	As a new Magnet Coordinator, the School community liaison and I will have to work together for on-site recruitment for quarter 2 in preparation for November's release of the magnet application.
Quarter 2	0	0	Events are scheduled for spring 2020 as fall and winter have been busy with school events and testing.
Quarter 3/4	0	0	Holladay was pursuing a Leadership Day in April for an On-Site Recruitment event, but all Q4 events were canceled.
Totals	0	0	

Activity: Off-Site Recruitment(For example, school visits, brochures left at a business or school, fliers posted at community centers. **Do not include District recruitment events**)

Range	Activity	# Brochures/ rack cards distributed	# of responses	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	Back to School Event	40	0	As a new Magnet Coordinator, the Quincie Douglas School Drive was my first event. It had a huge turnout of families from the neighborhood. I will be happy to return for another event.
Quarter 2	GEICO Showcasing	25	6	Holladay is teaming up with GEICO for a partnership and to share its magnet theme to potential parents.
Quarter 3/4	Pizza with the Principal	50	2	Holladay had a fundraising night, but also used the location as a recruitment event for families that did attend Holladay.
Totals		115	8	

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report**INTEGRATION**

Magnet Program

**Activity: Tours**

(Record the number of potential applicants. For example, if one parent comes for a tour with two potential student applicants, count the number as 2. Include shadowing.)

Range	# Students	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	8	Parents and students showed interest. I will have to commit to follow-up communication after campus tours.
Quarter 2	6	Parents are interested in Holladay after ADE's rating went from our D rating to a B rating.
Quarter 3/4	12	Parents are interested in Holladay's B rating, Title 1 Exemplary School Award, District Facebook Showcasing Holladay.
Totals	26	



INTEGRATION

Retention: Retention: Access the Synergy report “U-STU-2: Daily Enrollment by Student Demographics.” Use your Snipping Tool to take a screen shot of **Day 40 SY 2018-19, Day 100 SY 2018-19, Day 40 SY 2019-20, and Day 100 SY 2019-20.** Insert the screens in the space below, then fill out the reflection. [HINT: Shrink the Synergy window to 75%. Capture the date on top of the table as well.]

40 Day Student Daily Enrollment by Student Demographics

TUCSON UNIFIED
SCHOOL DISTRICT

Date: 10/18/2019 9:53:51 AM

Daily Enrollment by Grade, Gender and USP Ethnicity
239 - Holladay Magnet Elementary
 On: 09/27/2018 (Day 40 SY 2018-19)

Grade	White/Anglo		African American		Hispanic		Native American		Asian American		Multi-racial		Total		
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	Total
KG	0	4	3	2	18	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	21	17	38
	0.0%	10.5%	7.9%	5.3%	47.4%	26.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.6%	55.3%	44.7%	
01	1	0	5	1	6	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	16	28
	3.6%	0.0%	17.9%	3.6%	21.4%	53.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	42.9%	57.1%	
02	1	3	4	2	10	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	16	22	38
	2.6%	7.9%	10.5%	5.3%	26.3%	44.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.6%	0.0%	42.1%	57.9%	
03	1	1	6	5	11	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	10	28
	3.6%	3.6%	21.4%	17.9%	39.3%	10.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.6%	64.3%	35.7%	
04	0	1	7	2	13	11	0	1	0	0	0	1	20	16	36
	0.0%	2.8%	19.4%	5.6%	36.1%	30.6%	0.0%	2.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.8%	55.6%	44.4%	
05	0	0	6	4	7	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	18	31
	0.0%	0.0%	19.4%	12.9%	22.6%	41.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.2%	41.9%	58.1%	
Total	3	9	31	16	65	69	0	1	0	0	1	4	100	99	199
	1.5%	4.5%	15.6%	8.0%	32.7%	34.7%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	2.0%	50.3%	49.7%	
	12		47		134		1		0		5		199		
	6.0%		23.6%		67.3%		0.5%		0.0%		2.5%		100.0%		

TUCSON UNIFIED
SCHOOL DISTRICT

Date: 10/18/2019 9:52:06 AM

Daily Enrollment by Grade, Gender and USP Ethnicity
239 - Holladay Magnet Elementary
 On: 09/26/2019 (Day 40 SY 2019-20)

Grade	White/Anglo		African American		Hispanic		Native American		Asian American		Multi-racial		Total		
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	Total
KG	2	0	3	1	5	7	0	0	0	1	1	1	11	10	21
	9.5%	0.0%	14.3%	4.8%	23.8%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.8%	4.8%	4.8%	52.4%	47.6%	
01	0	3	5	3	16	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	21	20	41
	0.0%	7.3%	12.2%	7.3%	39.0%	31.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.4%	51.2%	48.8%	
02	0	0	4	2	6	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	15	25
	0.0%	0.0%	16.0%	8.0%	24.0%	52.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	40.0%	60.0%	
03	1	2	6	3	10	14	0	1	0	0	1	0	18	20	38
	2.6%	5.3%	15.8%	7.9%	26.3%	36.8%	0.0%	2.6%	0.0%	0.0%	2.6%	0.0%	47.4%	52.6%	
04	1	1	5	6	11	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	14	31
	3.2%	3.2%	16.1%	19.4%	35.5%	19.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.2%	54.8%	45.2%	
05	0	1	6	5	7	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	13	18	31
	0.0%	3.2%	19.4%	16.1%	22.6%	32.3%	0.0%	3.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.2%	41.9%	58.1%	
Total	4	7	29	20	55	63	0	2	0	1	2	4	90	97	187
	2.1%	3.7%	15.5%	10.7%	29.4%	33.7%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	0.5%	1.1%	2.1%	48.1%	51.9%	
	11		49		118		2		1		6		187		
	5.9%		26.2%		63.1%		1.1%		0.5%		3.2%		100.0%		



INTEGRATION

100 Day Student Daily Enrollment by Student Demographics

TUCSON UNIFIED
SCHOOL DISTRICT

Date: 1/16/2020 11:00:56 AM

Daily Enrollment by Grade, Gender and USP Ethnicity
239 - Holladay Magnet Elementary
 On: 01/17/2019 (Day 100 SY 2018-19)

Grade	White/Anglo		African American		Hispanic		Native American		Asian American		Multi-racial		Total		
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	Total
KG	0	3	3	3	18	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	21	18	39
	0.0%	7.7%	7.7%	7.7%	46.2%	25.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.1%	53.8%	46.2%	
01	1	0	6	1	6	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	15	28
	3.6%	0.0%	21.4%	3.6%	21.4%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	46.4%	53.6%	
02	1	3	6	2	11	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	19	21	40
	2.5%	7.5%	15.0%	5.0%	27.5%	40.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.5%	0.0%	47.5%	52.5%	
03	1	1	6	6	11	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	11	29
	3.4%	3.4%	20.7%	20.7%	37.9%	10.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%	62.1%	37.9%	
04	0	1	7	3	11	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	18	16	34
	0.0%	2.9%	20.6%	8.8%	32.4%	29.4%	0.0%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.9%	52.9%	47.1%	
05	0	0	7	4	7	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	18	32
	0.0%	0.0%	21.9%	12.5%	21.9%	40.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.1%	43.8%	56.3%	
Total	3	8	35	19	64	66	0	1	0	0	1	5	103	99	202
	1.5%	4.0%	17.3%	9.4%	31.7%	32.7%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	2.5%	51.0%	49.0%	
	11		54		130		1		0		6		202		
	5.4%		26.7%		64.4%		0.5%		0.0%		3.0%		100.0%		

TUCSON UNIFIED
SCHOOL DISTRICT

Date: 1/16/2020 11:00:32 AM

Daily Enrollment by Grade, Gender and USP Ethnicity
239 - Holladay Magnet Elementary
 On: 01/16/2020 (Day 100 SY 2019-20)

Grade	White/Anglo		African American		Hispanic		Native American		Asian American		Multi-racial		Total		
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	Total
KG	2	0	3	1	7	8	0	0	0	1	1	1	13	11	24
	8.3%	0.0%	12.5%	4.2%	29.2%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.2%	4.2%	4.2%	54.2%	45.8%	
01	0	3	5	3	17	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	22	22	44
	0.0%	6.8%	11.4%	6.8%	38.6%	34.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.3%	50.0%	50.0%	
02	0	1	3	2	7	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	16	26
	0.0%	3.8%	11.5%	7.7%	26.9%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	38.5%	61.5%	
03	1	2	6	3	10	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	17	20	37
	2.7%	5.4%	16.2%	8.1%	27.0%	37.8%	0.0%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	45.9%	54.1%	
04	1	1	5	6	12	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	16	34
	2.9%	2.9%	14.7%	17.6%	35.3%	23.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.9%	52.9%	47.1%	
05	0	1	6	4	7	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	13	17	30
	0.0%	3.3%	20.0%	13.3%	23.3%	33.3%	0.0%	3.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.3%	43.3%	56.7%	
Total	4	8	28	19	60	68	0	2	0	1	1	4	93	102	195
	2.1%	4.1%	14.4%	9.7%	30.8%	34.9%	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.5%	2.1%	47.7%	52.3%	
	12		47		128		2		1		5		195		
	6.2%		24.1%		65.6%		1.0%		0.5%		2.6%		100.0%		



INTEGRATION

2019 – 2020 Daily Enrollment by Student Demographics – 40 and 100 Day

TUCSON UNIFIED
SCHOOL DISTRICT

Date: 10/18/2019 9:52:06 AM

Daily Enrollment by Grade, Gender and USP Ethnicity
239 - Holladay Magnet Elementary
 On: 09/26/2019 (Day 40 SY 2019-20)

Grade	White/Anglo		African American		Hispanic		Native American		Asian American		Multi-racial		Total		
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	Total
KG	2	0	3	1	5	7	0	0	0	1	1	1	11	10	21
	9.5%	0.0%	14.3%	4.8%	23.8%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.8%	4.8%	4.8%	52.4%	47.6%	
01	0	3	5	3	16	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	21	20	41
	0.0%	7.3%	12.2%	7.3%	39.0%	31.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.4%	51.2%	48.8%	
02	0	0	4	2	6	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	15	25
	0.0%	0.0%	16.0%	8.0%	24.0%	52.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	40.0%	60.0%	
03	1	2	6	3	10	14	0	1	0	0	1	0	18	20	38
	2.6%	5.3%	15.8%	7.9%	26.3%	36.8%	0.0%	2.6%	0.0%	0.0%	2.6%	0.0%	47.4%	52.6%	
04	1	1	5	6	11	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	14	31
	3.2%	3.2%	16.1%	19.4%	35.5%	19.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.2%	54.8%	45.2%	
05	0	1	6	5	7	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	13	18	31
	0.0%	3.2%	19.4%	16.1%	22.6%	32.3%	0.0%	3.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.2%	41.9%	58.1%	
Total	4	7	29	20	55	63	0	2	0	1	2	4	90	97	187
	2.1%	3.7%	15.5%	10.7%	29.4%	33.7%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	0.5%	1.1%	2.1%	48.1%	51.9%	
	11		49		118		2		1		6		187		
	5.9%		26.2%		63.1%		1.1%		0.5%		3.2%		100.0%		

TUCSON UNIFIED
SCHOOL DISTRICT

Date: 1/16/2020 11:00:32 AM

Daily Enrollment by Grade, Gender and USP Ethnicity
239 - Holladay Magnet Elementary
 On: 01/16/2020 (Day 100 SY 2019-20)

Grade	White/Anglo		African American		Hispanic		Native American		Asian American		Multi-racial		Total		
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	Total
KG	2	0	3	1	7	8	0	0	0	1	1	1	13	11	24
	8.3%	0.0%	12.5%	4.2%	29.2%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.2%	4.2%	4.2%	54.2%	45.8%	
01	0	3	5	3	17	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	22	22	44
	0.0%	6.8%	11.4%	6.8%	38.6%	34.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.3%	50.0%	50.0%	
02	0	1	3	2	7	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	16	26
	0.0%	3.8%	11.5%	7.7%	26.9%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	38.5%	61.5%	
03	1	2	6	3	10	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	17	20	37
	2.7%	5.4%	16.2%	8.1%	27.0%	37.8%	0.0%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	45.9%	54.1%	
04	1	1	5	6	12	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	16	34
	2.9%	2.9%	14.7%	17.6%	35.3%	23.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.9%	52.9%	47.1%	
05	0	1	6	4	7	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	13	17	30
	0.0%	3.3%	20.0%	13.3%	23.3%	33.3%	0.0%	3.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.3%	43.3%	56.7%	
Total	4	8	28	19	60	68	0	2	0	1	1	4	93	102	195
	2.1%	4.1%	14.4%	9.7%	30.8%	34.9%	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.5%	2.1%	47.7%	52.3%	
	12		47		128		2		1		5		195		
	6.2%		24.1%		65.6%		1.0%		0.5%		2.6%		100.0%		

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report**INTEGRATION**

Magnet Program

**STUDENT RETENTION**

Are there any noteworthy differences or trends that you notice when analyzing this data?

Reflection:**40 Day – 2018 and 2019 Reflection**

- In 2018, the largest student ethnicity group was the Hispanic group with 67.3 percent of the student population with 134 students and in 2019, the Hispanic population decreased to being 63.1 percent of the student population with 118 students. In response to retention of our smaller ethnicity groups, here is a breakdown of the White/Anglo, African American, Native American, Asian American, and Multi-racial groups.
- In 2018, we had 11 White/Anglo students that represented 6 percent of the student population, compared to 2019, where we have 11 students in the category that represented 5.9 percent of the population. Between 2018 to 2019, 1 male student exited Holladay after kindergarten (going into first grade), 1 female exited student after first grade (going into second grade), and 1 male exited student after second grade (going into third grade). Holladay has added 2 female students this year in kindergarten.
- In 2018, we had 47 African American students that represented 23.6 percent of the student population, compared to 2019, where we have 49 students in the category that represented 26.2 percent of the population. Between 2018 to 2019, 2 females and 1 male students entered Holladay after kindergarten (current first grade), 1 female exited as 1 male student entered in after first grade (current second grade), 2 females and 1 male student entered after second grade (current third grade), 1 female exited as 1 male student entered after third grade (current fourth grade), 1 female exited as 3 male students entered after fourth grade (current fifth grade). Holladay has added 3 female and 2 male students this year in kindergarten.
- In 2018, we had 1 Native American student that represented 0.5 percent of the student population, compared to 2019, where we have 2 students in the category that represented 1.1 percent of the population. Between 2018 to 2019, 1 male student entered after second grade (current third grade).
- In 2018, we had 0 Asian American student that represented 0 percent of the student population, compared to 2019, where we have 1 student in the category that represented 0.5 percent of the population. Holladay has added 1 new Asian American student this year in kindergarten.
- In 2018, we had 5 Multi-racial students that represented 2.5 percent of the student population, compared to 2019, where we have 6 students in the category that represented 3.2 percent of the population. Between 2018 to 2019, kindergarten (now first), second (now third), and third grade (now fourth). Holladay has added 1 male and 1 female Multi-racial students this year in kindergarten.

Reflection on next page . . .



INTEGRATION

In the 2018 data, Holladay was close to a 70 percent student population with 67.3 percent of Hispanic students. By 2019, our largest student population are still the Hispanic students at 63.1 percent. Our African American student population rose from 2018's 23.6 percent to 2019's 26.2 percent. Quarterly retention phone calls and electronic communication will need to be used to maintain our student populations of the White/Anglo, Native American, and Asian American populations.

100 Day – 2019 and 2020 Reflection

- In 2019, the largest student ethnicity group was the Hispanic group with 64.4 percent of the student population with 130 students and in 2020, the Hispanic population decreased to being 65.6 percent of the student population with 128 students. In response to retention of our smaller ethnicity groups, here is a breakdown of the White/Anglo, African American, Native American, Asian American, and Multi-racial groups.
- In 2019, we had 11 White/Anglo students that represented 5.4 percent of the student population, compared to 2020, where we have 12 students in the category that represented 6.2 percent of the population. Between 2019 to 2020, 0 students left Holladay after kindergarten (current first grade), 1 female student exited as 1 male entered after first grade (current second grade), and 1 male student exited second grade (current). Holladay has added 2 female students this year in kindergarten.
- In 2019, we had 54 African American students that represented 26.7 percent of the student population, compared to 2020, where we have 47 students in the category that represented 24.1 percent of the population. Between 2019 to 2020, 2 female students entered after kindergarten (current first grade), 3 females exited as 1 entered after first grade (current second grade), 1 male exited after second grade (current third grade), 1 female exited after third grade (current fourth grade), and 1 female exited as 1 entered after fourth grade (current fifth grade).
- In 2019, we had 1 Native American student that represented 0.5 percent of the student population, compared to 2020, where we have 2 students in the category that represented 1.0 percent of the population. Between 2019 to 2020, 1 male student was added after second grade (current third grade).
- In 2019, we had 0 Asian American student that represented 0 percent of the student population, compared to 2020, where we have 1 student in the category that represented 0.5 percent of the population. Holladay has added 1 male student this year in kindergarten.
- In 2019, we had 6 Multi-racial students that represented 3.0 percent of the student population, compared to 2020, where we have 5 students in the category that represented 2.6 percent of the population. Between 2019 to 2020, 1 male student exited after kindergarten (current first grade), and 1 female student exited after second grade (current third grade). Holladay has added 1 female and 1 male student this year in kindergarten.

INTEGRATION



Reflection

In the 2019 data, by the 100th day the largest student population was the Hispanic students that accounted for 64.4 percent of the overall student population. The next largest student population was the African American students that accounted for 24.1 percent of the overall student population. Quarterly retention phone calls and electronic communication will need to be used to maintain our student populations of the White/Anglo, Native American, and Asian American populations.

Academic Year – 40th and 100th Day Reflection

- On the 40th day, the largest student ethnicity group was the Hispanic group with 63.1 percent of the student population with 118 and on the 100th day, the Hispanic population increased to being 65.6 percent of the student population with 128 students. In response to retention of our smaller ethnicity groups, here is a breakdown of the White/Anglo, African American, Native American, Asian American, and Multi-racial groups.
- On the 40th day, we had 11 White/Anglo students that represented 5.9 percent of the student population, compared to the 100th day, where we have 12 students in the category that represented 6.2 percent of the population. Second graded added 1 male student by the 100th day.
- On the 40th day, we had 49 African American students that represented 26.2 percent of the student population, compared to the 100th day, where we have 47 students in the category that represented 24.1 percent of the population. Second grade lost 1 female student and fifth grade lost 1 male student by the 100th day.
- On the 40th day, we had 2 Native American students that represented 1.1 percent of the student population, compared to the 100th day, where we have 2 students in the category that represented 1.0 percent of the population. No changes occurred by the 100th day.
- On the 40th day, we had 1 Asian American student that represented 0.5 percent of the student population, compared to the 100th day, where we have 1 student in the category that represented 0.5 percent of the population. No changes occurred by the 100th day.
- On the 40th day, we had 6 Multi-racial students that represented 3.2 percent of the student population, compared to the 100th day, where we have 5 students in the category that represented 2.6 percent of the population. Third grade lost 1 female student by the 100th day.

Reflection

Holladay was successful at marketing, outreach, and recruitment from the 40th to 100th day of school. Within the 60-day timeframe, Holladay added one White student in second grade from a recruitment event at the Children's Museum and 10 new Hispanic students.



INTEGRATION

Theme Visibility: Theme Visibility is not an emphasis area for SY 2019-20; however, it still plays an important role in establishing the culture and climate of each site.


THEME VISIBILITY

*Review the components found in the table below. Shade the box for each quarter for components that are strengths for your site in **green**. In the non-shaded boxes, identify what steps will be taken to ensure that this is addressed. Goal: Increase theme visibility from Q1 to Q4.*

Component	Q1 (15/20 = 75%)	Q2	Q3/Q4	Goal for 2020/21
Current magnet theme is evident on exterior of building/grounds.	Logos, marquee, artwork	Logos, marquee, artwork	Logos, marquee, artwork.	Continue showing B rating and magnet theme
Magnet school name is given in phone greeting.	Staff trained on phone greeting	Staff trained on phone greeting	Staff trained on phone greeting	Continue practices next year for everyone
Magnet theme is evident in main office.	Photos, bulletin boards, carpets, pens	Photos, bulletin boards, carpets, pens	Photos, bulletin boards, carpets, pens	Create a more vibrant showcase in the office
Magnet theme is evident in common areas.	Increase visibility in library and cafeteria	Library now has magnet theme	Library now has magnet theme	Cafeteria and library magnet theme
Magnet theme is evident in hallways/display areas in posted student work	Hallways show theme and student artwork	Hallways show theme and student artwork	Hallways show theme and student artwork	Continue supporting teachers with showcasing the arts
Magnet theme is noted in school communications/media.	Email signatures updated and social media	Email signatures updated and social media	Email signatures updated and social media	Continue best practices for the website/online/emails
Teachers have specific areas of the campus and facility for magnet activities/lessons/presentations	Library and cafeteria, but to increase visibility in these areas	Library and cafeteria, but to increase visibility in these areas	Library and cafeteria, but to increase visibility in these areas	Cafeteria and library magnet theme
Magnet theme is incorporated into the school's mission/vision statement.	PD planned and discussion started	PD planned and discussion started	PD planned and discussion started	Fully revise mission and vision
Evidence of family/community engagement/partnerships.	Holladay website and hallway display	Holladay website and hallway display	Holladay website and hallway display	Holladay website and hallway display



STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Directions: Use SchoolCity to access Report “**Summary**” data for each of the grade levels tested during Benchmark 1. Use the  Snipping Tool to take a screen shot of each grade level for Math and ELA, then fill out the Reflection box. Make sure to capture both Tucson Unified average scores and your school’s average scores for each grade level and subject area. Please delete any non-applicable grades from the table.

ELA – Q1 BENCHMARK

Are there any noteworthy differences or trends that you notice in comparing Benchmark achievement between your school and the District for ELA? What strategies or action steps are being employed to address these differences/trends (if applicable)?

Reflection:

- For the first quarter Benchmark, Holladay’s second grade students accumulated an average raw score of 10.6 correct with an average of 42.4 percent. The district had an average raw score of 11.6 correct with an average of 46.4 percent . **The difference of Holladay falling below the district’s average raw score of 1 correct and 4 percent below the district’s average.**
- For the first quarter Benchmark, Holladay’s third grade students accumulated an average raw score of 11.1 correct with an average of 36.9 percent. The district had an average raw score of 11.9 correct with an average of 39.5 percent. **The difference of Holladay falling below the district’s average raw score of 0.8 correct and 2.6 percent below the district’s average.**
- For the first quarter Benchmark, Holladay’s fourth grade students accumulated an average raw score of 15.5 correct with an average of 51.8 percent. The district had an average raw score of 15.5 correct with an average of 51.8 percent. **There is no differences between Holladay and the district average raw score and average percent.**
- For the first quarter Benchmark, Holladay’s fifth grade students accumulated an average raw score of 17.9 correct with an average of 59.8 percent. The district had an average raw score of 17.4 correct with an average of 58.2 percent. **The difference of Holladay being above the district’s average raw score by 0.5 correct and 1.6 percent above the district’s average.**

Strategies and action steps next page . . .

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report**STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT**

Magnet Program

**Strategies and action steps:**

- The District's Benchmark testing ran from September 16 to October 3. On September 16, Holladay's 21'st Century Community Learning Centers Grant (Extended Day) programs started. The program offers Math and English-Language Arts (ELA) tutoring and various enrichment programs. We aim to grow students in the academic tutoring hour Extended Day – especially in ELA academic tutoring for second, third, fourth, and fifth grade. Teachers will conduct best equitable practices to meet the needs of student population groups – All Ethnic Groups, English Language Learners (ELL) students, and Exceptional Education students.
- Classroom Teachers, Curriculum Service Provider (CSP), Instructional Data Intervention Specialist (IDIS), and the Multi-Tier System of Supports (MTSS) Facilitator will use Collaborative Teacher Teams (CTT) time to analyze and disaggregate student data to create/adjust intervention groups; examine and address check for understandings of exit tickets and Common Formative Assessments (CFAs); and create lesson plans to student needs.
- Principal, CSP, IDIS, MTSS Facilitator, and Magnet Coordinator will routinely use observation and reflection cycles for ELA instructional time in K – 5 classrooms. Areas of refinement will be addressed by Principal with whisper coaching or during weekly CTT time. Refinement trends will also serve as Professional Development topics on district PD Wednesday meetings.
- Classroom Teachers will hold fidelity to Daily 5 during ELA time.
- Classroom Teachers will use CAFÉ strategies (Comprehension skills, Accuracy skills, Fluency skills, and Expanded vocabulary skills) from Daily 5.
- Classroom Teachers will conference with every student weekly. Tier 2 and 3 students will receive more conferencing and check-ins.



STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

ELA – Q1 Benchmark Data

Insert screen shots in the appropriate boxes below. Delete any rows that are not applicable to your site

1920.TUSD.ELA.02.Q1Benchmark

By Grade	# Tested	Participation Rate	Avg. RS	Avg. % Correct	Minimally Proficient		Partially Proficient		Proficient		Highly Proficient	
					#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Tucson Unified School District	2608	80.1%	11.6	46.4%	943	36.2%	583	22.4%	726	27.8%	356	13.7%
HOLLADAY	25	100.0%	10.6	42.4%	10	40%	6	24%	7	28%	2	8%
Grade 2	25	0.8%	10.6	42.4%	10	40%	6	24%	7	28%	2	8%

1920.TUSD.ELA.03.Q1Benchmark

By Grade	# Tested	Participation Rate	Avg. RS	Avg. % Correct	Minimally Proficient		Partially Proficient		Proficient		Highly Proficient	
					#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Tucson Unified School District	2875	84.3%	11.9	39.5%	1033	35.9%	655	22.8%	833	29%	354	12.3%
HOLLADAY	37	97.4%	11.1	36.9%	15	40.5%	10	27%	8	21.6%	4	10.8%
Grade 3	37	1.1%	11.1	36.9%	15	40.5%	10	27%	8	21.6%	4	10.8%

1920.TUSD.ELA.04.Q1Benchmark

By Grade	# Tested	Participation Rate	Avg. RS	Avg. % Correct	Minimally Proficient		Partially Proficient		Proficient		Highly Proficient	
					#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Tucson Unified School District	2788	84.4%	15.5	51.8%	1036	37.2%	590	21.2%	785	28.2%	377	13.5%
HOLLADAY	31	96.9%	15.5	51.8%	9	29%	7	22.6%	13	41.9%	2	6.5%
Grade 4	31	1.0%	15.5	51.8%	9	29%	7	22.6%	13	41.9%	2	6.5%

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Magnet Program



1920.TUSD.ELA.05.Q1Benchmark

By Grade	# Tested	Participation Rate	Avg. RS	Avg. % Correct	Minimally Proficient		Partially Proficient		Proficient		Highly Proficient	
					#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Tucson Unified School District	3021	84.7%	17.4	58.2%	1148	38%	557	18.4%	1002	33.2%	314	10.4%
HOLLADAY	30	96.8%	17.9	59.8%	11	36.7%	7	23.3%	10	33.3%	2	6.7%
Grade 5	30	0.9%	17.9	59.8%	11	36.7%	7	23.3%	10	33.3%	2	6.7%



STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

ELA – Q2 BENCHMARK

Are there any noteworthy differences or trends that you notice in comparing Benchmark achievement between your school and the District for ELA? What strategies or action steps are being employed to address these differences/trends (if applicable)? Have these differences changed from the previous benchmark?

Reflection:

- For the second quarter Benchmark, Holladay's second grade students accumulated an average raw score of 16.2 correct (10.6 for Q1) with an average of 65 percent (42.4 percent for Q1). The district had an average raw score of 14.6 correct (11.6 for Q1) with an average of 58.3 percent (46.4 percent for Q1). **The difference of Holladay above the district's average raw score by 1.6 correct and 6.7 percent above the district's average (Q1 was below by an average raw score of 1 and 4 percent below the district average).**
- For the second quarter Benchmark, Holladay's third grade students accumulated an average raw score of 10.6 correct (11.1 for Q1) with an average of 35.4 percent (36.9 percent for Q1). The district had an average raw score of 11.3 correct (11.9 for Q1) with an average of 37.8 percent (39.5 percent for Q1). **The difference of Holladay falling below the district's average raw score by 0.7 correct and 2.4 percent below the district's average (Q1 was below by an average raw score 0.8 and 2.6 percent below the district's average).**
- For the second quarter Benchmark, Holladay's fourth grade students accumulated an average raw score of 16.4 correct (15.5 for Q1) with an average of 54.6 percent (51.8 percent for Q1). The district had an average raw score of 15.8 correct (15.5 for Q1) with an average of 52.8 percent (51.8 percent for Q1). **The difference of Holladay above the district's average raw score by 0.6 correct and 1.8 percent above the district's average (Q1 had no differences between Holladay and the district average raw score and average percent).**
- For the second quarter Benchmark, Holladay's fifth grade students accumulated an average raw score of 14.7 correct (17.9 for Q1) with an average of 49 percent (59.8 percent for Q1). The district had an average raw score of 14.8 correct (17.4 for Q1) with an average of 49.3 percent (58.2 percent for Q1). **The difference of Holladay below the district's average raw score by 0.1 correct and 0.3 percent above the district's average (Q1 was above by an average raw score of 0.5 and 1.6 percent above the district's average).**

Strategies and action steps next page . . .

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report**STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT**

Magnet Program

**Strategies and action steps:**

- The District’s Benchmark testing ran from September 16 to October 3. On September 16, Holladay’s 21’st Century Community Learning Centers Grant (Extended Day) programs started. The program offers Math and English-Language Arts (ELA) tutoring and various enrichment programs. We aim to grow students in the academic tutoring hour Extended Day – especially in ELA academic tutoring for second, third, fourth, and fifth grade. Teachers will conduct best equitable practices to meet the needs of student population groups – All Ethnic Groups, English Language Learners (ELL) students, and Exceptional Education students.
- Classroom Teachers, Curriculum Service Provider (CSP), Instructional Data Intervention Specialist (IDIS), and the Multi-Tier System of Supports (MTSS) Facilitator will use Collaborative Teacher Teams (CTT) time to analyze and disaggregate student data to create/adjust intervention groups; examine and address check for understandings of exit tickets and Common Formative Assessments (CFAs); and create lesson plans to student needs.
- Principal, CSP, IDIS, MTSS Facilitator, and Magnet Coordinator will routinely use observation and reflection cycles for ELA instructional time in K – 5 classrooms. Areas of refinement will be addressed by Principal with whisper coaching or during weekly CTT time. Refinement trends will also serve as Professional Development topics on district PD Wednesday meetings.
- Classroom Teachers will hold fidelity to Daily 5 during ELA time.
- Classroom Teachers will use CAFÉ strategies (Comprehension skills, Accuracy skills, Fluency skills, and Expanded vocabulary skills) from Daily 5.
- Classroom Teachers will conference with every student weekly. Tier 2 and 3 students will receive more conferencing and check-ins.

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT



ELA – Q2 Benchmark Data

Insert screen shots in the appropriate boxes below. Delete any rows that are not applicable to your site

1920.TUSD.ELA.02.Q2Benchmark

By Grade	# Tested	Participation Rate	Avg. RS	Avg. % Correct	Minimally Proficient		Partially Proficient		Proficient		Highly Proficient	
					#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Tucson Unified School District	2548	77.5%	14.6	58.3%	1064	41.8%	461	18.1%	791	31%	232	9.1%
HOLLADAY	25	96.2%	16.2	65%	10	40%	4	16%	6	24%	5	20%
Grade 2	25	0.8%	16.2	65%	10	40%	4	16%	6	24%	5	20%

1920.TUSD.ELA.03.Q2Benchmark

By Grade	# Tested	Participation Rate	Avg. RS	Avg. % Correct	Minimally Proficient		Partially Proficient		Proficient		Highly Proficient	
					#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Tucson Unified School District	2863	84.1%	11.3	37.7%	1089	38%	623	21.8%	871	30.4%	280	9.8%
HOLLADAY	36	97.3%	10.6	35.4%	16	44.4%	9	25%	8	22.2%	3	8.3%
Grade 3	36	1.1%	10.6	35.4%	16	44.4%	9	25%	8	22.2%	3	8.3%

1920.TUSD.ELA.04.Q2Benchmark

By Grade	# Tested	Participation Rate	Avg. RS	Avg. % Correct	Avg. TS	Minimally Proficient		Partially Proficient		Proficient		Avg. TS	#		
						#	%	Avg. TS	#	%	Avg. TS			#	%
Tucson Unified School District	2784	83.9%	15.8	52.8%	58:57	1137	40.8%	57:18	502	18%	63:55	897	32.2%	59:02	248
HOLLADAY	34	100.0%	16.4	54.6%	70:56	10	29.4%	77:58	10	29.4%	77:43	11	32.4%	65:04	3
Grade 4	34	1.0%	16.4	54.6%	70:56	10	29.4%	77:58	10	29.4%	77:43	11	32.4%	65:04	3

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Magnet Program



1920.TUSD.ELA.05.Q2Benchmark

By Grade	# Tested	Participation Rate	Avg. RS	Avg. % Correct	Avg. TS	Minimally Proficient			Partially Proficient			Proficient			
						#	%	Avg. TS	#	%	Avg. TS	#	%	Avg. TS	
Tucson Unified School District	3016	84.8%	14.8	49.3%	62:14	1232	40.8%	58:56	592	19.6%	65:16	849	28.1%	66:29	343
HOLLADAY	29	96.7%	14.7	49%	65:27	11	37.9%	55:18	12	41.4%	63:51	3	10.3%	77:40	3
Grade 5	29	0.8%	14.7	49%	65:27	11	37.9%	55:18	12	41.4%	63:51	3	10.3%	77:40	3



STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

ELA – Q3 BENCHMARK

Are there any noteworthy differences or trends that you notice in comparing Benchmark achievement between your school and the District for ELA? What strategies or action steps are being employed to address these differences/trends (if applicable)? Have these differences changed from the previous benchmarks?

Reflection:

- For the third quarter Benchmark, Holladay's second grade students accumulated an average raw score of 14.7 correct (10.6 for Q1 and 16.2 for Q2) with an average of 58.7 percent (42.4 percent for Q1 and 65 percent for Q2). The district had an average raw score of 12.8 correct (11.6 for Q1 and 14.6 for Q2) with an average of 51.1 percent (46.4 percent for Q1 and 58.3 percent for Q2). **The difference of Holladay above the district's average raw score by 1.9 correct and 7.6 percent above the district's average (Q1 was below by an average raw score of 1 and 4 percent below the district average and Q2 was above by an average score of 1.6 and 6.7 percent above the district average).**
- For the third quarter Benchmark, Holladay's third grade students accumulated an average raw score of 12.6 correct (11.1 for Q1 and 10.6 for Q2) with an average of 42.1 percent (36.9 percent for Q1 and 35.4 percent for Q2). The district had an average raw score of 13.3 correct (11.9 for Q1 and 11.3 for Q2) with an average of 44.5 percent (39.5 percent for Q1 and 37.8 percent for Q2). **The difference of Holladay falling below the district's average raw score by 0.7 correct and 2.4 percent below the district's average (Q1 was below by an average raw score 0.8 and 2.6 percent below the district's average and Q2 below the district's average raw score by 0.7 correct and 2.4 percent below the district's average).**
- For the third quarter Benchmark, Holladay's fourth grade students accumulated an average raw score of 13.9 correct (15.5 for Q1 and 16.4 for Q2) with an average of 46.5 percent (51.8 percent for Q1 and 54.6 percent for Q2). The district had an average raw score of 13.9 correct (15.5 for Q1 and 15.8 for Q2) with an average of 46.4 percent (51.8 percent for Q1 and 52.8 percent for Q2). **There was no difference of Holladay and the district's average raw score correct and 0.1 percent above the district's average (Q1 had no differences between Holladay and the district average raw score and average percent and Q2 was above the district's average raw score by 0.6 correct and 1.8 percent above the district's average).**
- For the third quarter Benchmark, Holladay's fifth grade students accumulated an average raw score of 14.9 correct (17.9 for Q1 and 14.7 for Q2) with an average of 49.8 percent (59.8 percent for Q1 and 49 percent for Q2). The district had an average raw score of 15.8 correct (17.4 for Q1 and 14.8 for Q2) with an average of 52.2 percent (58.2 percent for Q1 and 49.3 percent for Q2). **The difference of Holladay below the district's average raw score by 0.9 correct and 2.7 percent above the district's average (Q1 was above by an average raw score of 0.5 and 1.6 percent above the district's average and Q2 below the district's average raw score by 0.1 correct and 0.3 percent above the district's average).**

Strategies and action steps next page . . .

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report**STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT**

Magnet Program

**Strategies and action steps:**

- The District's Benchmark testing ran from **September 16 to October 3**. On September 16, Holladay's 21'st Century Community Learning Centers Grant (Extended Day) programs started. The program offers Math and English-Language Arts (ELA) tutoring and various enrichment programs. We aim to grow students in the academic tutoring hour Extended Day – especially in ELA academic tutoring for second, third, fourth, and fifth grade. Teachers will conduct best equitable practices to meet the needs of student population groups – All Ethnic Groups, English Language Learners (ELL) students, and Exceptional Education students.
- Classroom Teachers, Curriculum Service Provider (CSP), Instructional Data Intervention Specialist (IDIS), and the Multi-Tier System of Supports (MTSS) Facilitator will use Collaborative Teacher Teams (CTT) time to analyze and disaggregate student data to create/adjust intervention groups; examine and address check for understandings of exit tickets and Common Formative Assessments (CFAs); and create lesson plans to student needs.
- Principal, CSP, IDIS, MTSS Facilitator, and Magnet Coordinator will routinely use observation and reflection cycles for ELA instructional time in K – 5 classrooms. Areas of refinement will be addressed by Principal with whisper coaching or during weekly CTT time. Refinement trends will also serve as Professional Development topics on district PD Wednesday meetings.
- Classroom Teachers will hold fidelity to Daily 5 during ELA time.
- Classroom Teachers will use CAFÉ strategies (Comprehension skills, Accuracy skills, Fluency skills, and Expanded vocabulary skills) from Daily 5.
- Classroom Teachers will conference with every student weekly. Tier 2 and 3 students will receive more conferencing and check-ins.



STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

ELA – Q3 Benchmark Data

Insert screen shots in the appropriate boxes below. Delete any rows that are not applicable to your site

1920.TUSD.ELA.02.Q3Benchmark

By Grade ▲	# Tested ▲	Participation Rate ▲	Avg. RS ▲	Avg. % Correct ▲	Minimally Proficient		Partially Proficient		Proficient		Highly Proficient	
					# ▲	% ▲	# ▲	% ▲	# ▲	% ▲	# ▲	% ▲
Tucson Unified School District	2816	86.1%	12.8	51.1%	1049	37.3%	668	23.7%	860	30.5%	239	8.5%
HOLLADAY	25	96.2%	14.7	58.7%	5	20%	4	16%	14	56%	2	8%
Grade 2	25	0.8%	14.7	58.7%	5	20%	4	16%	14	56%	2	8%

1920.TUSD.ELA.03.Q3Benchmark

By Grade ▲	# Tested ▲	Participation Rate ▲	Avg. RS ▲	Avg. % Correct ▲	Avg. SS ▲	Minimally Proficient		Partially Proficient		Proficient		Highly Proficient	
						# ▲	Avg. TS ▲	# ▲	Avg. TS ▲	# ▲	Avg. TS ▲	# ▲	Avg. TS ▲
Tucson Unified School District	3027	86.6%	13.3	44.5%	2502.4	1159		585		1029		254	
HOLLADAY	34	97.1%	12.6	42.1%	2499.8	17		5		10		2	
Grade 3	34	1.0%	12.6	42.1%	2499.8	17		5		10		2	

1920.TUSD.ELA.04.Q3Benchmark

By Grade ▲	# Tested ▲	Participation Rate ▲	Avg. RS ▲	Avg. % Correct ▲	Minimally Proficient		Partially Proficient		Proficient		Highly Proficient	
					# ▲	% ▲	# ▲	% ▲	# ▲	% ▲	# ▲	% ▲
Tucson Unified School District	2971	89.5%	13.9	46.4%	1136	38.2%	647	21.8%	916	30.8%	272	9.2%
HOLLADAY	33	100.0%	13.9	46.5%	11	33.3%	9	27.3%	11	33.3%	2	6.1%
Grade 4	33	1.0%	13.9	46.5%	11	33.3%	9	27.3%	11	33.3%	2	6.1%

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Magnet Program



1920.TUSD.ELA.05.Q3Benchmark

By Grade ▲	# Tested ⚡	Participation Rate ⚡	Avg. RS ⚡	Avg. % Correct ⚡	Minimally Proficient		Partially Proficient		Proficient		Highly Proficient	
					# ⚡	% ⚡	# ⚡	% ⚡	# ⚡	% ⚡	# ⚡	% ⚡
Tucson Unified School District	3183	89.3%	15.8	52.5%	1320	41.5%	712	22.4%	967	30.4%	184	5.8%
HOLLADAY	29	100.0%	14.9	49.8%	14	48.3%	6	20.7%	9	31%	0	0%
Grade 5	29	0.8%	14.9	49.8%	14	48.3%	6	20.7%	9	31%	0	0%

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report**STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT**

Magnet Program

**MATH – Q1 BENCHMARK**

Are there any noteworthy differences or trends that you notice in comparing Benchmark achievement between your school and the District for Math? What strategies or action steps are being employed to address these differences/trends (if applicable)?

Reflection:

- For the first quarter Benchmark, Holladay's second grade students accumulated an average raw score of 13.3 correct with an average of 53.1 percent. The district had an average raw score of 10.3 correct with an average of 41.3 percent. **The difference of Holladay being above the district's average raw score by 3 correct and 11.8 percent above the district's average.**
- For the first quarter Benchmark, Holladay's third grade students accumulated an average raw score of 15.6 correct with an average of 52 percent. The district had an average raw score of 12.8 correct with an average of 42.7 percent. **The difference of Holladay being above the district's average raw score by 2.8 correct and 9.3 percent above the district's average.**
- For the first quarter Benchmark, Holladay's fourth grade students accumulated an average raw score of 17.3 correct with an average of 57.7 percent. The district had an average raw score of 15 correct with an average of 50.1 percent. **The difference of Holladay being above the district's average raw score by 2.3 correct and 7.6 percent above the district's average.**
- For the first quarter Benchmark, Holladay's fifth grade students accumulated an average raw score of 17.1 correct with an average of 57 percent. The district had an average raw score of 14.1 correct with an average of 46.9 percent. **The difference of Holladay being above the district's average raw score by 3 correct and 10.1 percent above the district's average.**

Strategies and action steps next page . . .

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report**STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT**

Magnet Program

**Strategies and action steps:**

- Classroom Teachers, Curriculum Service Provider (CSP), Instructional Data Intervention Specialist (IDIS), and Multi-Tier Systems of Support (MTSS) Facilitator, will use Collaborative Teacher Teams (CTT) time to analyze and disaggregate student data to create/adjust intervention groups; examine and address check for understandings of exit tickets and Common Formative Assessments (CFAs); and create lesson plans to student needs. Teachers will conduct best equitable practices to meet the needs of student population groups – All Ethnic Groups, English Language Learners (ELL) students, and Exceptional Education students.
- Principal, CSP, IDIS, and MTSS Facilitator will routinely do observation and reflection cycles for Math instructional time in K – 5 classrooms. Principal will assist with whisper coaching after observations complete. Areas of refinement will be addressed by Principal with whisper coaching or during weekly CTT time. Refinement trends will also serve as Professional Development topics on district PD Wednesday meetings.
- Holladay maintains an embedded math intervention time between 9:00 – 9:30 AM daily for all K – 5 classrooms for a total of 120 minutes per week. Classroom Teachers are assigned a staff member for math intervention time. Teachers will conduct re-teaching for students who fall below 80 percent from weekly CFAs.
- Math Pitfalls training on September 3 and 4. Math Pitfalls will be supplemental support used in math intervention time.
- Tier 2/3 math support push-ins instead of pull-out will be used to keep students in class to receive classroom Tier 1 instruction.
- Title 1/Magnet walk-through feedback: teachers to make use of whiteboards and manipulatives to support students with differentiated learning.
- Purposeful student collaborations: ex. Group of 4 students with one highly proficient (high), proficient (high-medium), partially proficient (medium-low), and minimally proficient (low).

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT



MATH – Q1 Benchmark Data

Insert screen shots in the appropriate boxes below. Delete any rows that are not applicable to your site

1920.TUSD.Math.02.Q1Benchmark

By Grade ▲	# Tested ⚡	Participation Rate ⚡	Avg. RS ⚡	Avg. % Correct ⚡	Minimally Proficient		Partially Proficient		Proficient		Highly Proficient	
					# ⚡	% ⚡	# ⚡	% ⚡	# ⚡	% ⚡	# ⚡	% ⚡
Tucson Unified School District	2833	87.1%	10.3	41.3%	1094	38.6%	680	24%	755	26.7%	304	10.7%
HOLLADAY	25	100.0%	13.3	53.1%	2	8%	7	28%	11	44%	5	20%
Grade 2	25	0.8%	13.3	53.1%	2	8%	7	28%	11	44%	5	20%

1920.TUSD.Math.03.Q1Benchmark

By Grade ▲	# Tested ⚡	Participation Rate ⚡	Avg. RS ⚡	Avg. % Correct ⚡	Minimally Proficient		Partially Proficient		Proficient		Highly Proficient	
					# ⚡	% ⚡	# ⚡	% ⚡	# ⚡	% ⚡	# ⚡	% ⚡
Tucson Unified School District	3034	88.9%	12.8	42.7%	1141	37.6%	617	20.3%	904	29.8%	372	12.3%
HOLLADAY	37	97.4%	15.6	52%	8	21.6%	6	16.2%	15	40.5%	8	21.6%
Grade 3	37	1.1%	15.6	52%	8	21.6%	6	16.2%	15	40.5%	8	21.6%

1920.TUSD.Math.04.Q1Benchmark

By Grade ▲	# Tested ⚡	Participation Rate ⚡	Avg. RS ⚡	Avg. % Correct ⚡	Minimally Proficient		Partially Proficient		Proficient		Highly Proficient	
					# ⚡	% ⚡	# ⚡	% ⚡	# ⚡	% ⚡	# ⚡	% ⚡
Tucson Unified School District	2989	90.5%	15	50.1%	1081	36.2%	640	21.4%	927	31%	341	11.4%
HOLLADAY	31	96.9%	17.3	57.7%	7	22.6%	7	22.6%	13	41.9%	4	12.9%
Grade 4	31	1.0%	17.3	57.7%	7	22.6%	7	22.6%	13	41.9%	4	12.9%

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Magnet Program



1920.TUSD.Math.05.Q1Benchmark

By Grade ▲	# Tested ⚡	Participation Rate ⚡	Avg-RS ⚡	Avg. % Correct ⚡	Minimally Proficient		Partially Proficient		Proficient		Highly Proficient	
					# ⚡	% ⚡	# ⚡	% ⚡	# ⚡	% ⚡	# ⚡	% ⚡
Tucson Unified School District	3230	90.6%	14.1	46.9%	1161	35.9%	729	22.6%	979	30.3%	361	11.2%
HOLLADAY	30	96.8%	17.1	57%	5	16.7%	7	23.3%	14	46.7%	4	13.3%
Grade 5	30	0.9%	17.1	57%	5	16.7%	7	23.3%	14	46.7%	4	13.3%



STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

MATH – Q2 BENCHMARK

Are there any noteworthy differences or trends that you notice in comparing Benchmark achievement between your school and the District for Math? What strategies or action steps are being employed to address these differences/trends (if applicable)? Have these differences changed from the previous benchmark?

Reflection:

- For the second quarter Benchmark, Holladay’s second grade students accumulated an average raw score of 17.6 correct (13.3 for Q1) with an average of 70.2 percent (53.1 percent for Q1). The district had an average raw score of 12.5 correct (10.3 for Q1) with an average of 50 percent (41.3 percent for Q1). **The difference of Holladay being above the district’s average raw score by 5.1 correct and 20.2 percent above the district’s average (Q1 was above the raw score average by 3 correct and 11.8 percent above the district’s average).**
- For the second quarter Benchmark, Holladay’s third grade students accumulated an average raw score of 15.3 correct (15.6 for Q1) with an average of 50.9 percent (52 percent for Q1). The district had an average raw score of 15.1 correct (12.8 for Q1) with an average of 50.4 percent (42.7 percent for Q1). **The difference of Holladay being above the district’s average raw score by 0.2 correct and 0.5 percent above the district’s average (Q1 was above the raw score average by 2.8 correct and 9.3 percent above the district’s average).**
- For the second quarter Benchmark, Holladay’s fourth grade students accumulated an average raw score of 19.8 correct (17.3 for Q1) with an average of 66 percent (57.7 percent for Q1). The district had an average raw score of 17 correct (15 for Q1) with an average of 56.6 percent (50.1 percent for Q1). **The difference of Holladay being above the district’s average raw score by 2.8 correct and 9.4 percent above the district’s average (Q1 was above the raw score average by 2.3 correct and 7.6 percent above the district’s average).**
- For the second quarter Benchmark, Holladay’s fifth grade students accumulated an average raw score of 17.5 correct (17.1 for Q1) with an average of 58.2 percent (57 percent for Q1). The district had an average raw score of 15 correct (14.1 for Q1) with an average of 49.9 percent (46.9 percent for Q1). **The difference of Holladay being above the district’s average raw score by 2.5 correct and 8.3 percent above the district’s average (Q1 was above the raw score average by 3 correct and 10.1 percent above the district’s average).**

Strategies and action steps next page . . .

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report**STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT**

Magnet Program

**Strategies and action steps:**

- Classroom Teachers, Curriculum Service Provider (CSP), Instructional Data Intervention Specialist (IDIS), and Multi-Tier Systems of Support (MTSS) Facilitator, will use Collaborative Teacher Teams (CTT) time to analyze and disaggregate student data to create/adjust intervention groups; examine and address check for understandings of exit tickets and Common Formative Assessments (CFAs); and create lesson plans to student needs. Teachers will conduct best equitable practices to meet the needs of student population groups – All Ethnic Groups, English Language Learners (ELL) students, and Exceptional Education students.
- Principal, CSP, IDIS, and MTSS Facilitator will routinely do observation and reflection cycles for Math instructional time in K – 5 classrooms. Principal will assist with whisper coaching after observations complete. Areas of refinement will be addressed by Principal with whisper coaching or during weekly CTT time. Refinement trends will also serve as Professional Development topics on district PD Wednesday meetings.
- Holladay maintains an embedded math intervention time between 9:00 – 9:30 AM daily for all K – 5 classrooms for a total of 120 minutes per week. Classroom Teachers are assigned a staff member for math intervention time. Teachers will conduct re-teaching for students who fall below 80 percent from weekly CFAs.
- Math Pitfalls training on September 3 and 4. Math Pitfalls will be supplemental support used in math intervention time.
- Tier 2/3 math support push-ins instead of pull-out will be used to keep students in class to receive classroom Tier 1 instruction.
- Title 1/Magnet walk-through feedback: teachers to make use of whiteboards and manipulatives to support students with differentiated learning.
- Purposeful student collaborations: ex. Group of 4 students with one highly proficient (high), proficient (high-medium), partially proficient (medium-low), and minimally proficient (low).

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT



MATH – Q2 Benchmark Data

Insert screen shots in the appropriate boxes below. Delete any rows that are not applicable to your site

1920.TUSD.Math.02.Q2Benchmark

By Grade ▲	# Tested ⇅	Participation Rate ⇅	Avg. RS ⇅	Avg. % Correct ⇅	Minimally Proficient		Partially Proficient		Proficient		Highly Proficient	
					# ⇅	% ⇅	# ⇅	% ⇅	# ⇅	% ⇅	# ⇅	% ⇅
Tucson Unified School District	2768	84.9%	12.5	50%	958	34.6%	624	22.5%	918	33.2%	268	9.7%
HOLLADAY	25	96.2%	17.6	70.2%	1	4%	5	20%	10	40%	9	36%
Grade 2	25	0.8%	17.6	70.2%	1	4%	5	20%	10	40%	9	36%

1920.TUSD.Math.03.Q2Benchmark

By Grade ▲	# Tested ⇅	Participation Rate ⇅	Avg. RS ⇅	Avg. % Correct ⇅	Minimally Proficient		Partially Proficient		Proficient		Highly Proficient	
					# ⇅	% ⇅	# ⇅	% ⇅	# ⇅	% ⇅	# ⇅	% ⇅
Tucson Unified School District	2995	88.0%	15.1	50.3%	1149	38.4%	623	20.8%	861	28.7%	362	12.1%
HOLLADAY	36	97.3%	15.3	50.9%	15	41.7%	7	19.4%	10	27.8%	4	11.1%
Grade 3	36	1.1%	15.3	50.9%	15	41.7%	7	19.4%	10	27.8%	4	11.1%

1920.TUSD.Math.04.Q2Benchmark

By Grade ▲	# Tested ⇅	Participation Rate ⇅	Avg. RS ⇅	Avg. % Correct ⇅	Minimally Proficient		Partially Proficient		Proficient		Highly Proficient	
					# ⇅	% ⇅	# ⇅	% ⇅	# ⇅	% ⇅	# ⇅	% ⇅
Tucson Unified School District	2957	85.4%	17	56.6%	1149	38.9%	540	18.3%	979	33.1%	289	9.8%
HOLLADAY	34	100.0%	19.8	66%	10	29.4%	2	5.9%	16	47.1%	6	17.6%
Grade 4	34	1.0%	19.8	66%	10	29.4%	2	5.9%	16	47.1%	6	17.6%

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Magnet Program



1920.TUSD.Math.05.Q2Benchmark

By Grade ▲	# Tested ⚡	Participation Rate ⚡	Avg. RS ⚡	Avg. % Correct ⚡	Minimally Proficient		Partially Proficient		Proficient		Highly Proficient	
					# ⚡	% ⚡	# ⚡	% ⚡	# ⚡	% ⚡	# ⚡	% ⚡
Tucson Unified School District	3187	86.5%	15	49.9% ■	1305	40.9% ■	522	16.4% ■	1001	31.4% ■	359	11.3% ■
HOLLADAY	28	93.3%	17.5	58.2% ■	8	28.6% ■	5	17.9% ■	9	32.1% ■	6	21.4% ■
Grade 5	28	0.6%	17.5	58.2% ■	8	28.6% ■	5	17.9% ■	9	32.1% ■	6	21.4% ■



STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

MATH – Q3 BENCHMARK

Are there any noteworthy differences or trends that you notice in comparing Benchmark achievement between your school and the District for Math? What strategies or action steps are being employed to address these differences/trends (if applicable)? Have these differences changed from the previous benchmarks?

Reflection:

- For the third quarter Benchmark, Holladay's second grade students accumulated an average raw score of 18.6 correct (13.3 for Q1 and 17.6 for Q2) with an average of 74.6 percent (53.1 percent for Q1 and 70.2 percent for Q2). The district had an average raw score of 12.8 correct (10.3 for Q1 and 12.5 for Q2) with an average of 51.3 percent (41.3 percent for Q1 and 50 percent for Q2). **The difference of Holladay being above the district's average raw score by 5.8 correct and 23.3 percent above the district's average (Q1 was above the raw score average by 3 correct and 11.8 percent and Q2 was above the district's average raw score by 5.1 correct and 20.2 percent above the district's average).**
- For the third quarter Benchmark, Holladay's third grade students accumulated an average raw score of 15.6 correct (15.6 for Q1 and 15.3 for Q2) with an average of 52.2 percent (52 percent for Q1 and 50.9 percent for Q2). The district had an average raw score of 15 correct (12.8 for Q1 and 15.1 for Q2) with an average of 49.9 percent (42.7 percent for Q1 and 50.4 percent for Q2). **The difference of Holladay being above the district's average raw score by 0.6 correct and 2.3 percent above the district's average (Q1 was above the raw score average by 2.8 correct and 9.3 percent and Q2 was above the district's average raw score by 0.2 correct and 0.5 percent above the district's average).**
- For the third quarter Benchmark, Holladay's fourth grade students accumulated an average raw score of 17.7 correct (17.3 for Q1 and 19.8 for Q2) with an average of 58.9 percent (57.7 percent for Q1 and 66 percent for Q2). The district had an average raw score of 15.6 correct (15 for Q1 and 17 for Q2) with an average of 52 percent (50.1 percent for Q1 and 56.6 percent). **The difference of Holladay being above the district's average raw score by 2.1 correct and 6.9 percent above the district's average (Q1 was above the raw score average by 2.3 correct and 7.6 percent above the district's average and Q2 was above the district's average raw score by 2.8 correct and 9.4 percent above the district's average).**
- For the third quarter Benchmark, Holladay's fifth grade students accumulated an average raw score of 20.3 correct (17.1 for Q1 and 17.5 for Q2) with an average of 67.8 percent (57 percent for Q1 and 58.2 percent for Q2). The district had an average raw score of 17.9 correct (14.1 for Q1 and 15 for Q2) with an average of 59.6 percent (46.9 percent for Q1 and 49.9 percent for Q2). **The difference of Holladay being above the district's average raw score by 2.4 correct and 8.2 percent above the district's average (Q1 was above the raw score average by 3 correct and 10.1 percent above the district's average and Q2 was above the district's average raw score by 2.5 correct and 8.3 percent above the district's average).**

Strategies and action steps next page . . .

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report**STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT**

Magnet Program

**Strategies and action steps:**

- Classroom Teachers, Curriculum Service Provider (CSP), Instructional Data Intervention Specialist (IDIS), and Multi-Tier Systems of Support (MTSS) Facilitator, will use Collaborative Teacher Teams (CTT) time to analyze and disaggregate student data to create/adjust intervention groups; examine and address check for understandings of exit tickets and Common Formative Assessments (CFAs); and create lesson plans to student needs. Teachers will conduct best equitable practices to meet the needs of student population groups – All Ethnic Groups, English Language Learners (ELL) students, and Exceptional Education students.
- Principal, CSP, IDIS, and MTSS Facilitator will routinely do observation and reflection cycles for Math instructional time in K – 5 classrooms. Principal will assist with whisper coaching after observations complete. Areas of refinement will be addressed by Principal with whisper coaching or during weekly CTT time. Refinement trends will also serve as Professional Development topics on district PD Wednesday meetings.
- Holladay maintains an embedded math intervention time between 9:00 – 9:30 AM daily for all K – 5 classrooms for a total of 120 minutes per week. Classroom Teachers are assigned a staff member for math intervention time. Teachers will conduct re-teaching for students who fall below 80 percent from weekly CFAs.
- Math Pitfalls training on September 3 and 4. Math Pitfalls will be supplemental support used in math intervention time.
- Tier 2/3 math support push-ins instead of pull-out will be used to keep students in class to receive classroom Tier 1 instruction.
- Title 1/Magnet walk-through feedback: teachers to make use of whiteboards and manipulatives to support students with differentiated learning.
- Purposeful student collaborations: ex. Group of 4 students with one highly proficient (high), proficient (high-medium), partially proficient (medium-low), and minimally proficient (low).

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT



MATH – Q3 Benchmark Data

Insert screen shots in the appropriate boxes below. Delete any rows that are not applicable to your site

1920.TUSD.Math.02.Q3Benchmark

By Grade	# Tested	Participation Rate	Avg. RS	Avg. % Correct	Minimally Proficient		Partially Proficient		Proficient		Highly Proficient	
					#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Tucson Unified School District	2830	94.2%	12.8	51.3%	1004	35.5%	562	19.9%	970	34.3%	294	10.4%
HOLLADAY	25	96.2%	18.6	74.6%	0	0%	3	12%	11	44%	11	44%
Grade 2	25	0.8%	18.6	74.6%	0	0%	3	12%	11	44%	11	44%

1920.TUSD.Math.03.Q3Benchmark

By Grade	# Tested	Participation Rate	Avg. RS	Avg. % Correct	Minimally Proficient		Partially Proficient		Proficient		Highly Proficient	
					#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Tucson Unified School District	2989	93.5%	15	49.9%	1105	37%	586	19.6%	1034	34.6%	264	8.8%
HOLLADAY	34	97.1%	15.6	52.2%	11	32.4%	6	17.6%	14	41.2%	3	8.8%
Grade 3	34	1.1%	15.6	52.2%	11	32.4%	6	17.6%	14	41.2%	3	8.8%

1920.TUSD.Math.04.Q3Benchmark

By Grade	# Tested	Participation Rate	Avg. RS	Avg. % Correct	Minimally Proficient		Partially Proficient		Proficient		Highly Proficient	
					#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Tucson Unified School District	2939	95.7%	15.6	52%	1176	40%	734	25%	843	28.7%	186	6.3%
HOLLADAY	33	100.0%	17.7	58.9%	9	27.3%	10	30.3%	10	30.3%	4	12.1%
Grade 4	33	1.1%	17.7	58.9%	9	27.3%	10	30.3%	10	30.3%	4	12.1%

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Magnet Program




1920.TUSD.Math.05.Q3Benchmark

By Grade ▲	# Tested ▲	Participation Rate ▲	Avg. RS ▲	Avg. % Correct ▲	Minimally Proficient		Partially Proficient		Proficient		Highly Proficient	
					# ▲	% ▲	# ▲	% ▲	# ▲	% ▲	# ▲	% ▲
Tucson Unified School District	3177	95.6%	17.9	59.6%	1344	42.3%	635	20%	959	30.2%	239	7.5%
HOLLADAY	29	100.0%	20.3	67.8%	9	31%	6	20.7%	12	41.4%	2	6.9%
Grade 5	29	0.9%	20.3	67.8%	9	31%	6	20.7%	12	41.4%	2	6.9%



STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Directions: Use SchoolCity to access “**Demographic Profile**” for each of the grade levels tested during Benchmark 1. Use “**Ethnicity Subgroups**” in the “**Profile Groups to Display**” box. Click the “**Proficient/Not Proficient**” radial button. Use the  Snipping Tool to take a screen shot of each grade level for Math and ELA, then fill out the Reflection box:

ELA – Q1 ACHIEVEMENT GAP DATA

Are there any noteworthy differences or trends that you notice in comparing Benchmark achievement between ethnicities for ELA? What strategies or action steps are being employed to address these differences/trends (if applicable)?

Reflection:

- Holladay’s second grade students had an average of 42.4 percent. Of the student population tested, 36 percent were proficient and 64 percent were not proficient. The African American population scored above the average with 42.7 percent. The Hispanic population scored below the average with 42.3 percent. The Hispanic population had 36.8 percent proficient students. The African American population had 33.3 percent proficient students.
- Holladay’s third grade students had an average of 36.9 percent. Of the student population tested, 32.4 percent were proficient and 67.6 percent were not proficient. The White, Native American, and African American populations scored above the average with 67.8, 63.3, and 40.8 percent, respectively. The Hispanic and Multi-racial populations scored below the average with 31.3 percent and 26.7 percent, respectively. The Hispanic population had 20.8 percent proficient students. The African American population had 37.5 percent proficient students. The White population had 100 percent proficient students. The Multi-Racial population had 0 percent proficient students. The Native American population had 100 percent proficient students.
- Holladay’s fourth grade students had an average of 51.8 percent. Of the student population tested, 48.4 percent were proficient and 51.6 percent were not proficient. The African American and White populations scored above the average with 60.4 percent and 53.4 percent, respectively. The Hispanic and Multi-Racial populations scored below the average with 48.1 percent and 45 percent, respectively. The Hispanic population had 44.4 percent proficient students. The African American population had 55.6 percent proficient students. The Multi-Racial population had 50 percent proficient students. The White population had 50 percent proficient students.
- Holladay’s fifth grade students had an average of 59.8 percent. Of the student population tested, 40 percent were proficient and 60 percent were not proficient. The African American and White populations scored above the average with 68.3 percent and 66.7 percent, respectively. The Hispanic and Native American populations scored below the average with 55.9 percent and 36.7 percent, respectively. The Hispanic population had 27.8 percent proficient students. The African American population had 60 percent proficient students. The Native American population had 0 percent proficient students. The White population had 100 percent proficient students.

Strategies and action steps next page . . .

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report**STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT**

Magnet Program

**Strategies and action steps:**

- Classroom Teachers, Curriculum Service Provider (CSP), Instructional Data Intervention Specialist (IDIS), and the Multi-Tier System of Supports (MTSS) Facilitator will use Collaborative Teacher Teams (CTT) time to analyze and disaggregate student data to create/adjust intervention groups; examine and address check for understandings of exit tickets and Common Formative Assessments (CFAs); and create lesson plans to student needs. Teachers will conduct best equitable practices to meet the needs of student population groups – All Ethnic Groups, English Language Learners (ELL) students, and Exceptional Education students.
- Principal, CSP, IDIS, MTSS Facilitator, and Magnet Coordinator will routinely use observation and reflection cycles for ELA instructional time in K – 5 classrooms. Areas of refinement will be addressed by Principal with whisper coaching or during weekly CTT time. Refinement trends will also serve as Professional Development topics on district PD Wednesday meetings.
- Classroom Teachers will meet the needs of student populations that fall below the school average and/or fall into the not-proficient category: 3rd grade Hispanic and Multi-racial student groups; 4th grade Hispanic and Multi-racial student groups; and 5th grade Hispanic and Native American student groups.
- 2nd grade classes are to maintain consistent growth with African American and Hispanic student populations as they are both very close to the school average but address students who are not-proficient.
- Classroom Teachers will hold fidelity to Daily 5 during ELA time.
- Classroom Teachers will use CAFÉ strategies (Comprehension skills, Accuracy skills, Fluency skills, and Expanded vocabulary skills) from Daily 5.
- Classroom Teachers will conference with every student weekly. Tier 2 and 3 students will receive more conferencing and check-ins.
- On September 16, Holladay's 21st Century Community Learning Centers Grant (Extended Day) programs started. The program offers Math and English-Language Arts (ELA) tutoring and various enrichment programs. We aim to grow students in the academic tutoring hour Extended Day – especially in ELA academic tutoring for second, third, fourth, and fifth grade.



Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Insert screen shots in the appropriate boxes below. Delete any rows that are not applicable to your site

1920.TUSD.ELA.02.Q1Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups ▲	Students Tested		Avg. RS ▼	Avg. Percent Correct ▲	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	# ▼	% ▲			# ▲	% ▼	# ▲	% ▼
All Test Takers	25	100%	10.6	42.4%	9	36%	16	64%
Hispanic	19	76%	10.6	42.3%	7	36.8%	12	63.2%
African American	6	24%	10.7	42.7%	2	33.3%	4	66.7%

1920.TUSD.ELA.03.Q1Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups ▲	Students Tested		Avg. RS ▼	Avg. Percent Correct ▲	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	# ▼	% ▲			# ▲	% ▼	# ▲	% ▼
All Test Takers	37	100%	11.1	36.9%	12	32.4%	25	67.6%
Hispanic	24	64.9%	9.3	31.1%	5	20.8%	19	79.2%
African American	8	21.6%	12.3	40.8%	3	37.5%	5	62.5%
White	3	8.1%	20.3	67.8%	3	100%	0	0%
Multi Racial	1	2.7%	8	26.7%	0	0%	1	100%
Native American	1	2.7%	19	63.3%	1	100%	0	0%

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Magnet Program



1920.TUSD.ELA.04.Q1Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	31	100%	15.5	51.8%	15	48.4%	16	51.6%
Hispanic	18	58.1%	14.4	48.1%	8	44.4%	10	55.6%
African American	9	29%	18.1	60.4%	5	55.6%	4	44.4%
Multi Racial	2	6.5%	13.5	45%	1	50%	1	50%
White	2	6.5%	16	53.4%	1	50%	1	50%

1920.TUSD.ELA.05.Q1Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	30	100%	17.9	59.8%	12	40%	18	60%
Hispanic	18	60%	16.8	55.9%	5	27.8%	13	72.2%
African American	10	33.3%	20.5	68.3%	6	60%	4	40%
Native American	1	3.3%	11	36.7%	0	0%	1	100%
White	1	3.3%	20	66.7%	1	100%	0	0%



STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

ELA – Q2 ACHIEVEMENT GAP DATA

Are there any noteworthy differences or trends that you notice in comparing Benchmark achievement between ethnicities for ELA? What strategies or action steps are being employed to address these differences/trends (if applicable)?

Reflection:

- Holladay's second grade students had an average of 65 percent. Of the student population tested, 44 percent (36 percent for Q1) were proficient and 56 percent (64 percent for Q1) were not proficient. The White population scored above the average with 92 percent. The Hispanic and African American populations scored below the average with 63.6 percent and 64.8 percent, respectively. The Hispanic population had 47.4 percent (36.8 percent for Q1) proficient students. The African American population had 20 percent (33.3 percent for Q1) proficient students. The White population had 100 percent (No Data for Q1) proficient students.
- Holladay's third grade students had an average of 35.4 percent. Of the student population tested, 30.6 percent (32.4 percent for Q1) were proficient and 69.4 percent (67.6 percent for Q1) were not proficient. The White and Native American populations scored above the average with 57.8 percent and 73.3 percent, respectively. The Hispanic, African American, and Multi-racial populations scored below the average with 33.8 percent, 28.1 percent, and 20 percent, respectively. The Hispanic population had 25 percent (20.8 percent for Q1) proficient students. The African American population had 28.6 percent (37.5 percent for Q1) proficient students. The White population had 66.7 percent (100 percent for Q1) proficient students. The Multi-Racial population had 0 percent (0 percent for Q1) proficient students. The Native American population had 100 percent (100 percent for Q1) proficient students.
- Holladay's fourth grade students had an average of 54.6 percent. Of the student population tested, 41.2 percent (48.4 percent for Q1) were proficient and 58.8 percent (51.6 percent for Q1) were not proficient. The African American and White populations scored above the average with 64.1 percent and 56.7 percent, respectively. The Hispanic and Multi-Racial populations scored below the average with 50.5 percent and 53.4 percent, respectively. The Hispanic population had 33.3 percent (44.4 percent for Q1) proficient students. The African American population had 66.7 percent (55.6 percent for Q1) proficient students. The Multi-Racial population had 50 percent (50 percent for Q1) proficient students. The White population had 0 percent (50 percent for Q1) proficient students.
- Holladay's fifth grade students had an average of 49 percent. Of the student population tested, 20.7 percent (40 percent for Q1) were proficient and 79.3 percent (60 percent for Q1) were not proficient. The African American and White populations scored above the average with 58.9 percent and 53.3 percent, respectively. The Hispanic and Native American populations scored below the average with 44.8 percent and 30 percent, respectively. The Hispanic population had 16.7 percent (27.8 percent for Q1) proficient students. The African American population had 33.3 percent (60 percent for Q1) proficient students. The Native American population had 0 percent (0 percent for Q1) proficient students. The White population had 0 percent (100 percent for Q1) proficient students.

Strategies and action steps next page . . .

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report**STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT**

Magnet Program

**Strategies and action steps:**

- Classroom Teachers, Curriculum Service Provider (CSP), Instructional Data Intervention Specialist (IDIS), and the Multi-Tier System of Supports (MTSS) Facilitator will use Collaborative Teacher Teams (CTT) time to analyze and disaggregate student data to create/adjust intervention groups; examine and address check for understandings of exit tickets and Common Formative Assessments (CFAs); and create lesson plans to student needs. Teachers will conduct best equitable practices to meet the needs of student population groups – All Ethnic Groups, English Language Learners (ELL) students, and Exceptional Education students.
- Classroom Teachers will meet the needs of student populations that fall below the school average and/or fall into the not-proficient category: 2nd grade classes are to address the Hispanic and African American populations; 3rd grade classes are to address the Hispanic, African American, and Multi-racial populations; 4th grade classes are to address the Hispanic and Multi-Racial populations; and 5th grade classes are to address the Hispanic and Native American populations.
- 4th grade classes are to maintain consistent growth with all ethnic populations as they are all close to the school average, but classroom teachers are to address students who are not-proficient.
- Classroom Teachers will hold fidelity to Daily 5 during ELA time.
- Classroom Teachers will use CAFÉ strategies (Comprehension skills, Accuracy skills, Fluency skills, and Expanded vocabulary skills) from Daily 5.
- Classroom Teachers will conference with every student weekly. Tier 2 and 3 students will receive more conferencing and check-ins.
- On September 16, Holladay's 21st Century Community Learning Centers Grant (Extended Day) programs started. The program offers Math and English-Language Arts (ELA) tutoring and various enrichment programs. We aim to grow students in the academic tutoring hour Extended Day – especially in ELA academic tutoring for second, third, fourth, and fifth grade.

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Magnet Program



Insert screen shots in the appropriate boxes below. Delete any rows that are not applicable to your site

1920.TUSD.ELA.02.Q2Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	25	100%	16.2	65%	11	44%	14	56%
Hispanic	19	76%	15.9	63.6%	9	47.4%	10	52.6%
African American	5	20%	16.2	64.8%	1	20%	4	80%
White	1	4%	23	92%	1	100%	0	0%

1920.TUSD.ELA.03.Q2Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	36	100%	10.6	35.4%	11	30.6%	25	69.4%
Hispanic	24	66.7%	10.1	33.8%	6	25%	18	75%
African American	7	19.4%	8.4	28.1%	2	28.6%	5	71.4%
White	3	8.3%	17.3	57.8%	2	66.7%	1	33.3%
Multi Racial	1	2.8%	6	20%	0	0%	1	100%
Native American	1	2.8%	22	73.3%	1	100%	0	0%

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Magnet Program



1920.TUSD.ELA.04.Q2Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups ▲	Students Tested		Avg. RS ▼	Avg. Percent Correct ▼	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	# ▼	% ▼			# ▼	% ▼	# ▼	% ▼
All Test Takers	34	100%	16.4	54.6%	14	41.2%	20	58.8%
Hispanic	21	61.8%	15.1	50.5%	7	33.3%	14	66.7%
African American	9	26.5%	19.2	64.1%	6	66.7%	3	33.3%
Multi Racial	2	5.9%	16	53.4%	1	50%	1	50%
White	2	5.9%	17	56.7%	0	0%	2	100%

1920.TUSD.ELA.05.Q2Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups ▲	Students Tested		Avg. RS ▼	Avg. Percent Correct ▼	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	# ▼	% ▼			# ▼	% ▼	# ▼	% ▼
All Test Takers	29	100%	14.7	49%	6	20.7%	23	79.3%
Hispanic	18	62.1%	13.4	44.8%	3	16.7%	15	83.3%
African American	9	31%	17.7	58.9%	3	33.3%	6	66.7%
Native American	1	3.4%	9	30%	0	0%	1	100%
White	1	3.4%	16	53.3%	0	0%	1	100%



STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

ELA – Q3 ACHIEVEMENT GAP DATA

Are there any noteworthy differences or trends that you notice in comparing Benchmark achievement between ethnicities for ELA? What strategies or action steps are being employed to address these differences/trends (if applicable)?

Reflection:

- Holladay's second grade students had an average of 58.7 percent. Of the student population tested, 64 percent (36 percent for Q1 and 44 percent for Q2) were proficient and 36 percent (64 percent for Q1 and 56 percent for Q2) were not proficient. The Hispanic and White population scored above the average with 59.2 percent and 60 percent, respectively. The African American population scored below the average with 56.8 percent. The Hispanic population had 68.4 percent (36.8 percent for Q1 and 47.4 percent for Q2) proficient students. The African American population had 40 percent (33.3 percent for Q1 and 20 percent for Q2) proficient students. The White population had 100 percent (No Data for Q1 and 100 percent for Q2) proficient students.
- Holladay's third grade students had an average of 42.1 percent. Of the student population tested, 30.6 percent (32.4 percent for Q1 and 30.6 percent for Q2) were proficient and 69.4 percent (67.6 percent for Q1 and 69.4 percent for Q2) were not proficient. The African American, Native American, and White populations scored above the average with 42.4 percent, 70 percent, and 62.2 percent, respectively. The Hispanic and Multi-Racial populations scored below the average with 38.6 percent and 26.7 percent, respectively. The Hispanic population had 31.8 percent (20.8 percent for Q1 and 25 percent for Q2) proficient students. The African American population had 28.6 percent (37.5 percent for Q1 and 28.6 for Q2) proficient students. The White population had 66.7 percent (100 percent for Q1 and 66.7 percent for Q2) proficient students. The Multi-Racial population had 0 percent (0 percent for Q1 and 0 percent for Q2) proficient students. The Native American population had 100 percent (100 percent for Q1 and 100 percent for Q2) proficient students.
- Holladay's fourth grade students had an average of 46.5 percent. Of the student population tested, 39.4 percent (48.4 percent for Q1 and 41.2 percent for Q2) were proficient and 60.6 percent (51.6 percent for Q1 and 58.8 for Q2) were not proficient. The African American and Multi-Racial populations scored above the average with 57.8 percent and 46.7 percent, respectively. The Hispanic and White populations scored below the average with 41.7 percent and 43.3 percent, respectively. The Hispanic population had 25 percent (44.4 percent for Q1 and 33.3 percent in Q2) proficient students. The African American population had 66.7 percent (55.6 percent for Q1 and 66.7 percent for Q2) proficient students. The Multi-Racial population had 50 percent (50 percent for Q1 and 50 percent for Q2) proficient students. The White population had 0 percent (50 percent for Q1 and 0 percent for Q2) proficient students.
- Holladay's fifth grade students had an average of 49.8 percent. Of the student population tested, 31 percent (40 percent for Q1 and 20.7 percent for Q2) were proficient and 69 percent (60 percent for Q1 and 79.3 percent for Q2) were not proficient. The African American and White populations scored above the average with 56.3 percent and 63.3 percent, respectively. The Hispanic and Native American populations scored below the average with 46.8 percent and 40 percent, respectively. The Hispanic population had 23.3 percent (27.8 percent for Q1 and 16.7 percent) proficient students. The African American population had 37.5 percent (60 percent for Q1 and 33.3



STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

percent for Q2) proficient students. The Native American population had 0 percent (0 percent for Q1 and 0 percent for Q2) proficient students. The White population had 100 percent (100 percent for Q1 and 0 percent for Q2) proficient students.

Strategies and action steps:

- Classroom Teachers, Curriculum Service Provider (CSP), Instructional Data Intervention Specialist (IDIS), and the Multi-Tier System of Supports (MTSS) Facilitator will use Collaborative Teacher Teams (CTT) time to analyze and disaggregate student data to create/adjust intervention groups; examine and address check for understandings of exit tickets and Common Formative Assessments (CFAs); and create lesson plans to student needs. Teachers will conduct best equitable practices to meet the needs of student population groups – All Ethnic Groups, English Language Learners (ELL) students, and Exceptional Education students.
- Classroom Teachers will meet the needs of student populations that fall below the school average and/or fall into the not-proficient category: 2nd grade classes are to address the African American populations; 3rd grade classes are to address the Hispanic and Multi-racial populations; 4th grade classes are to address the Hispanic and White populations; and 5th grade classes are to address the Hispanic and Native American populations.
- 2nd grade classes are to maintain consistent growth with all ethnic populations as they are all close to the school average, but classroom teachers are to address students who are not-proficient.
- Classroom Teachers will hold fidelity to Daily 5 during ELA time.
- Classroom Teachers will use CAFÉ strategies (Comprehension skills, Accuracy skills, Fluency skills, and Expanded vocabulary skills) from Daily 5.
- Classroom Teachers will conference with every student weekly. Tier 2 and 3 students will receive more conferencing and check-ins.
- On September 16, Holladay's 21st Century Community Learning Centers Grant (Extended Day) programs started. The program offers Math and English-Language Arts (ELA) tutoring and various enrichment programs. We aim to grow students in the academic tutoring hour Extended Day – especially in ELA academic tutoring for second, third, fourth, and fifth grade.

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT



Insert screen shots in the appropriate boxes below. Delete any rows that are not applicable to your site

1920.TUSD.ELA.02.Q3Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups ▲	Students Tested		Avg. RS ⚡	Avg. Percent Correct ⚡	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	# ⚡	% ⚡			# ⚡	% ⚡	# ⚡	% ⚡
All Test Takers	25	100%	14.7	58.7%	16	64%	9	36%
African American	5	20%	14.2	56.8%	2	40%	3	60%
Hispanic	19	76%	14.8	59.2%	13	68.4%	6	31.6%
White	1	4%	15	60%	1	100%	0	0%

1920.TUSD.ELA.03.Q3Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups ▲	Students Tested		Avg. RS ⚡	Avg. Percent Correct ⚡	Avg. SS ⚡	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	# ⚡	% ⚡				# ⚡	% ⚡	# ⚡	% ⚡
All Test Takers	34	100%	12.6	42.1%	2499.8	12	35.3%	22	64.7%
African American	7	20.6%	12.7	42.4%	2501.1	2	28.6%	5	71.4%
Hispanic	22	64.7%	11.6	38.6%	2495.1	7	31.8%	15	68.2%
Multi Racial	1	2.9%	8	26.7%	2480	0	0%	1	100%
Native American	1	2.9%	21	70%	2537	1	100%	0	0%
White	3	8.8%	18.7	62.2%	2525.3	2	66.7%	1	33.3%

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Magnet Program



1920.TUSD.ELA.04.Q3Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups ▲	Students Tested		Avg. RS ▼	Avg. Percent Correct ▼	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	# ▼	% ▼			# ▼	% ▼	# ▼	% ▼
All Test Takers	33	100%	13.9	46.5%	13	39.4%	20	60.6%
African American	9	27.3%	17.3	57.8%	6	66.7%	3	33.3%
Hispanic	20	60.6%	12.5	41.7%	5	25%	15	75%
Multi Racial	2	6.1%	14	46.7%	1	50%	1	50%
White	2	6.1%	13	43.3%	1	50%	1	50%

1920.TUSD.ELA.05.Q3Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups ▲	Students Tested		Avg. RS ▼	Avg. Percent Correct ▼	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	# ▼	% ▼			# ▼	% ▼	# ▼	% ▼
All Test Takers	29	100%	14.9	49.8%	9	31%	20	69%
African American	8	27.6%	16.9	56.3%	3	37.5%	5	62.5%
Hispanic	19	65.5%	14.1	46.8%	5	26.3%	14	73.7%
Native American	1	3.4%	12	40%	0	0%	1	100%
White	1	3.4%	19	63.3%	1	100%	0	0%

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT



MATH – Q1 ACHIEVEMENT GAP DATA

Are there any noteworthy differences or trends that you notice in comparing Benchmark achievement between ethnicities for MATH? What strategies or action steps are being employed to address these differences/trends (if applicable)?

Reflection:

- Holladay's second grade students had an average of 53.1 percent. Of the student population tested, 64 percent were proficient and 36 percent were not proficient. The Hispanic population scored above the average with 55.8 percent. The African American population scored below the average with 44.7 percent. The Hispanic population had 68.4 percent proficient students. The African American population had 50 percent proficient students.
- Holladay's third grade students had an average of 52 percent. Of the student population tested, 62.2 percent were proficient and 37.8 percent were not proficient. The African American and White populations scored above the average with 55.9 percent and 71.1 percent, respectively. The Hispanic, Multi-Racial, and Native American populations scored below the average with 49.7 percent, 20 percent, and 50 percent, respectively. The Hispanic population had 62.5 percent proficient students. The African American population had 50 percent proficient students. The White population had 100 percent proficient students. The Multi-Racial population had 0 percent proficient students. The Native American population had 100 percent proficient students.
- Holladay's fourth grade students had an average of 57.7 percent. Of the student population tested, 54.8 percent were proficient and 46.2 percent were not proficient. The African American and White populations scored above the average with 69.3 percent and 65 percent, respectively. The Hispanic and Multi-Racial populations scored below the average with 52.2 percent and 48.3 percent, respectively. The Hispanic population had 55.6 percent proficient students. The African American population had 66.7 percent proficient students. The Multi-Racial population had 0 percent proficient students. The White population had 50 percent proficient students.
- Holladay's fifth grade students had an average of 57 percent. Of the student population tested, 60 percent were proficient and 40 percent were not proficient. The African American and White populations scored above the average with 64 percent and 70 percent, respectively. The Hispanic and Native American populations scored below the average with 53.5 percent and 36.7 percent, respectively. The Hispanic population had 61.1 percent proficient students. The African American population had 60 percent proficient students. The Native American population had 0 percent proficient students. The White population had 100 percent proficient students.

Strategies and action steps next page . . .

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report**STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT**

Magnet Program

**Strategies and action steps:**

- Classroom Teachers, Curriculum Service Provider (CSP), Instructional Data Intervention Specialist (IDIS), and Multi-Tier Systems of Support (MTSS) Facilitator, will use Collaborative Teacher Teams (CTT) time to analyze and disaggregate student data to create/adjust intervention groups; examine and address check for understandings of exit tickets and Common Formative Assessments (CFAs); and create lesson plans to student needs. Teachers will conduct best equitable practices to meet the needs of student population groups – All Ethnic Groups, English Language Learners (ELL) students, and Exceptional Education students.
- Principal, CSP, IDIS, and MTSS Facilitator will routinely do observation and reflection cycles for Math instructional time in K – 5 classrooms. Principal will assist with whisper coaching after observations complete. Areas of refinement will be addressed by Principal with whisper coaching or during weekly CTT time. Refinement trends will also serve as Professional Development topics on district PD Wednesday meetings.
- Holladay maintains an embedded math intervention time between 9:00 – 9:30 AM daily for all K – 5 classrooms for a total of 120 minutes per week. Classroom Teachers are assigned a staff member for math intervention time. Teachers will conduct re-teaching for students who fall below 80 percent from weekly CFAs.
- Math Pitfalls training on September 3 and 4. Math Pitfalls will be supplemental support used in math intervention time.
- Tier 2/3 math support push-ins instead of pull-out will be used to keep students in class to receive classroom Tier 1 instruction.
- Title 1/Magnet walk-through feedback: teachers to make use of whiteboards and manipulatives to support students with differentiated learning.
- Purposeful student collaborations: ex. Group of 4 students with one highly proficient (high), proficient (high-medium), partially proficient (medium-low), and minimally proficient (low).
- Math bootcamps as part of Holladay's interventions.



Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Insert screen shots in the appropriate boxes below. Delete any rows that are not applicable to your site

1920.TUSD.MATH.02.Q1Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups ▲	Students Tested		Avg. RS ⚡	Avg. Percent Correct ⚡	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	# ▼	% ⚡			# ⚡	% ⚡	# ⚡	% ⚡
All Test Takers	25	100%	13.3	53.1%	16	64%	9	36%
Hispanic	19	76%	13.9	55.8%	13	68.4%	6	31.6%
African American	6	24%	11.2	44.7%	3	50%	3	50%

1920.TUSD.MATH.03.Q1Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups ▲	Students Tested		Avg. RS ⚡	Avg. Percent Correct ⚡	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	# ▼	% ⚡			# ⚡	% ⚡	# ⚡	% ⚡
All Test Takers	37	100%	15.6	52%	23	62.2%	14	37.8%
Hispanic	24	64.9%	14.9	49.7%	15	62.5%	9	37.5%
African American	8	21.6%	16.8	55.9%	4	50%	4	50%
White	3	8.1%	21.3	71.1%	3	100%	0	0%
Multi Racial	1	2.7%	6	20%	0	0%	1	100%
Native American	1	2.7%	15	50%	1	100%	0	0%

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Magnet Program



1920.TUSD.MATH.04.Q1Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	31	100%	17.3	57.7%	17	54.8%	14	45.2%
Hispanic	18	58.1%	15.7	52.2%	10	55.6%	8	44.4%
African American	9	29%	20.8	69.3%	6	66.7%	3	33.3%
Multi Racial	2	6.5%	14.5	48.3%	0	0%	2	100%
White	2	6.5%	19.5	65%	1	50%	1	50%

1920.TUSD.MATH.05.Q1Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	30	100%	17.1	57%	18	60%	12	40%
Hispanic	18	60%	16.1	53.5%	11	61.1%	7	38.9%
African American	10	33.3%	19.2	64%	6	60%	4	40%
Native American	1	3.3%	11	36.7%	0	0%	1	100%
White	1	3.3%	21	70%	1	100%	0	0%



STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

MATH – Q2 ACHIEVEMENT GAP DATA

Are there any noteworthy differences or trends that you notice in comparing Benchmark achievement between ethnicities for MATH? What strategies or action steps are being employed to address these differences/trends (if applicable)?

Reflection:

- Holladay's second grade students had an average of 70.2 percent. Of the student population tested, 76 percent (64 percent for Q1) were proficient and 24 percent (36 percent for Q1) were not proficient. The Hispanic population scored above the average with 72.2 percent. The African American and White populations scored below the average with 63.2 percent and 68 percent, respectively. The Hispanic population had 78.9 percent (68.4 percent for Q1) proficient students. The African American population had 60 percent (50 percent for Q1) proficient students. The White population had 100 percent (No Data for Q1) proficient students.
- Holladay's third grade students had an average of 50.9 percent. Of the student population tested, 38.9 percent (62.2 percent for Q1) were proficient and 61.1 percent (37.8 percent for Q1) were not proficient. The African American, White, and Native American populations scored above the average with 51.9 percent, 80 percent, and 73.3 percent, respectively. The Hispanic and Multi-Racial populations scored below the average with 46.4 percent and 43.3 percent, respectively. The Hispanic population had 46.4 percent (62.5 percent for Q1) proficient students. The African American population had 42.9 percent (50 percent for Q1) proficient students. The White population had 100 percent (100 percent for Q1) proficient students. The Multi-Racial population had 0 percent (0 percent for Q1) proficient students. The Native American population had 100 percent (100 percent for Q1) proficient students.
- Holladay's fourth grade students had an average of 66 percent. Of the student population tested, 64.7 percent (54.8 percent of Q1) were proficient and 35.3 percent (46.2 percent for Q1) were not proficient. The African American and Multi-Racial populations scored above the average with 80.7 percent and 78.3 percent, respectively. The Hispanic and White populations scored below the average with 59.7 percent and 53.4 percent, respectively. The Hispanic population had 59.7 percent (55.6 percent for Q1) proficient students. The African American population had 88.9 percent (66.7 percent for Q1) proficient students. The Multi-Racial population had 100 percent (0 percent for Q1) proficient students. The White population had 0 percent (50 percent for Q1) proficient students.
- Holladay's fifth grade students had an average of 58.2 percent. Of the student population tested, 53.6 percent (60 percent for Q1) were proficient and 46.4 percent (40 percent for Q1) were not proficient. The African American, Native American, and White populations scored above the average with 72.1 percent, 70 percent, and 80 percent, respectively. The Hispanic population scored below the average with 50.2 percent, respectively. The Hispanic population had 44.4 percent (61.1 percent for Q1) proficient students. The African American population had 62.5 percent (60 percent for Q1) proficient students. The Native American population had 100 percent (0 percent for Q1) proficient students. The White population had 100 percent (100 percent for Q1) proficient students.

Strategies and action steps next page . . .

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report**STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT**

Magnet Program

**Strategies and action steps:**

- Classroom Teachers, Curriculum Service Provider (CSP), Instructional Data Intervention Specialist (IDIS), and Multi-Tier Systems of Support (MTSS) Facilitator, will use Collaborative Teacher Teams (CTT) time to analyze and disaggregate student data to create/adjust intervention groups; examine and address check for understandings of exit tickets and Common Formative Assessments (CFAs); and create lesson plans to student needs. Teachers will conduct best equitable practices to meet the needs of student population groups – All Ethnic Groups, English Language Learners (ELL) students, and Exceptional Education students.
- Principal, CSP, IDIS, and MTSS Facilitator will routinely do observation and reflection cycles for Math instructional time in K – 5 classrooms. Principal will assist with whisper coaching after observations complete. Areas of refinement will be addressed by Principal with whisper coaching or during weekly CTT time. Refinement trends will also serve as Professional Development topics on district PD Wednesday meetings.
- Holladay maintains an embedded math intervention time between 9:00 – 9:30 AM daily for all K – 5 classrooms for a total of 120 minutes per week. Classroom Teachers are assigned a staff member for math intervention time. Teachers will conduct re-teaching for students who fall below 80 percent from weekly CFAs.
- Math Pitfalls training on September 3 and 4. Math Pitfalls will be supplemental support used in math intervention time.
- Tier 2/3 math support push-ins instead of pull-out will be used to keep students in class to receive classroom Tier 1 instruction.
- Title 1/Magnet walk-through feedback: teachers to make use of whiteboards and manipulatives to support students with differentiated learning.
- Purposeful student collaborations: ex. Group of 4 students with one highly proficient (high), proficient (high-medium), partially proficient (medium-low), and minimally proficient (low).
- Math bootcamps as part of Holladay's interventions.

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT



Insert screen shots in the appropriate boxes below. Delete any rows that are not applicable to your site

1920.TUSD.MATH.02.Q2Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups ▲	Students Tested		Avg. RS ⚡	Avg. Percent Correct ⚡	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	# ▼	% ⚡			# ⚡	% ⚡	# ⚡	% ⚡
All Test Takers	25	100%	17.6	70.2%	19	76%	6	24%
Hispanic	19	76%	18.1	72.2%	15	78.9%	4	21.1%
African American	5	20%	15.8	63.2%	3	60%	2	40%
White	1	4%	17	68%	1	100%	0	0%

1920.TUSD.MATH.03.Q2Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups ▲	Students Tested		Avg. RS ⚡	Avg. Percent Correct ⚡	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	# ▼	% ⚡			# ⚡	% ⚡	# ⚡	% ⚡
All Test Takers	36	100%	15.3	50.9%	14	38.9%	22	61.1%
Hispanic	24	66.7%	13.9	46.4%	7	29.2%	17	70.8%
African American	7	19.4%	15.6	51.9%	3	42.9%	4	57.1%
White	3	8.3%	24	80%	3	100%	0	0%
Multi Racial	1	2.8%	13	43.3%	0	0%	1	100%
Native American	1	2.8%	22	73.3%	1	100%	0	0%

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Magnet Program



1920.TUSD.MATH.04.Q2Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	34	100%	19.8	66%	22	64.7%	12	35.3%
Hispanic	21	61.8%	17.9	59.7%	12	57.1%	9	42.9%
African American	9	26.5%	24.2	80.7%	8	88.9%	1	11.1%
Multi Racial	2	5.9%	23.5	78.3%	2	100%	0	0%
White	2	5.9%	16	53.4%	0	0%	2	100%

1920.TUSD.MATH.05.Q2Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	28	100%	17.5	58.2%	15	53.6%	13	46.4%
Hispanic	18	64.3%	15.1	50.2%	8	44.4%	10	55.6%
African American	8	28.6%	21.6	72.1%	5	62.5%	3	37.5%
Native American	1	3.6%	21	70%	1	100%	0	0%
White	1	3.6%	24	80%	1	100%	0	0%



STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

MATH – Q3 ACHIEVEMENT GAP DATA

Are there any noteworthy differences or trends that you notice in comparing Benchmark achievement between ethnicities for MATH? What strategies or action steps are being employed to address these differences/trends (if applicable)?

Reflection:

- Holladay's second grade students had an average of 74.6 percent. Of the student population tested, 88 percent (64 percent for Q1 and 76 percent for Q2) were proficient and 12 percent (36 percent for Q1 and 24 percent for Q2) were not proficient. The African American and White populations scored above the average with 75.2 percent and 76 percent, respectively. The Hispanic population scored below the average with 74.3 percent. The Hispanic population had 84.2 percent (68.4 percent for Q1 and 78.9) proficient students. The African American population had 100 percent (50 percent for Q1 and 60 percent for Q2) proficient students. The White population had 100 percent (No Data for Q1 and 100 percent for Q2) proficient students.
- Holladay's third grade students had an average of 52.2 percent. Of the student population tested, 50 percent (62.2 percent for Q1 and 38.9 percent for Q2) were proficient and 50 percent (37.8 percent for Q1 and 61.1 percent) were not proficient. The Native American and White populations scored above the average with 83.3 percent and 75.6 percent, respectively. The African American, Hispanic, and Multi-Racial populations scored below the average with 51.4 percent, 48.3 percent, and 40 percent, respectively. The Hispanic population had 45.5 percent (62.5 percent for Q1 and 46.4 percent for Q2) proficient students. The African American population had 42.9 percent (50 percent for Q1 and 42.9 percent for Q2) proficient students. The White population had 100 percent (100 percent for Q1 and 100 percent for Q2) proficient students. The Multi-Racial population had 0 percent (0 percent for Q1 and 0 percent for Q2) proficient students. The Native American population had 100 percent (100 percent for Q1 and 100 percent for Q2) proficient students.
- Holladay's fourth grade students had an average of 58.9 percent. Of the student population tested, 42.4 percent (54.8 percent of Q1 and 64.7 percent for Q2) were proficient and 57.6 percent (46.2 percent for Q1 and 35.3 percent for Q2) were not proficient. The African American and Multi-Racial populations scored above the average with 74.4 percent and 66.7 percent, respectively. The Hispanic and White populations scored below the average with 51.2 percent and 58.4 percent, respectively. The Hispanic population had 40 percent (55.6 percent for Q1 and 59.7 percent for Q2) proficient students. The African American population had 55.6 percent (66.7 percent for Q1 and 88.9 percent for Q2) proficient students. The Multi-Racial population had 50 percent (0 percent for Q1 and 100 percent for Q2) proficient students. The White population had 0 percent (50 percent for Q1 and 0 percent for Q2) proficient students.
- Holladay's fifth grade students had an average of 67.8 percent. Of the student population tested, 48.3 percent (60 percent for Q1 and 53.5 percent for Q2) were proficient and 51.7 percent (40 percent for Q1 and 46.4 percent for Q2) were not proficient. The African American population scored above the average with 76.3 percent. The Hispanic, Native American, and White populations scored below the average with 64.9 percent, 63.3 percent, and 60 percent, respectively. The Hispanic population had 47.4 percent (61.1 percent for Q1 and 44.4 percent for Q2) proficient students. The African American population had 62.5 percent (60 percent for Q1 and 62.5 percent for Q2)



STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

proficient students. The Native American population had 0 percent (0 percent for Q1 and 100 percent for Q2) proficient students. The White population had 0 percent (100 percent for Q1 and 100 percent for Q2) proficient students.

Strategies and action steps:

- Classroom Teachers, Curriculum Service Provider (CSP), Instructional Data Intervention Specialist (IDIS), and Multi-Tier Systems of Support (MTSS) Facilitator, will use Collaborative Teacher Teams (CTT) time to analyze and disaggregate student data to create/adjust intervention groups; examine and address check for understandings of exit tickets and Common Formative Assessments (CFAs); and create lesson plans to student needs. Teachers will conduct best equitable practices to meet the needs of student population groups – All Ethnic Groups, English Language Learners (ELL) students, and Exceptional Education students.
- Principal, CSP, IDIS, and MTSS Facilitator will routinely do observation and reflection cycles for Math instructional time in K – 5 classrooms. Principal will assist with whisper coaching after observations complete. Areas of refinement will be addressed by Principal with whisper coaching or during weekly CTT time. Refinement trends will also serve as Professional Development topics on district PD Wednesday meetings.
- Holladay maintains an embedded math intervention time between 9:00 – 9:30 AM daily for all K – 5 classrooms for a total of 120 minutes per week. Classroom Teachers are assigned a staff member for math intervention time. Teachers will conduct re-teaching for students who fall below 80 percent from weekly CFAs.
- Math Pitfalls training on September 3 and 4. Math Pitfalls will be supplemental support used in math intervention time.
- Tier 2/3 math support push-ins instead of pull-out will be used to keep students in class to receive classroom Tier 1 instruction.
- Title 1/Magnet walk-through feedback: teachers to make use of whiteboards and manipulatives to support students with differentiated learning.
- Purposeful student collaborations: ex. Group of 4 students with one highly proficient (high), proficient (high-medium), partially proficient (medium-low), and minimally proficient (low).
- Math bootcamps as part of Holladay's interventions.

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Magnet Program



Insert screen shots in the appropriate boxes below. Delete any rows that are not applicable to your site

1920.TUSD.MATH.02.Q3Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups ▲	Students Tested		Avg. RS ⬆	Avg. Percent Correct ⬆	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	# ⬆	% ⬆			# ⬆	% ⬆	# ⬆	% ⬆
All Test Takers	25	100%	18.6	74.6%	22	88%	3	12%
African American	5	20%	18.8	75.2%	5	100%	0	0%
Hispanic	19	76%	18.6	74.3%	16	84.2%	3	15.8%
White	1	4%	19	76%	1	100%	0	0%

1920.TUSD.MATH.03.Q3Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups ▲	Students Tested		Avg. RS ⬆	Avg. Percent Correct ⬆	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	# ⬆	% ⬆			# ⬆	% ⬆	# ⬆	% ⬆
All Test Takers	34	100%	15.6	52.2%	17	50%	17	50%
African American	7	20.6%	15.4	51.4%	3	42.9%	4	57.1%
Hispanic	22	64.7%	14.5	48.3%	10	45.5%	12	54.5%
Multi Racial	1	2.9%	12	40%	0	0%	1	100%
Native American	1	2.9%	25	83.3%	1	100%	0	0%
White	3	8.8%	22.7	75.6%	3	100%	0	0%

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Magnet Program



1920.TUSD.MATH.04.Q3Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups ▲	Students Tested		Avg. RS ⚡	Avg. Percent Correct ⚡	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	# ⚡	% ⚡			# ⚡	% ⚡	# ⚡	% ⚡
All Test Takers	33	100%	17.7	58.9%	14	42.4%	19	57.6%
African American	9	27.3%	22.3	74.4%	5	55.6%	4	44.4%
Hispanic	20	60.6%	15.4	51.2%	8	40%	12	60%
Multi Racial	2	6.1%	20	66.7%	1	50%	1	50%
White	2	6.1%	17.5	58.4%	0	0%	2	100%

1920.TUSD.MATH.05.Q3Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups ▲	Students Tested		Avg. RS ⚡	Avg. Percent Correct ⚡	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	# ⚡	% ⚡			# ⚡	% ⚡	# ⚡	% ⚡
All Test Takers	29	100%	20.3	67.8%	14	48.3%	15	51.7%
African American	8	27.6%	22.9	76.3%	5	62.5%	3	37.5%
Hispanic	19	65.5%	19.5	64.9%	9	47.4%	10	52.6%
Native American	1	3.4%	19	63.3%	0	0%	1	100%
White	1	3.4%	18	60%	0	0%	1	100%



STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Directions: Choose the top 5 attended intervention/enrichment classes at your school.

Before/after school INTERVENTION classes	Type of intervention offered (example: 6 th grade ELA tutoring)	How were students placed in program? (example: progress report grades, teacher recommendation)	Number of students who participated in program.
3 rd Grade ELA Tutoring	3 rd grade ELA Tutoring	Benchmark results / teacher recommendation	17
3 rd Grade Math Tutoring	3 rd Grade Math Tutoring	Benchmark results / teacher recommendation	17
4 th Grade ELA Tutoring	4 th Grade ELA Tutoring	Benchmark results / teacher recommendation	14
5 th Grade ELA Tutoring	5 th Grade ELA Tutoring	Benchmark results / teacher recommendation	17
Reading Intervention	K – 3 rd Grade Reading Intervention	NSGRA results / Benchmark results/ teacher recommendation	19
Total enrollment for above classes			84
Grand Total of ALL intervention classes			115

Before/after school ENRICHMENT classes	Type of enrichment offered (example: Robotics)	How were students placed in program? (example: progress report grades, teacher recommendation)	Number of students who participated in program.
Guitar	Music / Performing Arts	Student choice	12
Holladay Performers	Dance / Performing Arts	Student choice	18
STEM	Science and Technology	Student choice	16
Team Sport	Physical Activities	Student choice	20
Visual Arts K – 2	Mixed Media / Visual Arts	Student choice	12
Total enrollment for above classes			78
Grand Total of ALL enrichment classes (High Schools: Only include MAGNET themed enrichment classes)			115



Magnet – School Level Quarterly Report

2019-20

PROFESSIONAL LEARNING COMMUNITIES

Directions: Use the District rubric to rate a minimum of four of your PLCs.

COLLABORATIVE CULTURE			
Educators work together in collaborative teams to achieve student learning.			
Learning	Literal	Refined	Internalized
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team meets regularly (weekly/biweekly/monthly) during the school day. Team members attend for compliance purposes only; team members may be unprepared and/or disorganized. No evidence that school goals, collective commitments and team norms are followed. Team is unclear regarding PLC focus and processes. Team does not use the <i>Guiding Questions for the PLC Team Cycle of Inquiry</i> to frame PLC discussions. Team meets only when required on the district designated Wednesday PD for PLC times (Team Cycle of Inquiry is not followed). Team does not turn in <i>Agenda and Minutes</i> log or log does not reflect analysis of student learning or teacher practice and growth. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team develops written norms and establishes learning goals that clarify expectations and commitments. Team members arrive prepared & participate. Team adheres to school goals, collective commitments, and team norms. Team shows evidence that the focus of PLC is curriculum instruction. Team is inconsistent in its use of the <i>Guiding Questions</i> or engages only shallowly with this tool. Some individual team members meet at least twice per month to attempt Team Cycle of Inquiry. Team <i>Agenda and Minutes</i> logs reflect limited understanding of PLC process and/or limited rigor with regard to reflections about course content knowledge and effective teaching practice. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team focuses on prearranged topics that impact student learning and makes revisions to goals to improve team effectiveness. Team members are committed to the inquiry process and share openly. Team reflects on alignment of their work with school goals, collective commitments, and team norms. Team focuses PLC work on curriculum and instruction via cycles of collective inquiry. Team regularly frames PLC work with the use of the <i>Guiding Questions</i>. Most team members coordinate time each week to meet to maintain Team Cycle of Inquiry. Team <i>Agenda and Minutes</i> logs indicate that some members engage in reflection on their own instructional effectiveness as well as analysis of student learning outcomes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team honors their collective commitments to each other and their students in order to maximize learning. Team members push themselves and one another to grow and deepen in their practice. Team norms and site commitments are reviewed regularly and members actively use the existence of norms to address challenges in team dynamics as they arise. Team engages in robust exploration of curriculum content, instructional practice, and student learning via rigorous collaborative inquiry. Team ensures that the <i>Guiding Questions</i> always frame the discussion and thinking of PLC meetings; for many team members the <i>Guiding Questions</i> have become internalized habits of mind. Team takes initiative to coordinate with one another (and with site administration if needed) to ensure that all team members meet weekly to maximize the benefits of Team Cycle of Inquiry. Team <i>Agenda and Minutes</i> logs clearly show strong commitment to ensuring that all team members understand content standards and are rigorous in reflecting on their own needs for growth.

Quarter	Levels of Performance	Team A	Team B	Team C	Team D	Team E	Team F	Average
1	Learning = 1 Literal = 2 Refined = 3 Internalized = 4	4	3	3	3	4	4	3.5
2	Learning = 1 Literal = 2 Refined = 3 Internalized = 4	4	3	3	3	4	4	3.5
3	Learning = 1 Literal = 2 Refined = 3 Internalized = 4	4	3	4	4	4	4	3.83
4	Learning = 1 Literal = 2 Refined = 3 Internalized = 4							#DIV/0!



Magnet – School Level Quarterly Report

2019-20

PROFESSIONAL LEARNING COMMUNITIES

GUARANTEED CURRICULUM			
Educators establish what we want our students to learn.			
Learning	Literal	Refined	Internalized
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team uses district developed curriculum guide resources. Team does not identify an essential learning for the current inquiry cycle. Team does not discuss whether the essential learning is understood by team members at the level of task analysis. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team works together to define the essential learning and establish pacing. Team selects an essential learning for the current inquiry cycle but does not ensure that it is drawn directly from the District Curriculum. Team members engage in limited or inconsistent discussion regarding the sub-skills inherent in the essential learning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team builds shared knowledge of current content standards, unpacks high-stakes assessments to clarify essential learning, and adjusts instruction based on formative assessments. Team always draws its essential learning from the current scope and sequence in the District Curriculum. Team ensures that each team member is confident in their understanding of the sub-skills inherent in the essential learning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team continually refines essential learning and guarantees a viable instructional program for all students. Team ensures that the essential learning comes only from designated, highly-leveraged standards in the current scope and sequence in the District Curriculum. Team uses their collective understanding of the task analysis of the essential learning in order to increase the rigor and accuracy of Tier 1 differentiation, common formative assessments, and to develop/refine pacing guides.

Quarter	Levels of Performance	Team A	Team B	Team C	Team D	Team E	Team F	Average
1	Learning = 1 Literal = 2 Refined = 3 Internalized = 4	3	1	3	2	3	4	2.67
2	Learning = 1 Literal = 2 Refined = 3 Internalized = 4	3	2	4	3	3	4	3.67
3	Learning = 1 Literal = 2 Refined = 3 Internalized = 4	4	2	4	4	4	4	3.67
4	Learning = 1 Literal = 2 Refined = 3 Internalized = 4							#DIV/0!



Magnet – School Level Quarterly Report

2019-20

PROFESSIONAL LEARNING COMMUNITIES

COMMON ASSESSMENT			
Educators determine if each student has learned what we want them to learn.			
Learning	Literal	Refined	Internalized
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team uses benchmark assessments several times throughout the year. Team does not review or make reference to specific benchmark data that relates to the essential learning focus. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team analyzes student work and assessments and discusses common criteria. Some team members administer common assessment tools based on team discussions of common criteria. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team consistently applies common criteria to assess student work and discuss formative instructional practices. Team discusses common formative assessments at the Focus stage of the Inquiry Cycle; administers CFA in the Teach stage of the Inquiry Cycle; analyzes results together at the Assess stage of the Inquiry Cycle; and implements targeted re-teaching or enrichment based on collective data analysis in the Respond stage of the Inquiry Cycle. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team consistently utilizes formative instructional practices, including common assessments, to gather evidence of student learning. Team consistently uses assessment results to reflect on teacher's own strengths and areas for refinement as practitioners. Team consistently uses assessment results for the purpose of continually refining equitable access to curriculum for all learners.

Quarter	Levels of Performance	Team A	Team B	Team C	Team D	Team E	Team F	Average
1	Learning = 1 Literal = 2 Refined = 3 Internalized = 4	3	2	4	3	4	4	3.33
2	Learning = 1 Literal = 2 Refined = 3 Internalized = 4	3	2	4	3	4	4	3.33
3	Learning = 1 Literal = 2 Refined = 3 Internalized = 4	4	2	4	4	4	4	3.67
4	Learning = 1 Literal = 2 Refined = 3 Internalized = 4							#DIV/0!



Magnet – School Level Quarterly Report

2019-20

PROFESSIONAL LEARNING COMMUNITIES

ENSURING LEARNING			
Educators respond when some students have not learned it.			
Learning	Literal	Refined	Internalized
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team does not collectively discuss potential specific difficulties in student understanding of the essential learning. Team uses school/district classes, established “pull out” or afterschool programs, and curriculum resources when students are identified for intervention. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team usually waits until after Tier 1 instruction to determine appropriate response to students struggling to understand the essential learning. Team provides students with additional time and support that does not remove students from new direct instruction when they experience difficulty. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At the Focus stage of the Inquiry Cycle, team discusses in specific terms the demands of the essential learning, anticipates the needs of current students, and plans for differentiated groups in the course of Tier 1 instruction. Team develops and utilizes a timely, directive, and systemic plan for students when they experience difficulty. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team members analyze patterns in content challenges and student difficulties that are specific to current students in order to ensure equitable supports and access to curriculum. Team coordinates a flexible, supportive, and proactive system of intervention for students who experience difficulty.

Quarter	Levels of Performance	Team A	Team B	Team C	Team D	Team E	Team F	Average
1	Learning = 1 Literal = 2 Refined = 3 Internalized = 4	3	2	3	2	3	4	2.83
2	Learning = 1 Literal = 2 Refined = 3 Internalized = 4	3	2	3	2	3	4	2.83
3	Learning = 1 Literal = 2 Refined = 3 Internalized = 4	3	2	3	3	4	4	3.17
4	Learning = 1 Literal = 2 Refined = 3 Internalized = 4							#DIV/0!



Magnet – School Level Quarterly Report

2019-20

PROFESSIONAL LEARNING COMMUNITIES

ENRICHING LEARNING			
Educators extend and enrich the learning for students who have demonstrated mastery.			
Learning	Literal	Refined	Internalized
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team does not collectively discuss anticipated differences in the rates of student understanding of the essential learning. Team uses school/district classes, established “pull out” or afterschool programs, and curriculum resources for identified students. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team usually waits until after Tier 1 instruction to determine appropriate response to students who already understand the essential learning. Team provides students with additional time and support for enrichment during the school day for those who have moved beyond the essential learning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At the Focus stage of the Inquiry Cycle, team discusses in specific terms the demands of the essential learning, anticipates the needs of current students, and plans for differentiated groups in the course of Tier 1 instruction. Team develops and utilizes a timely, directive, and systemic plan for students who have moved beyond the essential learning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team members analyze patterns specific to current students in order to ensure opportunities to advance in the curriculum. Team coordinates a flexible, supportive, and proactive system of intervention for students who have moved beyond the essential learning.

Quarter	Levels of Performance	Team A	Team B	Team C	Team D	Team E	Team F	Average
1	Learning = 1 Literal = 2 Refined = 3 Internalized = 4	3	2	3	2	3	4	2.83
2	Learning = 1 Literal = 2 Refined = 3 Internalized = 4	4	2	3	2	3	4	3
3	Learning = 1 Literal = 2 Refined = 3 Internalized = 4	4	2	4	3	4	4	3.5
4	Learning = 1 Literal = 2 Refined = 3 Internalized = 4							#DIV/0!



Magnet – School Level Quarterly Report

2019-20

PROFESSIONAL LEARNING COMMUNITIES

PLCS: ANALYSIS OF NEEDS AND PROGRESS

PLC – Phases of Development

Component	Quarter 1 Average Phase of Development	Quarter 2 Average Phase of Development	Quarter 3 Average Phase of Development
Collaborative Culture	3.5	3.5	3.83
Guranteed Curriculum	2.67	3.67	3.67
Common Assessment	3.33	3.33	3.67
Ensuring Learning	2.83	2.83	3.17
Enriching Learning	2.83	3	3.5

PLC – Needs Analysis

What additional PLC resources, information, or PD activities would most benefit you in supporting the work of Professional Learning Communities at your site? List at least three. (Example: protocols for analyzing student data; protocols for analyzing student work; how to make an action plan; how to work collaboratively as a team, ideas for intervention/enrichment opportunities, etc. Name at least 3)

- 1. Ideas for interventions/enrichment opportunities**
- 2. Applying equitable practices**
- 3. Protocols for analyzing student data**

PLC – Planning Next Steps

Review the “Critical Focus Area: High Functioning Professional Learning Communities” and the accompanying “Critical Focus Area Action Steps” section of your school’s 2018-19 Magnet School Plan.

Reflect on the progress (if any) that has been made in achieving these action steps. Identify next steps.

Quarter 1

Reflection:

Classroom Teachers, Curriculum Service Provider (CSP), Instructional Data Intervention Specialist (IDIS), and Multi-Tier Systems of Support (MTSS) Facilitator, used Collaborative Teacher Teams (CTT) time to analyze and disaggregate student data to create/adjust intervention groups; examine and address check for understandings of exit tickets and Common Formative Assessments (CFAs); and create lesson plans to student needs. Teachers will conduct best equitable practices to meet the needs of student population groups – All Ethnic Groups, English Language Learners (ELL) students, and Exceptional Education students.

Classroom Teachers have areas of refinement with interventions and enrichment opportunities for differentiated instruction, applying equitable practices for differentiated instruction and interventions, and protocols for analyzing student data.

Next Steps:

Holladay will provide Professional Development (PD) for Collaborative Teacher Teams (CTT) on areas of refinement and best practices. Topics include:



Magnet – School Level Quarterly Report

2019-20

PROFESSIONAL LEARNING COMMUNITIES

	<p>Intervention/Enrichment Opportunities; Differentiated Instruction; Equitable Practices; and Protocols for Analyzing Student Data.</p>
<p>Quarter 2</p>	<p>Reflection: Classroom Teachers, Curriculum Service Provider (CSP), Instructional Data Intervention Specialist (IDIS), and Multi-Tier Systems of Support (MTSS) Facilitator, used Collaborative Teacher Teams (CTT) time to analyze and disaggregate student data to create/adjust intervention groups; examine and address check for understandings of exit tickets and Common Formative Assessments (CFAs); and create lesson plans to student needs. Teachers will conduct best equitable practices to meet the needs of student population groups – All Ethnic Groups, English Language Learners (ELL) students, and Exceptional Education students.</p> <p>Classroom Teachers have received Professional Developments (PD) on Protocols for Analyzing Student Data to disaggregate student data. This PD allows CTT time to address student needs, adjust classroom instruction, and plan for interventions. Disaggregating data showcases gaps and meet the needs of students – particularly ELL students, Exceptional Education Students, and specific ethnic groups. Protocols for analyzing student data will tie together with future PDs on Equitable Practices.</p> <p>Next Steps: Holladay will provide Professional Development (PD) for Collaborative Teacher Teams (CTT) on areas of refinement and best practices. Future PDs will include Equitable Practices.</p>
<p>Quarter 3/4</p>	<p>Classroom Teachers, Curriculum Service Provider (CSP), Instructional Data Intervention Specialist (IDIS), and Multi-Tier Systems of Support (MTSS) Facilitator, used Collaborative Teacher Teams (CTT) time to analyze and disaggregate student data to create/adjust intervention groups; examine and address check for understandings of exit tickets and Common Formative Assessments (CFAs); and create lesson plans to student needs. Teachers will conduct best equitable practices to meet the needs of student population groups – All Ethnic Groups, English Language Learners (ELL) students, and Exceptional Education students.</p> <p>Classroom Teachers have received Professional Developments (PD) on Protocols for Analyzing Student Data to disaggregate student data. This PD allows CTT time to address student needs, adjust classroom instruction, and plan for interventions. Disaggregating data showcases gaps and meet the needs of students – particularly ELL students, Exceptional Education Students, and specific ethnic groups. These practices have resulted in providing equitable practices for interventions and classroom instruction for Equity V. Equality PD. Classroom Teachers differentiate students to meet the needs of all their students.</p> <p>Next Steps:</p>



Magnet – School Level Quarterly Report

2019-20

PROFESSIONAL LEARNING COMMUNITIES

	<p>Holladay will continue best practices and meet the refinement areas from Collaborative Teacher Team (CTT) sessions for the 2020 – 2021 academic school year.</p>
<p>For 2020/21</p>	<p>Next Steps: Holladay Teachers and Supporting Staff will continue best practices for disaaggregating student data during Collaborative Teacher Teams (CTT) embedded time. Dissagregating student data will address gaps for reteaching classroom instruction and plan interventions accordingly.</p> <p>Holladay Teachers and Supporting Staff will conduct equitable practices to reach all students and meeting the needs of the whole child – especially important for All Ethnic Groups, English Language Learners (ELL) students, and Exceptional Education students.</p>



Magnet – School Level Quarterly Report

2019-20

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Directions: Each school is allocated opportunities for Site Focused PD for the 2019-20 school year. If additional opportunities for PD have been offered (such as Saturday PD), please add additional rows.

SITE SPECIFIC PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT			
Date	Title of PD	Focus of PD	Rationale
07/25	Embody Learning Pt. 1	Arts Enrichment, Tableaus, Graffiti Art	Classroom Teachers and supporting staff learning arts integration techniques to enrich classroom instruction.
07/26	Embody Learning Pt. 2	Arts Enrichment, Tableaus, Graffiti Art	Classroom Teachers and supporting staff learning arts integration techniques to enrich classroom instruction.
07/26	Focus 5 – Reading Portraits	Reading Art, Portraits, Images	Classroom Teachers and supporting staff learning arts integration techniques to enrich classroom instruction.
09/18	Theme Visibility	Enhancing Arts Magnet Theme Visibility	Showcasing arts integration from classroom instruction.
10/23	Embody Learning Pt. 3	Arts Enrichment, Tableaus, Graffiti Art	Classroom Teachers and supporting staff learning arts integration techniques to enrich classroom instruction.
10/30	Focus 5 – Analyzing Portraits	Analyzing, Portraits, Images	Classroom Teachers and supporting staff learning arts integration techniques to enrich classroom instruction.
<p>Summary/Reflection: Write a paragraph summarizing the professional development opportunities provided to staff during Quarter 1. During Quarter 2 and 3/4, update this paragraph as needed. During Quarter 3/4, include goals for 2020/21.</p> <p>See next page . . .</p>			



Magnet – School Level Quarterly Report

2019-20

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Quarter 1 Reflection:

Holladay began with a week of off contract paid Professional Development (PD) to familiarize Teachers and Supporting Staff with Tucson Unified School District's Curriculum 5.0 and Scope and Sequence resources. This time also included arts integration techniques and time to conduct Collaborative Teacher Teams (CTT). Our focus for the school year was not only to continue on visual and performing arts in their respective classes, clubs, and after school programs, but to truly integrate the arts magnet theme in classroom instruction at Holladay. Holladay is using Embody Learning to weave tableaux, graffiti art, and holding energy into classroom instruction. The PD was a success with more engaged classrooms instruction. Students communicate or represent information through tableaux, graffiti art, and holding energy. In our Reading Portraits PD by Focus Five, teachers learned to critically look at art, portraits, images, and picture books to use in the classroom. Students are analyzing, interpreting, and creating predictions based on the skills of examining pictures for facial expression, gesture, clothing, setting, and objects. As we have learned these valued skills to help teachers in the classroom, teachers are allowing students to fully use art forms in the classroom.

Quarter 2 Reflection:

Holladay continue to build off the summer and quarter 1 Professional Developments (PD). Teachers are making use of all the arts integration to weave into the classroom and curriculum. Embody Learning expanded on tableaux, graffiti art, and holding energy by "tapping in." "Tapping In" allows students to assess what their added part will contribute to tableaux, graffiti art, and holding energy. Focus Five expanded on reading art, portraits, and images by adding analysis into when making inferences.

Quarter 3/4 Reflection (and Goals for 2020/21):

Although no Professional Development (PD) from Embody Learning and Focus Five for arts magnet theme happened, check-ins on arts integration occurred.

For the 2020 – 2021 academic school year, Holladay will continue to use the arts integration knowledge from Embody Learning and Focus Five. Holladay plans to expand on those skills and refine skills as needed.

Magnet – School Level Quarterly Report**2019-20****FAMILY/COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT**

Magnet Program



FAMILY/COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT				
	Q1	Q2	Q3/Q4	Total
# Family/community events	6	2	3	
# Participants in family/community events	819	70	325	
Summary: List one example of parent/community engagement for each of Epstein's Six Types of Involvement below. Need more information? https://www.sps186.org/downloads/table/13040/6TypesJ.Epstien.pdf				
	Name of Activity	Brief Description		
Type 1: Parenting	Family Art Night	Workshops to understand arts integration on arts magnet theme		
Type 2: Communicating	Consistent Communication	Flyers, Facebook, Holladay Website, Class Dojo App, Phone Calls, Emails		
Type 3: Volunteering	Parent-Teacher Organization	Parents create events to keep school community involved		
Type 4: Learning at Home	Spanish Math Night	CSP offered tips on ways Spanish speaking families can support in math		
Type 5: Decision Making	Parent-Teacher Organization	Parents communicate family needs and wants with Holladay faculty		
Type 6: Collaborating with Community	Performances	Roni Capin Ashford-Rivera dual language author visit		
Reflection: Epstein's Six Types of Involvement has meant School Site Council, Family Engagement Team, Parent-Teacher Organization, and Professional Development sessions have been beneficial to meeting the needs of our stakeholders. Our role is important to bringing our arts magnet theme to the culture of the community. We are also extending invites for school events from the community to teach us as well.				

Magnet Program



MAGNET 2019-20

SCHOOL LEVEL Q3/4 REPORT

SCHOOL NAME: Mansfeld Magnet MS	MAGNET THEME(S): STEM
--	------------------------------

MAGNET LEADERSHIP TEAM MEMBERS	
NAME	TITLE
Seth Aleshire	Principal
Jacqueline Croteau	Magnet Coordinator
Maria Balaguer	8 th Grade Teacher
Lisa Bradford	Elective Teacher
Leticia Lozano	7 th Grade Teacher
	6 th Grade Teacher
Christine Georgelos	CSP
Patricia Vogel	Technology
Carol Moscone	Community Liaison

MAGNET LEADERSHIP/CERTIFICATION TEAM MEETINGS	
DATE	# MINUTES MET
October 23	60 minutes
November 6, 20	120 minutes
December 11	60 minutes
January 8	60
January 22	60

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Q3/4 Report**INTEGRATION**

Magnet Program



Recruitment: Record actions that taken this quarter to support your integration goal. Include tours, phone inquiries, mailings, school visits, other recruitment activities conducted by your site. Include District recruitment events and mailings that were specific to your magnet program. Insert additional lines as needed. Keep appropriate documentation (recruitment log) on site for review.

COMMUNICATION**Activity: Recruitment Mailings/Fliers**

(Record the # of school/district generated magnet mailings. Examples: 100 surveys to neighborhood parents, 500 open house postcards. Dropping off fliers at schools counts as mailings.)

Range	# Mailings/ Fliers	# of responses	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	0	0	Mansfeld did not have a Magnet Coordinator until Oct 28. Duties were picked up by CSP
Quarter 2	975	75	STEM fliers went home with students. 75 students and parents returned RSVP for the event. Gave out 25 information packets at various recruiting events. 4 parents followed up with phone call. One resulted in a tour. 7 students and parents attended STEM night (given information about STEM night at recruiting events.
Quarter 3/4	975	25	Stem Fliers went home with students. 15 students and parents returned RSVP for the event. Gave out 15 information packets to parents coming for school visit. 10 incoming 5 th graders and parents attended STEM night.
Totals	0	0	

Activity: Recruitment Related Phone Calls

Range	#	# Parent link (recruitment)	
Quarter 1	0	0	Mansfeld did not have a Magnet Coordinator until Oct 28. Duties were picked up by CSP.
Quarter 2	20		Phone calls directly to Magnet Coordinator relating to tour and shadow days
Quarter 3/4	30		Phone calls directly to Magnet Coordinator relating to tour and shadow days
Totals	0	0	

Activity: Retention Related Phone Calls

Range	#	# Parent Link (retention)	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	1579		Open House info & Important information

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Q3/4 Report**INTEGRATION**

Magnet Program



	1479		iPad Paperwork Coming Home Today
	1472		Notice of Boost starting date
	1476		Parent/Teacher conferences & iPad roll out information
Quarter 2	0		Did not complete any retention phone calls
Quarter 3/4	0		Did not complete any retention phone calls
Totals	6006		

Activity: Recruitment - Electronic Communication

Range	Outgoing e-mails	Incoming e-mails	Social media (i.e.: # posts)	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	0	0	0	Mansfeld did not have a Magnet Coordinator until Oct 28. Duties were picked up by CSP.
Quarter 2	15	15	0	Responded to emails requesting more information
Quarter 3/4	27	27	0	Responded to emails requesting more information
Totals	0	0	0	

Activity: Retention - Electronic Communication

Range	Outgoing e-mails	Incoming e-mails	Social media (i.e.: # posts)	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	0	0	0	Mansfeld did not have a Magnet Coordinator until Oct 28. Duties were picked up by CSP.
Quarter 2	0	0	0	Did not complete any retention electronic communication
Quarter 3/4		0	0	Did not complete any retention electronic communication
Totals	0	0	0	

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Q3/4 Report

INTEGRATION

Magnet Program



RECRUITMENT ACTIVITIES AND EVENTS				
-----------------------------------	--	--	--	--

Activity: On-Site Recruitment				
-------------------------------	--	--	--	--

(For example, open house, classes visiting from feeder schools, student shadowing)				
--	--	--	--	--

Range	Activity	# of participants	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.	
Quarter 1	None	0	Mansfeld did not have a Magnet Coordinator until Oct 28. Duties picked up by CSP.	
Quarter 2	Student & Parent Tours, STEM Night	180	We had 6 hands-on workshops with each hosting a room combination of 30 students and parents participating. Our Keynote Speaker was new to our STEM Night as well as a presenter. Despite rainy weather, we had a great turnout of vendors, presenters, students and parents. Participants completed evaluations for each presenter. Each workshop received a top score of 5.	
Quarter 3/4	Student & Parent Tours, STEM Night	165	We had 6 hands-on workshops with each hosting a room combination of 30 students and parents participating. Our Keynote Speaker was new to our STEM Night, as well as, 3 presenters. PTSO helped us celebrate 90 years by bringing cookies and cupcakes to STEM Night. Participants completed evaluations for each presenter. Each workshop received a top score of 5.	
Totals	0	0		

Activity: Off-Site Recruitment				
--------------------------------	--	--	--	--

(For example, school visits, brochures left at a business or school, fliers posted at community centers. Do not include District recruitment events)				
--	--	--	--	--

Range	Activity	# Brochures/ rack cards distributed	# of responses	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	0	0	0	Mansfeld did not have a Magnet Coordinator until Oct 28. Duties picked up by CSP.
Quarter 2	2 District Sponsored recruitment events (Catalina High & Children's museum 2 school site (Fruchtendler, Tully) presentation	5	1	Greater parent & child attendance for outside Mansfeld feeder pattern at District Sponsored event. Only one site visit (Fruchtendler) resulted in 3 student tours coming from outside feeder pattern. 4 parents who were at recruitment nights scheduled a tour. 6 parents brought their families to our STEM Night.

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Q3/4 Report

INTEGRATION

Magnet Program



Quarter 3/4	Children’s Museum Saturday event	75	2	This event did not draw a lot of people interested in school. They took brochures because I gave them to them when they took a pen.
Totals	0	0	0	

Activity: Tours
 (Record the number of potential applicants. For example, if one parent comes for a tour with two potential student applicants, count the number as 2. Include shadowing.)

Range	# Students	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	0	Mansfeld did not have a Magnet Coordinator until Oct 28. Duties picked up by CSP.
Quarter 2	10	We gave tours to 10 students and parents this quarter. We did not host shadow days this quarter. Magnet Coordinator will be working with counselors during 5 th grade move-up days. We are scheduling parents from the lottery and feeder schools that are not hosting a move-up day to attend on the date we host an elementary school’s 5 th grade. Mansfeld had so Many parents requesting shadow days that our teachers were getting overwhelmed and it is a scheduling nightmare for the coordinator to accommodate the requests.
Quarter 3/4	17	We gave tours to 17 students and parents this quarter. These were students who have been accepted. 2 stu8dents I recruited at the first Children’s Museum, event enrolled and were accepted through the lottery. We did not host shadow days this quarter. Magnet Coordinator was present with counselors during 5 th grade move-up days.
Totals		

Retention: Access the Synergy report “U-STU-2: Daily Enrollment by Student Demographics.” ENTRY GRADE / ALL GRADES

STUDENT RETENTION

Are there any noteworthy differences or trends that you notice when analyzing this data? White pop + .3%, African Am +10% , Hispanic -.5, Native AM +.6%, Asian AM –3%, Multi Rac -.7%

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Q3/4 Report

INTEGRATION

Magnet Program



Daily Enrollment by Grade, Gender and USP Ethnicity

520 - Mansfeld Magnet Middle School

On: 09/26/2019 (Day 40 SY 2019-20)

Grade	White/Anglo		African American		Hispanic		Native American		Asian American		Multi-racial		Total		
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	Total
06	19	24	16	12	96	119	1	5	3	2	7	8	142	170	312
	6.1%	7.7%	5.1%	3.8%	30.8%	38.1%	0.3%	1.6%	1.0%	0.6%	2.2%	2.6%	45.5%	54.5%	
07	19	25	12	12	107	130	3	4	2	2	2	6	145	179	324
	5.9%	7.7%	3.7%	3.7%	33.0%	40.1%	0.9%	1.2%	0.6%	0.6%	1.9%	1.9%	44.8%	55.2%	
08	32	29	12	18	117	114	3	8	6	1	6	6	176	176	352
	9.1%	8.2%	3.4%	5.1%	33.2%	32.4%	0.9%	2.3%	1.7%	0.3%	1.7%	1.7%	50.0%	50.0%	
Total	70	78	40	42	320	363	7	17	11	5	15	20	463	525	988
	7.1%	7.9%	4.0%	4.3%	32.4%	36.7%	0.7%	1.7%	1.1%	0.5%	1.5%	2.0%	46.9%	53.1%	
	148		82		603		24		16		35		988		
	15.0%		8.3%		69.1%		2.4%		1.6%		3.5%		100.0%		

Daily Enrollment by Grade, Gender and USP Ethnicity

520 - Mansfeld Magnet Middle School

On: 09/27/2018 (Day 40 SY 2018-19)

Grade	White/Anglo		African American		Hispanic		Native American		Asian American		Multi-racial		Total		
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	Total
06	19	25	15	13	114	130	1	6	3	1	3	5	155	180	335
	5.7%	7.5%	4.5%	3.9%	34.0%	38.8%	0.3%	1.8%	0.9%	0.3%	0.9%	1.5%	46.3%	53.7%	
07	35	36	18	21	116	117	4	9	6	2	4	6	183	191	374
	9.4%	9.6%	4.8%	5.6%	31.0%	31.3%	1.1%	2.4%	1.6%	0.5%	1.1%	1.6%	48.9%	51.1%	
08	18	23	14	13	118	104	5	6	1	0	6	4	162	150	312
	5.8%	7.4%	4.5%	4.2%	37.8%	33.3%	1.6%	1.9%	0.3%	0.0%	1.9%	1.3%	51.9%	48.1%	
Total	72	84	47	47	348	351	10	21	10	3	13	15	500	521	1021
	7.1%	8.2%	4.6%	4.6%	34.1%	34.4%	1.0%	2.1%	1.0%	0.3%	1.3%	1.5%	49.0%	51.0%	
	156		94		699		31		13		28		1021		
	15.3%		9.2%		68.5%		3.0%		1.3%		2.7%		100.0%		

Theme Visibility:

THEME VISIBILITY

Review the components found in the table below. Shade the box for each quarter for components that are strengths for your site in **green**. In the non-shaded boxes, identify what steps will be taken to ensure that this is addressed. Goal: Increase theme visibility from Q1 to Q4.

Component	Q1	Q2	Q3/Q4	Goal for 2019/20
Current magnet theme is evident on exterior of building/grounds.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Add STEM flags to all flag poles around the building
Magnet school name is given in phone greeting.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Continue to use the current greeting
Magnet theme is evident in main office.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Add new posters with new awards
Magnet theme is evident in common areas.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Add more posters

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Q3/4 Report

INTEGRATION




Magnet theme is evident in hallways/display areas in posted student work	Yes	Yes	Yes	Need to create replicable documents for teachers to post STEM Principals. Haphazardly doOne now
Magnet theme is noted in school communications/media.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Continue what we are currently doing
Teachers have specific areas of the campus and facility for magnet activities/lessons/presentations	Yes	Yes	Yes	Continue what we are currently doing
Magnet theme is incorporated into the school's mission/vision statement.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Continue what we are currently doing
Evidence of family/community engagement/partnerships.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Need to work on this and create a stronger presence



Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Q3/4 Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Directions: Use SchoolCity to access Report “**Summary**” data for each of the grade levels tested during Benchmark 1. Use the  Snipping Tool to take a screen shot of each grade level for Math and ELA, then fill out the Reflection box. Make sure to capture both Tucson Unified average scores and your school’s average scores for each grade level and subject area. Please delete any non-applicable grades from the table.

ELA – Q1 BENCHMARK










Are there any noteworthy differences or trends that you notice in comparing Benchmark achievement between your school and the District for ELA? What strategies or action steps are being employed to address these differences/trends (if applicable)?

Reflection: Mansfeld scored above the district in all three grade levels. Implementation of Verizon iPads will be used to incorporate STEM strategies into lessons to create technology- rich and engaging lessons. Encourage students to attend Boost homework help. Make greater use UArizona students for tutoring. iPad will be used to create more frequent formative assessments that will guide instruction.

ELA – Q1 Benchmark Data

Insert screen shots in the appropriate boxes below. Delete any rows that are not applicable to your site

1920.TUSD.ELA.06.Q1Benchmark

By Grade ▲	# Tested ▲	Participation Rate ▲	Avg. RS ▲	Avg. % Correct ▲	Avg. TS ▲	Proficient			Not Proficient		
						# ▲	% ▲	Avg. TS ▲	# ▲	% ▲	Avg. TS ▲
Tucson Unified School District	3005	87.2%	11.8	39.2% 	58:28	1273	42.4% 	59:48	1732	57.6% 	57:29
MANSFELD	329	95.6%	12.8	42.6% 	85:28	157	47.7% 	83:27	172	52.3% 	87:19
Grade 6	329	9.7%	12.8	42.6% 	85:28	157	47.7% 	83:27	172	52.3% 	87:19

1920.TUSD.ELA.07.Q1Benchmark

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Q3/4 Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT



By Grade ▲	# Tested ▲	Participation Rate ▲	Avg. RS ▲	Avg. % Correct ▲	Avg. TS ▲	Proficient			Not Proficient		
						# ▲	% ▲	Avg. TS ▲	# ▲	% ▲	Avg. TS ▲
Tucson Unified School District	3052	86.3%	16.1	53.7% ■	42:02	1220	40% ■	41:52	1832	60% ■	42:09
MANSFELD	324	93.4%	17.7	58.9% ■	56:58	160	49.4% ■	54:22	164	50.6% ■	59:30
Grade 7	324	9.3%	17.7	58.9% ■	56:58	160	49.4% ■	54:22	164	50.6% ■	59:30

1920.TUSD.ELA.08.Q1Benchmark

By Grade ▲	# Tested ▲	Participation Rate ▲	Avg. RS ▲	Avg. % Correct ▲	Avg. TS ▲	Proficient			Not Proficient		
						# ▲	% ▲	Avg. TS ▲	# ▲	% ▲	Avg. TS ▲
Tucson Unified School District	2913	85.5%	13.6	45.5% ■	49:24	1293	44.4% ■	49:09	1620	55.6% ■	49:36
MANSFELD	344	94.0%	14.9	49.8% ■	64:39	186	54.1% ■	62:53	158	45.9% ■	66:42
Grade 8	344	10.1%	14.9	49.8% ■	64:39	186	54.1% ■	62:53	158	45.9% ■	66:42

ELA – Q2 BENCHMARK

Are there any noteworthy differences or trends that you notice in comparing Benchmark achievement between your school and the District for ELA? What strategies or action steps are being employed to address these differences/trends (if applicable)? Have these differences changed from the previous benchmark?

Reflection: 6th grade ELA saw a 6.2% Drop difference between Q1 47.7% and Q2 41.5% scores. Dr. Aleshire has required ELA teachers to complete a data analysis on each of the classes as well as coming up with intervention plans. He meets with them weekly to go over their efforts with the all grade levels. Our CSP is also working one-on-one with teachers and lessons. 7th grade also showed a small percentage drop Q1 49.4% to Q 24.7%

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Q3/4 Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT



8th grade saw a similar drop Q1 51.4% to Q2 47.9%. As a result of the drop in these scores all ELA teachers are working on developing and implementing intervention strategies. All 3 grade level scores for Proficiency were still higher than the districts average.

ELA – Q2 Benchmark Data

Insert screen shots in the appropriate boxes below. Delete any rows that are not applicable to your site

1920.TUSD.ELA.06.Q2Benchmark

By Grade ▲	# Tested ⚡	Participation Rate ⚡	Avg. RS ⚡	Avg. % Correct ⚡	Proficient		Not Proficient	
					# ⚡	% ⚡	# ⚡	% ⚡
Tucson Unified School District	2869	83.1%	12.9	43%	1059	36.9%	1810	63.1%
MANSFELD	299	86.7%	13.6	45.2%	124	41.5%	175	58.5%
Grade 6	299	8.8%	13.6	45.2%	124	41.5%	175	58.5%

1920.TUSD.ELA.07.Q2Benchmark

By Grade ▲	# Tested ⚡	Participation Rate ⚡	Avg. RS ⚡	Avg. % Correct ⚡	Proficient		Not Proficient	
					# ⚡	% ⚡	# ⚡	% ⚡
Tucson Unified School District	2955	83.2%	15.1	50.4%	1305	44.2%	1650	55.8%
MANSFELD	309	88.8%	16.7	55.6%	176	57%	133	43%
Grade 7	309	8.8%	16.7	55.6%	176	57%	133	43%

1920.TUSD.ELA.08.Q2Benchmark

By Grade ▲	# Tested ⚡	Participation Rate ⚡	Avg. RS ⚡	Avg. % Correct ⚡	Proficient		Not Proficient	
					# ⚡	% ⚡	# ⚡	% ⚡
Tucson Unified School District	2870	82.6%	14.8	49.3%	1150	40.1%	1720	59.9%
MANSFELD	330	89.9%	15.9	53.1%	158	47.9%	172	52.1%
Filtered Students Average	330	89.9%	15.9	53.1%	158	47.9%	172	52.1%
Grade 7	2	11.8%	10	33.3%	0	0%	2	100%
Grade 8	330	9.6%	15.9	53.1%	158	47.9%	172	52.1%

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Q3/4 Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT



ELA – Q3 BENCHMARK

Are there any noteworthy differences or trends that you notice in comparing Benchmark achievement between your school and the District for ELA? What strategies or action steps are being employed to address these differences/trends (if applicable)? Have these differences changed from the previous benchmarks?

Reflection: 6th grade ELA saw a 2.4% (43.9% Increase between Q2 41.5% but not enough of a gain to equal Q1 scores (47.7%.) Dr. Aleshire continues requiring ELA teachers to complete a data analysis on each of the classes as well as coming up with intervention plans. He meets with them weekly to go over their efforts in his weekly Admin meetings with all teachers. 7th grade Q3 shows a drop of 2.6% (54.2%) drop from Q2 (57.0%) but 7th grade still had an overall improvement in growth for the year of 4.8%. 8th grade continued to drop from Q1 51.4% and Q2 47.9%. scores to an overall drop in proficiency of 7.6% 8th grade teachers should dig into the last benchmark scores and determine where there were gaps in this year’s 8th grade instruction and adjust instruction to close the gaps. All 3 grade level scores for Proficiency were higher than the district’s averages.

ELA – Q3 Benchmark Data

Insert screen shots in the appropriate boxes below. Delete any rows that are not applicable to your site

1920.TUSD.ELA.06.Q3Benchmark

By Grade	# Tested	Participation Rate	Avg. RS	Avg. % Correct	Avg. TS	Proficient			Not Proficient		
						#	%	Avg. TS	#	%	Avg. TS
Tucson Unified School District	2915	82.0%	14.6	48.7%	62:16	1178	40.4%	65:47	1737	59.6%	59:53
MANSFELD	321	89.4%	15.5	51.8%	85:35	141	43.9%	81:46	180	56.1%	88:35
Grade 6	321	9.2%	15.5	51.8%	85:35	141	43.9%	81:46	180	56.1%	88:35

1920.TUSD.ELA.07.Q3Benchmark

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Q3/4 Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Magnet Program



By Grade	# Tested	Participation Rate	Avg. RS	Avg. % Correct	Avg. TS	Proficient			Not Proficient		
						#	%	Avg. TS	#	%	Avg. TS
Tucson Unified School District	3013	80.3%	12.9	43.1%	54:35	1283	42.6%	54:50	1730	57.4%	54:25
MANSFELD	319	90.6%	14.6	48.6%	69:40	173	54.2%	69:37	146	45.8%	69:45
Grade 7	319	8.8%	14.6	48.6%	69:40	173	54.2%	69:37	146	45.8%	69:45

1920.TUSD.ELA.08.Q3Benchmark

By Grade	# Tested	Participation Rate	Avg. RS	Avg. % Correct	Avg. TS	Proficient			Not Proficient		
						#	%	Avg. TS	#	%	Avg. TS
Tucson Unified School District	2898	80.8%	16.3	54.2%	58:22	1031	35.6%	58:03	1867	64.4%	58:33
MANSFELD	338	88.9%	17.9	59.6%	78:59	157	46.4%	74:26	181	53.6%	82:55
Grade 7	2	9.1%	14.5	48.4%	63:49	0	0%	-	2	100%	63:49
Grade 8	338	9.6%	17.9	59.6%	78:59	157	46.4%	74:26	181	53.6%	82:55

MATH – Q1 BENCHMARK

Are there any noteworthy differences or trends that you notice in comparing Benchmark achievement between your school and the District for Math? What strategies or action steps are being employed to address these differences/trends (if applicable)?

Reflection: The Q1 benchmarks removed the accelerated students in 6th and 7th and had them take the benchmarks separately. The scores are entered below. Mansfeld scored pretty much on point with the district scores. Implementation of Verizon iPads will be used to incorporate STEM strategies into lessons to create technology- rich and engaging lessons. Encourage students to attend Boost homework help. Make greater use of UArizona students for tutoring. iPad will be used to create more frequent formative assessments that will guide instruction.

MATH – Q1 Benchmark Data

Insert screen shots in the appropriate boxes below. Delete any rows that are not applicable to your site

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Q3/4 Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT



1920.TUSD. Math.06.Q1Benchmark													
By Grade ▲	# Tested ⚡	Participation Rate ⚡	Avg. RS ⚡	Avg. % Correct ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡	Proficient			Not Proficient				
						# ⚡	% ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡	# ⚡	% ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡		
Tucson Unified School District	2702	78.4%	14.3	47.7% ■	60:53	1207	44.7% ■	63:23	1495	55.3% ■	58:52		
MANSFELD	243	70.6%	14.2	47.4% ■	86:53	102	42% ■	88:52	141	58% ■	85:26		
Grade 6	243	7.1%	14.2	47.4% ■	86:53	102	42% ■	88:52	141	58% ■	85:26		
Accelerated Scores													
By Grade ▲	# Tested ⚡	Participation Rate ⚡	Avg. RS ⚡	Avg. % Correct ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡	Proficient			Not Proficient				
						# ⚡	% ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡	# ⚡	% ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡		
Tucson Unified School District	338	53.5%	16.8	56% ■	73:57	145	42.9% ■	69:27	193	57.1% ■	77:19		
MANSFELD	84	89.4%	20.2	67.3% ■	78:28	56	66.7% ■	80:01	28	33.3% ■	75:23		
Grade 6	84	13.5%	20.2	67.3% ■	78:28	56	66.7% ■	80:01	28	33.3% ■	75:23		
1920.TUSD.Math.07.Q1Benchmark													
By Grade ▲	# Tested ⚡	Participation Rate ⚡	Avg. RS ⚡	Avg. % Correct ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡	Proficient			Not Proficient				
						# ⚡	% ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡	# ⚡	% ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡		
Tucson Unified School District	2712	76.4%	9	29.9% ■	61:55	1167	43% ■	70:02	1545	57% ■	55:48		
MANSFELD	239	68.7%	8.9	29.5% ■	87:26	112	46.9% ■	92:49	127	53.1% ■	82:41		
Grade 7	239	6.8%	8.9	29.5% ■	87:26	112	46.9% ■	92:49	127	53.1% ■	82:41		
Accelerated Students													

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Q3/4 Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT



By Grade	# Tested	Participation Rate	Avg. RS	Avg. % Correct	Avg. TS	Proficient			Not Proficient		
						#	%	Avg. TS	#	%	Avg. TS
Tucson Unified School District	369	22.7%	13.4	44.5%	89:13	143	38.8%	95:13	226	61.2%	85:25
MANSFELD	93	9.2%	16.5	54.9%	89:32	58	62.4%	93:03	35	37.6%	83:44
Grade 7	93	9.9%	16.5	54.9%	89:32	58	62.4%	93:03	35	37.6%	83:44

1819.TUSD.Math.08.Q1Benchmark

By Grade	# Tested	Participation Rate	Avg. RS	Avg. % Correct	Avg. TS	Proficient			Not Proficient		
						#	%	Avg. TS	#	%	Avg. TS
Tucson Unified School District	2831	81.1%	12.2	40.7%	56:27	1150	40.6%	63:41	1681	59.4%	51:29
MANSFELD	342	93.2%	14.1	46.9%	71:48	184	53.8%	75:51	158	46.2%	67:06
Grade 8	221	8.4%	12	39.9%	73:07	93	42.1%	79:41	128	57.9%	68:21

1920.TUSD.Algebra.HS.Q1Benchmark

Students did not take this benchmark assessment in Q1

MATH – Q2 BENCHMARK

Are there any noteworthy differences or trends that you notice in comparing Benchmark achievement between your school and the District for Math? What strategies or action steps are being employed to address these differences/trends (if applicable)? Have these differences changed from the previous benchmark?

Reflection: 6th grade Math finished Q2 .8% (42.8%) above Q1 (40%) and above TUSD at 40.8%. Mansfeld’s advance Math students in Q2 scored 66.7% compared to TUSD at 42.9%. 7th grade Math so no change at 46.9% for both Q1 and Q2. TUSD also remained at 43% for both Quarters. 8th grade Math saw minimal growth at .1% (53.8-53.9%) in comparison to TUSD Q2 score of 41.63%.

1920.TUSD.Math.06.Q2Benchmark

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Q3/4 Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Magnet Program



By Grade ▲	# Tested ▲	Participation Rate ▲	Avg. RS ▲	Avg. % Correct ▲	Avg. TS ▲	Proficient			Not Proficient		
						# ▲	% ▲	Avg. TS ▲	# ▲	% ▲	Avg. TS ▲
Tucson Unified School District	2710	73.6%	14.8	49.5% ■	59:38	1105	40.8% ■	59:47	1605	59.2% ■	59:32
MANSFELD	236	67.0%	15	50% ■	80:11	101	42.8% ■	82:06	135	57.2% ■	78:45
Grade 6	236	6.9%	15	50% ■	80:11	101	42.8% ■	82:06	135	57.2% ■	78:45

By Grade ▲	# Tested ▲	Participation Rate ▲	Avg. RS ▲	Avg. % Correct ▲	Avg. TS ▲	Proficient			Not Proficient		
						# ▲	% ▲	Avg. TS ▲	# ▲	% ▲	Avg. TS ▲
Tucson Unified School District	338	50.3%	16.8	56% ■	73:57	145	42.9% ■	69:27	193	57.1% ■	77:19
MANSFELD	84	81.6%	20.2	67.3% ■	78:28	56	66.7% ■	80:01	28	33.3% ■	75:23
Grade 6	84	12.7%	20.2	67.3% ■	78:28	56	66.7% ■	80:01	28	33.3% ■	75:23

1920.TUSD.Math.07.Q2Benchmark

By Grade ▲	# Tested ▲	Participation Rate ▲	Avg. RS ▲	Avg. % Correct ▲	Avg. TS ▲	Proficient			Not Proficient		
						# ▲	% ▲	Avg. TS ▲	# ▲	% ▲	Avg. TS ▲
Tucson Unified School District	2712	74.1%	9	29.9% ■	61:55	1167	43% ■	70:02	1545	57% ■	55:48
MANSFELD	239	67.3%	8.9	29.5% ■	87:26	112	46.9% ■	92:49	127	53.1% ■	82:41
Filtered Students Average	239	68.5%	8.9	29.5% ■	87:26	112	46.9% ■	92:49	127	53.1% ■	82:41
Grade 7	239	7.2%	8.9	29.5% ■	87:26	112	46.9% ■	92:49	127	53.1% ■	82:41

1819.TUSD.Math.08.Q2Benchmark

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Q3/4 Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT



By Grade ▲	# Tested ⚡	Participation Rate ⚡	Avg. RS ⚡	Avg. % Correct ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡	Proficient			Not Proficient		
						# ⚡	% ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡	# ⚡	% ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡
Tucson Unified School District	2831	73.6%	11.7	39% ■	61:42	1170	41.3% ■	67:33	1661	58.7% ■	57:35
MANSFELD	343	92.0%	13.4	44.6% ■	70:37	185	53.9% ■	74:02	158	46.1% ■	66:36
Grade 7	2	0.8%	10	33.4% ■	52:23	1	50% ■	69:24	1	50% ■	35:23
Grade 8	343	10.0%	13.4	44.6% ■	70:37	185	53.9% ■	74:02	158	46.1% ■	66:36

1920.TUSD. Algebra.HS.Q2Benchmark

By Grade ▲	# Tested ⚡	Participation Rate ⚡	Avg. RS ⚡	Avg. % Correct ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡	Proficient			Not Proficient		
						# ⚡	% ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡	# ⚡	% ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡
Tucson Unified School District	1440	6.6%	8.8	32.6% ■	53:40	638	44.3% ■	64:05	802	55.7% ■	45:23
MANSFELD	2	0.3%	7	25.9% ■	59:52	1	50% ■	55:33	1	50% ■	64:12
Grade 8	2	0.1%	7	25.9% ■	59:52	1	50% ■	55:33	1	50% ■	64:12

MATH – Q3 BENCHMARK

Are there any noteworthy differences or trends that you notice in comparing Benchmark achievement between your school and the District for Math? What strategies or action steps are being employed to address these differences/trends (if applicable)? Have these differences changed from the previous benchmarks?

Reflection: 6th grade Math has a proficiency increase over Q2 (42.8%) by .4% and above Q1 (40%) by 3.4% finishing the school year with an increase of proficiency by .6%. All quarters showed proficiency levels above the district average. Mansfeld’s advance Math students in Q3 scored 53.9% a drop of 2.8% from Q2 (66.7%). However, they finished the year with an increase in proficiency of 7.0% (53.9%).

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Q3/4 Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT



7th grade Q3 shows a decrease in proficiency of 11.0% (35.4). However, 24% of 7th grade (92 students) took the Accelerated assessment and scored a 63% proficiency. TUSD remained at 43% for all quarters. 8th grade Math proficiency level for Q3 was 58% compared to 42.1% in Q1 and 50% in Q2. 8th grade shows yearly growth in Math as 5.9%.

MATH – Q3 Benchmark Data

Insert screen shots in the appropriate boxes below. Delete any rows that are not applicable to your site

1920.TUSD. Math.06. Q3Benchmark

By Grade	# Tested	Participation Rate	Avg. RS	Avg. % Correct	Avg. TS	Proficient			Not Proficient		
						#	%	Avg. TS	#	%	Avg. TS
Tucson Unified School District	2758	80.9%	13.1	43.7%	64:59	1169	42.4%	68:16	1589	57.6%	62:33
MANSFELD	242	68.6%	13.2	44.1%	99:10	105	43.4%	92:28	137	56.6%	104:18
Grade 6	242	7.1%	13.2	44.1%	99:10	105	43.4%	92:28	137	56.6%	104:18

TUSD Math.06A.Q3Benchmark

By Grade	# Tested	Participation Rate	Avg. RS	Avg. % Correct	Avg. TS	Proficient			Not Proficient		
						#	%	Avg. TS	#	%	Avg. TS
Tucson Unified School District	269	40.9%	16.2	54%	100:16	102	37.9%	95:50	167	62.1%	102:58
MANSFELD	89	87.3%	19.4	64.6%	94:40	48	53.9%	96:05	41	46.1%	93:01
Grade 6	89	13.7%	19.4	64.6%	94:40	48	53.9%	96:05	41	46.1%	93:01

1920.TUSD. Math.07. Q3Benchmark

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Q3/4 Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Magnet Program



By Grade	# Tested	Participation Rate	Avg. RS	Avg. % Correct	Avg. TS	Proficient			Not Proficient		
						#	%	Avg. TS	#	%	Avg. TS
Tucson Unified School District	2727	77.7%	12	39.9%	67:44	1081	39.6%	73:56	1646	60.4%	63:39
MANSFELD	223	63.9%	11.3	37.5%	94:02	79	35.4%	99:20	144	64.6%	91:08
Grade 7	223	6.4%	11.3	37.5%	94:02	79	35.4%	99:20	144	64.6%	91:08

1920.TUSD. Math. 07A.Q3Benchmark

By Grade	# Tested	Participation Rate	Avg. RS	Avg. % Correct	Avg. TS	Proficient			Not Proficient		
						#	%	Avg. TS	#	%	Avg. TS
Tucson Unified School District	335	47.6%	15.7	52.3%	95:13	140	41.8%	101:29	195	58.2%	90:43
MANSFELD	92	92.0%	18	59.9%	103:39	58	63%	101:34	34	37%	107:13
Grade 7	92	13.1%	18	59.9%	103:39	58	63%	101:34	34	37%	107:13

1920.TUSD. Math.08. Q3Benchmark

By Grade	# Tested	Participation Rate	Avg. RS	Avg. % Correct	Avg. TS	Proficient			Not Proficient		
						#	%	Avg. TS	#	%	Avg. TS
Tucson Unified School District	2871	82.4%	15.4	51.3%	59:45	1081	37.7%	61:40	1790	62.3%	58:35
MANSFELD	338	91.6%	18.4	61.4%	83:29	196	58%	80:13	142	42%	87:59
Grade 7	2	3.9%	12.5	41.7%	90:23	0	0%	-	2	100%	90:23
Grade 8	338	9.8%	18.4	61.4%	83:29	196	58%	80:13	142	42%	87:59

1819.TUSD. Algebra.HS. Q1Benchmark

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Q3/4 Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Magnet Program



By Grade	# Tested	Participation Rate	Avg. RS	Avg. % Correct	Avg. TS	Proficient			Not Proficient		
						#	%	Avg. TS	#	%	Avg. TS
Tucson Unified School District	3351	15.2%	9.7	35.7%	44:03	1483	44.3%	52:14	1868	55.7%	37:33
MANSFELD	2	0.3%	7	25.9%	49:46	0	0%	-	2	100%	49:46
Grade 8	2	0.1%	7	25.9%	49:46	0	0%	-	2	100%	49:46

1920.TUSD. Algebra.HS. Q2Benchmark

By Grade	# Tested	Participation Rate	Avg. RS	Avg. % Correct	Avg. TS	Proficient			Not Proficient		
						#	%	Avg. TS	#	%	Avg. TS
Tucson Unified School District	1440	6.6%	8.8	32.6%	53:40	638	44.3%	64:05	802	55.7%	45:23
MANSFELD	2	0.3%	7	25.9%	59:52	1	50%	55:33	1	50%	64:12
Grade 8	2	0.1%	7	25.9%	59:52	1	50%	55:33	1	50%	64:12


1920.TUSD. Algebra.H.S. Q3Benchmark

By Grade	# Tested	Participation Rate	Avg. RS	Avg. % Correct	Avg. TS	Proficient			Not Proficient		
						#	%	Avg. TS	#	%	Avg. TS
Tucson Unified School District	3119	12.4%	9.6	35.7%	41:16	1342	43%	48:28	1777	57%	35:49
MANSFELD	3	0.3%	8	29.6%	63:58	1	33.3%	103:39	2	66.7%	44:08
Grade 7	1	0.0%	12	44.4%	103:39	1	100%	103:39	0	0%	-
Grade 8	2	0.1%	6	22.2%	44:08	0	0%	-	2	100%	44:08



Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Q3/4 Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Directions: Use SchoolCity to access “**Demographic Profile**” for each of the grade levels tested during Benchmark 1. Use “**Ethnicity Subgroups**” in the “**Profile Groups to Display**” box. Click the “**Proficient/Not Proficient**” radial button. Use the  Snipping Tool to take a screen shot of each grade level for Math and ELA, then fill out the Reflection box:

ELA – Q1 ACHIEVEMENT GAP DATA

Are there any noteworthy differences or trends that you notice in comparing Benchmark achievement between ethnicities for ELA? What strategies or action steps are being employed to address these differences/trends (if applicable)?

Reflection: Level IV and Level III ELs took the Q1 benchmarks. In hindsight the EL instructors decided that the test does not reflect their ability as well as using the EL benchmark exams developed by Language Acquisition. Strategies to incorporate in Q2 benchmarks are to have all EL students take the Lang Acq. Benchmarks. The teachers will develop a model that will allow the ELs to experience the Lang Acq. Exam as if they were taking the benchmark exam English Speaking kids are taking. The idea would be to help prepare them what to expect when they are mainstreamed or exited. Another benefit is to ease the students’ fears and make them more comfortable taking the exam.

Insert screen shots in the appropriate boxes below. Delete any rows that are not applicable to your site

1920.TUSD.ELA.06. Q1Benchmark

USP ▲	Students Tested		Avg. RS ⬆	Avg. Percent Correct ⬆	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	# ▼	% ⬆			# ⬆	% ⬆	# ⬆	% ⬆
All Test Takers	329	100%	12.8	42.6%	157	47.7%	172	52.3%
Hispanic	225	68.4%	12.2	40.5%	100	44.4%	125	55.6%
White	48	14.6%	14.6	48.7%	26	54.2%	22	45.8%
African American	29	8.8%	12.7	42.4%	13	44.8%	16	55.2%
Multi Racial	16	4.9%	17.3	57.7%	14	87.5%	2	12.5%
Native American	6	1.8%	7.8	26.1%	1	16.7%	5	83.3%
Asian Pacific American	5	1.5%	14.6	48.7%	3	60%	2	40%

1920.TUSD.ELA.07. Q1Benchmark

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Q3/4 Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT



Ethnicity Subgroups ▲	Students Tested		Avg. RS ⬆	Avg. Percent Correct ⬆	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	# ▼	% ⬆			# ⬆	% ⬆	# ⬆	% ⬆
All Test Takers	325	100%	17.7	58.9%	161	49.5%	164	50.5%
Hispanic	247	76%	17.2	57.4%	115	46.6%	132	53.4%
White	41	12.6%	21.2	70.8%	28	68.3%	13	31.7%
African American	18	5.5%	14.8	49.3%	7	38.9%	11	61.1%
Multi Racial	8	2.5%	19.5	65%	5	62.5%	3	37.5%
Native American	7	2.2%	16.6	55.2%	3	42.9%	4	57.1%
Asian Pacific American	4	1.2%	19.5	65%	3	75%	1	25%

1920.TUSD.ELA.08. Q1Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups ▲	Students Tested		Avg. RS ⬆	Avg. Percent Correct ⬆	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	# ▼	% ⬆			# ⬆	% ⬆	# ⬆	% ⬆
All Test Takers	344	100%	14.9	49.8%	186	54.1%	158	45.9%
Hispanic	234	68%	14.1	47%	117	50%	117	50%
White	59	17.2%	19.6	65.5%	49	83.1%	10	16.9%
African American	22	6.4%	11.9	39.6%	7	31.8%	15	68.2%
Multi Racial	12	3.5%	18.3	60.8%	9	75%	3	25%
Native American	11	3.2%	11.7	39.1%	1	9.1%	10	90.9%
Asian Pacific American	6	1.7%	12.8	42.8%	3	50%	3	50%

ELA – Q2 ACHIEVEMENT GAP DATA

Are there any noteworthy differences or trends that you notice in comparing Benchmark achievement between ethnicities for ELA? What strategies or action steps are being employed to address these differences/trends (if applicable)?

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Q3/4 Report**STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT**

Magnet Program



Reflection: Mansfeld's 6th grade Hispanic population saw a drop in ELA scores from Q1 (44%) to Q2 (37%); however, 20 less students took the benchmark in Q2. White students scored Q1 at 54.2% and moved up a small percent to 55.8% in Q2. Our African American population scored 44.8% in Q1 with 13 students tested. In Q2 an additional 7 students took the assessment and scored a proficiency of 40%. Multi-Racial students' score with the same number of students testing proficient in Q1 (87.5%) to Q2 scored 73.3% proficient. Native American population saw no growth with both quarters testing 1 student proficient with 5 (Q1) and 4 (Q2) testing as non-proficient. 5 Asian/Pacific students were tested both in Q1 and Q2. Q1 saw 3 students scoring proficient and with Q2 3 students tested with 2 of them scoring as proficient.

In 7th grade, Hispanic students in Q1 tested at 46.6% Proficiency with 243 students compared to a score of 53.5% of 243 tested in Q2, a good growth of 6.9% increase towards proficiency. The White population scored 68.3% growth in proficiency in Q1 followed in Q2 with 83.8% an increase of 15.5% with close to the same number of students tested in each quarter. 18 African American students scored 38.9% in Q1 and in Q2 out of 12 students tested, 7 students had a proficiency score of 58.3% an increase of 19.4%! Multi-Racial population in Q1 had a proficiency score of 62.5% with 7 students tested. In Q2 their proficiency score dropped to 57.1% with the same number of students tested. Mansfeld's Native American population's proficiency level dropped in Q2 with only 1 out of 8 students scoring proficient. In Q1 3 out of 7 students scored as proficient. Asian/Pacific students 3 students score at 100% proficiency.

In 8th grade Hispanic students in Q1 scored 50% proficiency in Q2 they dropped 8.9% points to a score of 41.2 (less students tested in Q2). White students tested at 83.1% in Q1. With the same number of students tested the proficiency dropped to 77.6% or a 5.4% drop. African American students with the same number of students testing in both Q1 and Q2 moved from a Q1 proficiency of 31.8 to 41.2%, an increase in proficiency of 9.4%! Multi-Racial students dropped from Q1 with a proficiency score of 75% to 66.7% with no discernable differences in number of students tested. Native American population of 10 students had 1 student score at proficiency in both Q1 and Q2. Asian/Pacific population scored a proficiency level of 50% for both Q1 and Q2 with a total of 6 students tested.

Insert screen shots in the appropriate boxes below. Delete any rows that are not applicable to your site

1920.TUSD.ELA.06. Q2Benchmark

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Q3/4 Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Magnet Program



Ethnicity Subgroups ▲	Students Tested		Avg. RS ⬆	Avg. Percent Correct ⬆	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	# ▼	% ⬆			# ⬆	% ⬆	# ⬆	% ⬆
All Test Takers	302	100%	13.6	45.3%	126	41.7%	176	58.3%
Hispanic	216	71.5%	13	43.5%	80	37%	136	63%
White	43	14.2%	15.5	51.6%	24	55.8%	19	44.2%
African American	20	6.6%	13.3	44.2%	8	40%	12	60%
Multi Racial	15	5%	16.7	55.5%	11	73.3%	4	26.7%
Native American	5	1.7%	12.2	40.7%	1	20%	4	80%
Asian Pacific American	3	1%	16	53.3%	2	66.7%	1	33.3%

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Q3/4 Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Magnet Program



1920.TUSD.ELA.07. Q2Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups ▲	Students Tested		Avg. RS ▲	Avg. Percent Correct ▲	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	# ▼	% ▲			# ▲	% ▲	# ▲	% ▲
All Test Takers	310	100%	16.7	55.6%	176	56.8%	134	43.2%
Hispanic	243	78.4%	16	53.4%	130	53.5%	113	46.5%
White	37	11.9%	21.1	70.2%	31	83.8%	6	16.2%
African American	12	3.9%	16.1	53.6%	7	58.3%	5	41.7%
Native American	8	2.6%	13.8	45.8%	1	12.5%	7	87.5%
Multi Racial	7	2.3%	18.7	62.4%	4	57.1%	3	42.9%
Asian Pacific American	3	1%	22	73.3%	3	100%	0	0%

1819.TUSD.ELA.08. Q2Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups ▲	Students Tested		Avg. RS ▲	Avg. Percent Correct ▲	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	# ▼	% ▲			# ▲	% ▲	# ▲	% ▲
All Test Takers	333	100%	15.9	53.1%	159	47.7%	174	52.3%
Hispanic	228	68.5%	15.1	50.2%	94	41.2%	134	58.8%
White	58	17.4%	20.3	67.6%	45	77.6%	13	22.4%
African American	17	5.1%	15.1	50.2%	7	41.2%	10	58.8%
Multi Racial	15	4.5%	17.4	58%	10	66.7%	5	33.3%
Native American	10	3%	10.2	34%	1	10%	9	90%
Asian Pacific American	5	1.5%	15.2	50.7%	2	40%	3	60%

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Q3/4 Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Magnet Program



ELA – Q3 ACHIEVEMENT GAP DATA

Are there any noteworthy differences or trends that you notice in comparing Benchmark achievement between ethnicities for ELA? What strategies or action steps are being employed to address these differences/trends (if applicable)?

Reflection: Mansfeld's 6th grade Hispanic population saw a drop in ELA scores from Q1 (44%) to Q2 (37%) but growth of 1% in Q3 with 228 students accessed. White students scored Q1 at 54.2% and moved up a small percent to 55.8% in Q2 with another 2% growth in Q3 (56.8%) for an overall growth at 2.6% at the end of the year. African American population scored 44.8% in Q1 with 13 students tested. In Q2 an additional 7 students took the assessment and scored a proficiency of 40%. Q3 Benchmark scores for 24 African American (54.2%) students assessed saw an increase in proficiency of 14.2%. Multi-Racial students' saw 7 students testing proficient in Q1 (87.5%) to Q2 scored 73.3% proficient. In Q3 15 Multiracial students achieved a proficiency of 73.3%. Native American population saw no growth with both Q1 and Q2 1 student proficient with 5 (Q1) and 4 (Q2) testing as non-proficient. Q3 the 5 students tested increased proficiency 5 Asian/Pacific students were tested both in Q1 and Q2. Q1 saw 3 students scoring proficient and with Q2 of the 5 students tested 1 student scored proficient. A total of 321 6th grade students took the Q3 Benchmark scoring 43.9% proficient. Q1 saw 329 students assessed with a score of 47.7% proficient.

In 7th grade, Hispanic students in Q1 tested at 46.6% Proficiency with 243 students compared to a score of 53.5% of 243 tested in Q2 demonstrating positive proficiency of 6.9%. In Q3 239 students assessed with a 40% proficiency, indicating a drop in proficiency of 13.5%. The White population scored 68.3% growth in proficiency in Q1 followed in Q2 with 83.8% an increase of 15.5% with close to the same number of students tested in each quarter. Q3 44 students achieved 75.6% proficiency a 7.3% increase over Q1. 18 African American students scored 38.9% in Q1 and in Q2 out of 12 students tested, 7 students had a proficiency score of 58.3% an increase of 19.4%! 20 students took Q3 assessment with a proficiency of 40%, dropping in proficiency from Q2 but maintain growth (1.1%) over Q1. Multi-Racial population in Q1 had a proficiency score of 62.5% with 7 students tested. In Q2 their proficiency score dropped to 57.1% with the same number of students tested. In Q3 benchmarks 8 students tested with a proficiency of 50%, an overall drop in proficiency of 12.5%. Mansfeld's Native American population's proficiency level dropped in Q2 with only 1 out 8 students scoring proficient. In Q1 3 out of 7 students scored as proficient. Q3 benchmarks were a repeat of Q1 (1 student proficient). 3 Asian/Pacific students were accessed in Q3 with a proficiency level of 66.7%

8th grade Hispanic students in Q1 scored 50% proficiency in Q2 they dropped 8.9% points to a score of 41.2 (less students tested in Q2). White students tested at 83.1% in Q1. With the same number of students tested the proficiency dropped to 77.6% or a 5.4% drop. African American students with the same number of students testing in both Q1 and Q2 moved from a Q1 proficiency of 31.8 to 41.2%, an increase in proficiency of 9.4%! Multi-Racial students dropped from Q1 with a proficiency score of 75% to 66.7% with no discernable differences in number of students tested. Native American population of 10 students had 1 student score at proficiency in both Q1 and Q2. Asian/Pacific population scored a proficiency level of 50% for both Q1 and Q2 with a total of 6 students tested.

Insert screen shots in the appropriate boxes below. Delete any rows that are not applicable to your site

1920.TUSD.ELA.06. Q3Benchmark

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Q3/4 Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Magnet Program



Ethnicity Subgroups	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	321	100%	15.5	51.8%	141	43.9%	180	56.1%
African American	24	7.5%	16.5	55.0%	13	54.2%	11	45.8%
Asian Pacific American	5	1.6%	17	56.7%	3	60%	2	40%
Hispanic	228	71%	14.8	49.3%	88	38.6%	140	61.4%
Multi Racial	15	4.7%	19.8	66.0%	11	73.3%	4	26.7%
Native American	5	1.6%	11.6	38.7%	1	20%	4	80%
White	44	13.7%	17.7	59.0%	25	56.8%	19	43.2%

1920.TUSD.ELA.07. Q3Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	319	100%	14.6	48.6%	173	54.2%	146	45.8%
African American	20	6.3%	13	43.3%	8	40%	12	60%
Asian Pacific American	3	0.9%	16.7	55.6%	2	66.7%	1	33.3%
Hispanic	239	74.9%	14.1	47.0%	127	53.1%	112	46.9%
Multi Racial	8	2.5%	16.9	56.2%	4	50%	4	50%
Native American	8	2.5%	9.9	32.9%	1	12.5%	7	87.5%
White	41	12.9%	18.6	62.0%	31	75.6%	10	24.4%

1920.TUSD.ELA.08. Q3Benchmark

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Q3/4 Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT



Ethnicity Subgroups	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	338	100%	17.9	59.6%	157	46.4%	181	53.6%
African American	20	5.9%	18.1	60.2%	10	50%	10	50%
Asian Pacific American	7	2.1%	13.7	45.7%	2	28.6%	5	71.4%
Hispanic	227	67.2%	17.3	57.7%	90	39.6%	137	60.4%
Multi Racial	14	4.1%	19.9	66.2%	10	71.4%	4	28.6%
Native American	9	2.7%	13.4	44.8%	2	22.2%	7	77.8%
White	61	18%	20.6	68.8%	43	70.5%	18	29.5%

MATH – Q1 ACHIEVEMENT GAP DATA

Are there any noteworthy differences or trends that you notice in comparing Benchmark achievement between ethnicities for MATH? What strategies or action steps are being employed to address these differences/trends (if applicable)?

Reflection: Mansfeld scored on point with the district scores. Implementation of Verizon iPads will be used to incorporate STEM strategies into lessons to create technology- rich and engaging lessons. Encourage students to attend Boost homework help. Make greater use UArizona students for tutoring. iPad will be used to create more frequent formative assessments that will guide instruction. Math department will take an active role in implementing strategies that will develop stronger study skills with all students but a specific target of working with the Native American Students. UArizona Tutors will be utilized to assist all students in helping them develop stronger study skills.

Insert screen shots in the appropriate boxes below. Delete any rows that are not applicable to your site

1920.TUSD. MATH.06. Q1Benchmark

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Q3/4 Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Magnet Program



Ethnicity Subgroups ▲	Students Tested		Avg. RS ⬆	Avg. Percent Correct ⬆	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	# ▼	% ⬆			# ⬆	% ⬆	# ⬆	% ⬆
All Test Takers	239	100%	8.9	29.5%	112	46.9%	127	53.1%
Hispanic	194	81.2%	8.9	29.6%	88	45.4%	106	54.6%
White	19	7.9%	9.5	31.7%	11	57.9%	8	42.1%
African American	13	5.4%	6.7	22.3%	4	30.8%	9	69.2%
Native American	6	2.5%	9	30%	5	83.3%	1	16.7%
Multi Racial	4	1.7%	10.5	35%	2	50%	2	50%
Asian Pacific American	3	1.3%	10.3	34.5%	2	66.7%	1	33.3%

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Q3/4 Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Magnet Program



1920.TUSD. MATH.07. Q1Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups ▲	Students Tested		Avg. RS ⬆	Avg. Percent Correct ⬆	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	# ▼	% ⬆			# ⬆	% ⬆	# ⬆	% ⬆
All Test Takers	239	100%	8.9	29.5%	112	46.9%	127	53.1%
Hispanic	194	81.2%	8.9	29.6%	88	45.4%	106	54.6%
White	19	7.9%	9.5	31.7%	11	57.9%	8	42.1%
African American	13	5.4%	6.7	22.3%	4	30.8%	9	69.2%
Native American	6	2.5%	9	30%	5	83.3%	1	16.7%
Multi Racial	4	1.7%	10.5	35%	2	50%	2	50%
Asian Pacific American	3	1.3%	10.3	34.5%	2	66.7%	1	33.3%

1920.TUSD. MATH.08. Q1Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups ▲	Students Tested		Avg. RS ⬆	Avg. Percent Correct ⬆	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	# ▼	% ⬆			# ⬆	% ⬆	# ⬆	% ⬆
All Test Takers	345	100%	14.1	46.8%	186	53.9%	159	46.1%
Hispanic	234	67.8%	13	43.4%	115	49.1%	119	50.9%
White	59	17.1%	18.5	61.7%	45	76.3%	14	23.7%
African American	22	6.4%	13.2	43.9%	10	45.5%	12	54.5%
Multi Racial	11	3.2%	16.6	55.5%	8	72.7%	3	27.3%
Native American	11	3.2%	11.5	38.5%	5	45.5%	6	54.5%
Asian Pacific American	8	2.3%	13.6	45.4%	3	37.5%	5	62.5%

1920.TUSD. Algebra.HS. Q1Benchmark

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Q3/4 Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT



Ethnicity Subgroups ▲	Students Tested		Avg. RS ▲	Avg. Percent Correct ▲	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	# ▼	% ▲			# ▲	% ▲	# ▲	% ▲
All Test Takers	2	100%	7	25.9%	0	0%	2	100%
Multi Racial	1	50%	6	22.2%	0	0%	1	100%
White	1	50%	8	29.6%	0	0%	1	100%

MATH – Q2 ACHIEVEMENT GAP DATA

Are there any noteworthy differences or trends that you notice in comparing Benchmark achievement between ethnicities for MATH? What strategies or action steps are being employed to address these differences/trends (if applicable)?

Reflection: In 6th grade Math Hispanics dropped in proficiency from Q1 (45.4%) to 41.7% in Q2 with a minimal difference in number of students taking the assessment between the two quarters. White students dropped 7.9% difference between Q1 (57.9%) to 50% in Q2. African American students in Q1 had a proficiency score of 30.8% and in Q2 they increased proficiency with a score 36.8% a 6% increase difference. Native American students dropped dramatically in Q2. They went from a 83.3% proficiency score for 6 students, but in Q2 flip flopped to 20% Proficient and 80% Not Proficient. This needs a discussion with 8th grade Math teaches examining to determine why this occurred. What standards were introduced in Q1 and Q2? The Asian/Pacific students in Q1 scored 66.7% and in Q2 increased their proficiency to a score of 75%. 3 students were tested in both Quarters.

7th grade: In Q2 Hispanic students dropped 15.5% proficiency points, White students dropped 26.3% in proficiency. African Americans stayed the same for both Q1 and Q2 30.8% in proficiency. The Native American Students did a flip flop. Students went from a Q1 score of 83.3% to 28.6% with 4 students assessed. Multi-Racial Students scored 50% out 4 students in Q1 followed by 3 students tested in Q2 with a proficiency score of 33.3%. Neither of the 2 Asian/Pacific students obtained proficiency in Q2. In Q1 they were at a 66.7%. Students are falling behind in Q2 because of a lack of teaching consistency. The teacher of record was absent for most of first semester. As a result, students are being taught by either a 1st year teacher in one class or a variety of substitute teachers in the other. The CSP has spent her time individually coaching the new teacher and writing lesson plans and assisting in the classroom for both 7th grade Math teachers. Teachers are working from benchmark data and are including interventions through the I-excel program and UArizona tutors.

8th grade Hispanic students saw no change between Q1 (49.1) and Q2 (49.2). White students grew in proficiency in Q2 (81%) by 4.7% (Q1 76.3%.) African American students increased Q2 (45.5%) proficiency by 2.1% (Q1 45.5%.) with 22 students taking the assessment. Multi-Racial students decreased in proficiency



Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Q3/4 Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

from Q1 (72.7% - 11 students) to Q2 (50% - 10 students) a decrease of 25.5%. 8 Asian/Pacific students increased proficiency by 25% difference from Q1 (37.5%) to Q2 (62.5%.)

Insert screen shots in the appropriate boxes below. Delete any rows that are not applicable to your site

1920.TUSD. MATH.06.Q2Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups ▲	Students Tested		Avg. RS ▲	Avg. Percent Correct ▲	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	# ▼	% ▲			# ▲	% ▲	# ▲	% ▲
All Test Takers	236	100%	15	50%	101	42.8%	135	57.2%
Hispanic	175	74.2%	14.8	49.5%	73	41.7%	102	58.3%
White	26	11%	16.3	54.2%	13	50%	13	50%
African American	19	8.1%	14.3	47.7%	7	36.8%	12	63.2%
Multi Racial	7	3%	16.9	56.2%	4	57.1%	3	42.9%
Native American	5	2.1%	12.6	42%	1	20%	4	80%
Asian Pacific American	4	1.7%	16.3	54.2%	3	75%	1	25%

Ethnicity Subgroups ▲	Students Tested		Avg. RS ▲	Avg. Percent Correct ▲	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	# ▼	% ▲			# ▲	% ▲	# ▲	% ▲
All Test Takers	87	100%	14.5	48.3%	39	44.8%	48	55.2%
Hispanic	51	58.6%	14.4	47.8%	22	43.1%	29	56.9%
White	19	21.8%	15.8	52.6%	11	57.9%	8	42.1%
Multi Racial	8	9.2%	14.6	48.7%	3	37.5%	5	62.5%
African American	7	8%	11.9	39.5%	2	28.6%	5	71.4%
Asian Pacific American	2	2.3%	14.5	48.4%	1	50%	1	50%

1819.TUSD.MATH.07.Q2Benchmark

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Q3/4 Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Magnet Program



Ethnicity Subgroups ▲	Students Tested		Avg. RS ▲	Avg. Percent Correct ▲	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	# ▼	% ▲			# ▲	% ▲	# ▲	% ▲
All Test Takers	232	100%	8.4	28%	71	30.6%	161	69.4%
Hispanic	188	81%	8.4	28.1%	58	30.9%	130	69.1%
White	19	8.2%	8.6	28.6%	6	31.6%	13	68.4%
African American	13	5.6%	7.7	25.6%	4	30.8%	9	69.2%
Native American	7	3%	8	26.7%	2	28.6%	5	71.4%
Multi Racial	3	1.3%	8.7	28.9%	1	33.3%	2	66.7%
Asian Pacific American	2	0.9%	9	30%	0	0%	2	100%

1819.TUSD.MATH.08.Q2Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups ▲	Students Tested		Avg. RS ▲	Avg. Percent Correct ▲	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	# ▼	% ▲			# ▲	% ▲	# ▲	% ▲
All Test Takers	343	100%	13.4	44.6%	185	53.9%	158	46.1%
Hispanic	232	67.6%	12.5	41.8%	114	49.1%	118	50.9%
White	58	16.9%	18.2	60.6%	47	81%	11	19%
African American	21	6.1%	11.7	38.9%	10	47.6%	11	52.4%
Multi Racial	14	4.1%	13.5	45%	7	50%	7	50%
Native American	10	2.9%	7.9	26.4%	2	20%	8	80%
Asian Pacific American	8	2.3%	14.8	49.2%	5	62.5%	3	37.5%

1819.TUSD.Algebra.HS.Q2Benchmark

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Q3/4 Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT



Ethnicity Subgroups ▲	Students Tested		Avg. RS ◆	Avg. Percent Correct ◆	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	# ▼	% ◆			# ◆	% ◆	# ◆	% ◆
All Test Takers	2	100%	7	25.9%	0	0%	2	100%
Multi Racial	1	50%	6	22.2%	0	0%	1	100%
White	1	50%	8	29.6%	0	0%	1	100%

MATH – Q3 ACHIEVEMENT GAP DATA

Are there any noteworthy differences or trends that you notice in comparing Benchmark achievement between ethnicities for MATH? What strategies or action steps are being employed to address these differences/trends (if applicable)?

Reflection: In 6th grade Math Hispanics dropped in proficiency from Q1 (45.4%) to 41.7% in Q2 with a minimal difference in number of students taking the assessment between the two quarters. Q3 benchmarks show Hispanic students dropped in proficiency by 1.8% (39.9%). White students dropped 7.9% difference between Q1 (57.9%) to 50% in Q2. In Q3 White students increased their proficiency to 55.6%, up 5.6% from Q2, but ended the year dropping 1.3% in proficiency. African American students in Q1 had a proficiency score of 30.8% and in Q2 they increased proficiency with a score 36.8% a 6% increase difference. African American students continued to increase their proficiency over both Q1 and Q2 to a score of 47.6% proficiency in Q3. They ended the year with a growth of 16.8%. Native American students dropped dramatically in Q2. They went from 83.3% proficiency score for 6 students, but in Q2 flip flopped to 20% Proficient and 80% Not Proficient. Q3 showed a 40% proficiency with 5 students testing. The Asian/Pacific students in Q1 scored 66.7% and in Q2 increased their proficiency to a score of 75%. 3 students were tested in both quarters. 4 students were tested in Q3 scoring 50% proficiency. A total of 242 6th grade students took the benchmark scoring 43.4% proficiency overall ethnicities.

89 6th grade Accelerated students took Q3 Benchmark scoring 53.9% proficiency over all ethnicities. African American students scored 33.3% with 6 students taking the Q3 assessment. Asian Pacific students scored 50% proficiency with 2 students taking the test. 54 Hispanic students took the accelerated assessment and scored 46.3% proficient. 8 students identified as Multi-Racial scored a proficiency of 62.5%. 19 White students were proficient at 78.9%.

7th grade: In Q2 Hispanic students dropped 15.5% at 39.9% proficiency. Q3 saw Hispanic scores fall to 35.2% a 4.7% drop. In Q2 White students dropped to 26.3% from 31.6% in Q3 White students increased proficiency to 52.6% but completing the year with a drop in overall proficiency of 5.3%. African Americans stayed the same for both Q1 and Q2 30.8% in proficiency. Q3 tested 16 students with a proficiency of 25%. The Native American Students did a flip flop.

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Q3/4 Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT



Students went from a Q1 score of 83.3% to 28.6% with 4 students assessed. In Q3 7 Native American students tested with a score of 14.3%. Multi-Racial Students scored 50% out of 4 students in Q1 followed by 3 students tested in Q2 with a proficiency score of 33.3%. In Q3 3 Multi-Racial students scored a 33.3 proficiency. Neither of the 2 Asian/Pacific students obtained proficiency in Q2. In Q3 2 Asian students scored 50% proficiency. Overall 7th grade tested 223 students with a proficiency level of 35.4%.

7th Grade Accelerated in Q3 saw 92 students assessed scoring 63% proficiency. 5 African American students scored 20% proficiency. 2 Asian students scored 50% proficient. 58 Hispanic students tested for a proficiency of 63.8%. 4 Multi-Racial students scored 75% proficiency. 23 White students scored 69.9% proficiency.

8th grade Hispanic students saw no change between Q1 (49.1%) and Q2 (49.2%). Q3 testing tested 226 students with a proficiency score of 52.7%. White students grew in proficiency in Q2 (81%) by 4.7% (Q1 76.3%) and in Q3 finished with a score of 85% with 60 students tested. African American students increased Q2 (45.5%) proficiency by 2.1% (Q1 45.5%) with 22 students taking the assessment. In Q3 23 students took the assessment and scored 47.8 % proficiency. Multi-Racial students decreased in proficiency from Q1 (72.7% - 11 students) to Q2 (50% - 10 students) a decrease of 25.5%. In Q3 13 students identified as Multi-Racial scored 76.9%. 8 Asian/Pacific students increased proficiency by 25% difference from Q1 (37.5%) to Q2 (62.5%). In Q3 8 Asian students scored 50% proficiency. 338 8th grade students participated in Q3 benchmarks with an overall proficiency of 58%.

Insert screen shots in the appropriate boxes below. Delete any rows that are not applicable to your site

1920.TUSD. MATH.06. Q3Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	242	100%	13.2	44.1%	105	43.4%	137	56.6%
African American	21	8.7%	14	46.8%	10	47.6%	11	52.4%
Asian Pacific American	4	1.7%	14.3	47.5%	2	50%	2	50%
Hispanic	178	73.6%	12.8	42.8%	71	39.9%	107	60.1%
Multi Racial	7	2.9%	16.4	54.7%	5	71.4%	2	28.6%
Native American	5	2.1%	12.6	42.0%	2	40%	3	60%
White	27	11.2%	14.3	47.8%	15	55.6%	12	44.4%

1920.TUSD.Math.06ABenchmark

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Q3/4 Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Magnet Program



Ethnicity Subgroups	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	89	100%	19.4	64.6%	48	53.9%	41	46.1%
African American	6	6.7%	17.5	58.3%	2	33.3%	4	66.7%
Asian Pacific American	2	2.2%	17.5	58.3%	1	50%	1	50%
Hispanic	54	60.7%	18.3	61.1%	25	46.3%	29	53.7%
Multi Racial	8	9%	20.9	69.6%	5	62.5%	3	37.5%
White	19	21.3%	22.6	75.3%	15	78.9%	4	21.1%

1920.TUSD. MATH.07.Q3Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	223	100%	11.3	37.5%	79	35.4%	144	64.6%
African American	16	7.2%	9.8	32.7%	4	25%	12	75%
Asian Pacific American	2	0.9%	13	43.4%	1	50%	1	50%
Hispanic	176	78.9%	11.3	37.6%	62	35.2%	114	64.8%
Multi Racial	3	1.3%	11.7	38.9%	1	33.3%	2	66.7%
Native American	7	3.1%	9.3	30.9%	1	14.3%	6	85.7%
White	19	8.5%	12.8	42.8%	10	52.6%	9	47.4%

1920.TUSD.Math.07A.Q3 Benchmark

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Q3/4 Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Magnet Program



Ethnicity Subgroups	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	92	100%	18	59.9%	58	63%	34	37%
African American	5	5.4%	14.6	48.6%	1	20%	4	80%
Asian Pacific American	2	2.2%	22	73.3%	1	50%	1	50%
Hispanic	58	63%	17.6	58.6%	37	63.8%	21	36.2%
Multi Racial	4	4.3%	18.3	60.9%	3	75%	1	25%
White	23	25%	19.2	64.1%	16	69.6%	7	30.4%

1920.TUSD. MATH.08.Q3Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	338	100%	18.4	61.4%	196	58%	142	42%
African American	23	6.8%	16.5	55.1%	11	47.8%	12	52.2%
Asian Pacific American	8	2.4%	16.8	55.8%	4	50%	4	50%
Hispanic	226	66.9%	17.5	58.4%	119	52.7%	107	47.3%
Multi Racial	13	3.8%	21.8	72.6%	10	76.9%	3	23.1%
Native American	8	2.4%	12.8	42.5%	1	12.5%	7	87.5%
White	60	17.8%	22.8	75.9%	51	85%	9	15%

1920.TUSD. Algebra.HS.Q3Benchmark

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Q3/4 Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Magnet Program



Ethnicity Subgroups	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	3	100%	8	29.6%	1	33.3%	2	66.7%
Hispanic	1	33.3%	12	44.4%	1	100%	0	0%
Multi Racial	1	33.3%	8	29.6%	0	0%	1	100%
White	1	33.3%	4	14.8%	0	0%	1	100%

Directions: Choose the top five attended intervention/enrichment classes at your school.

Before/after school INTERVENTION classes	Type of intervention offered (example: 6 th grade ELA tutoring)	How were students placed in program? (example: progress report grades, teacher recommendation)	Number of students who participated in program.
Homework Help	Homework Help	Teacher/parent recommendation	0
6 th Grade Homework Help	Tutoring/Homework Help	Teacher/parent recommendation	11
7 th Grade Homework Help	Tutoring/Homework Help	Teacher/parent recommendation	7
8 th Grade Homework Help	Tutoring/Homework Help	Teacher/parent recommendation	9
ExEd Homework Help	Tutoring/Homework Help	Teacher/parent recommendation	0
Total enrollment for above classes			27
Grand Total of ALL intervention classes			27

Before/after school ENRICHMENT classes	Type of enrichment offered (example: Robotics)	How were students placed in program? (example: progress report grades, teacher recommendation)	Number of students who participated in program.
Science Olympiad	Science/Engineering	Self selection/try outs	20
Computer Science Club	Computers	Self selection	2

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Q3/4 Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Magnet Program



GEMS Club	Science/Engineering (girls)	Self selection	8
Math Exploration Club	Math	Self selection	13
Robotics	Robotics	Self selection	6
Total enrollment for above classes			79
Grand Total of ALL enrichment classes (High Schools: Only include MAGNET themed enrichment classes)			79



Magnet – School Level Q3/4 Report

2019-20

PROFESSIONAL LEARNING COMMUNITIES

Directions: Use the District rubric to rate a minimum of four of your PLCs.

No data was collected for Q1. Mansfeld did not have a Magnet Coordinator until Oct 28.

COLLABORATIVE CULTURE			
Educators work together in collaborative teams to achieve student learning.			
Learning	Literal	Refined	Internalized
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team meets regularly (weekly/biweekly/monthly) during the school day. Team members attend for compliance purposes only; team members may be unprepared and/or disorganized. No evidence that school goals, collective commitments and team norms are followed. Team is unclear regarding PLC focus and processes. Team does not use the <i>Guiding Questions for the PLC Team Cycle of Inquiry</i> to frame PLC discussions. Team meets only when required on the district designated Wednesday PD for PLC times (Team Cycle of Inquiry is not followed). Team does not turn in <i>Agenda and Minutes</i> log or log does not reflect analysis of student learning or teacher practice and growth. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team develops written norms and establishes learning goals that clarify expectations and commitments. Team members arrive prepared & participate. Team adheres to school goals, collective commitments, and team norms. Team shows evidence that the focus of PLC is curriculum instruction. Team is inconsistent in its use of the <i>Guiding Questions</i> or engages only shallowly with this tool. Some individual team members meet at least twice per month to attempt Team Cycle of Inquiry. Team <i>Agenda and Minutes</i> logs reflect limited understanding of PLC process and/or limited rigor with regard to reflections about course content knowledge and effective teaching practice. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team focuses on prearranged topics that impact student learning and makes revisions to goals to improve team effectiveness. Team members are committed to the inquiry process and share openly. Team reflects on alignment of their work with school goals, collective commitments, and team norms. Team focuses PLC work on curriculum and instruction via cycles of collective inquiry. Team regularly frames PLC work with the use of the <i>Guiding Questions</i>. Most team members coordinate time each week to meet to maintain Team Cycle of Inquiry. Team <i>Agenda and Minutes</i> logs indicate that some members engage in reflection on their own instructional effectiveness as well as analysis of student learning outcomes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team honors their collective commitments to each other and their students in order to maximize learning. Team members push themselves and one another to grow and deepen in their practice. Team norms and site commitments are reviewed regularly and members actively use the existence of norms to address challenges in team dynamics as they arise. Team engages in robust exploration of curriculum content, instructional practice, and student learning via rigorous collaborative inquiry. Team ensures that the <i>Guiding Questions</i> always frame the discussion and thinking of PLC meetings; for many team members the <i>Guiding Questions</i> have become internalized habits of mind. Team takes initiative to coordinate with one another (and with site administration if needed) to ensure that all team members meet weekly to maximize the benefits of Team Cycle of Inquiry. Team <i>Agenda and Minutes</i> logs clearly show strong commitment to ensuring that all team members understand content standards and are rigorous in reflecting on their own needs for growth.

Collaborative Culture

Quarter	Levels of Performance	Team A	Team B	Team C	Team D	Team E	Team F	Average
1	Learning = 1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Literal = 2							
	Refined = 3							
	Internalized = 4							
2	Learning = 1	2	3	1	2	2	3	2.16
	Literal = 2							
	Refined = 3							
	Internalized = 4							
3	Learning = 1	3	1	2	2	3	2	2.16
	Literal = 2							
	Refined = 3							
	Internalized = 4							
4	Learning = 1							
	Literal = 2							
	Refined = 3							



Magnet – School Level Q3/4 Report

2019-20

PROFESSIONAL LEARNING COMMUNITIES

Internalized =4							
-----------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

GUARANTEED CURRICULUM			
Educators establish what we want our students to learn.			
Learning	Literal	Refined	Internalized
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team uses district developed curriculum guide resources. Team does not identify an essential learning for the current inquiry cycle. Team does not discuss whether the essential learning is understood by team members at the level of task analysis. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team works together to define the essential learning and establish pacing. Team selects an essential learning for the current inquiry cycle but does not ensure that it is drawn directly from the District Curriculum. Team members engage in limited or inconsistent discussion regarding the sub-skills inherent in the essential learning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team builds shared knowledge of current content standards, unpacks high-stakes assessments to clarify essential learning, and adjusts instruction based on formative assessments. Team always draws its essential learning from the current scope and sequence in the District Curriculum. Team ensures that each team member is confident in their understanding of the sub-skills inherent in the essential learning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team continually refines essential learning and guarantees a viable instructional program for all students. Team ensures that the essential learning comes only from designated, highly-leveraged standards in the current scope and sequence in the District Curriculum. Team uses their collective understanding of the task analysis of the essential learning in order to increase the rigor and accuracy of Tier 1 differentiation, common formative assessments, and to develop/refine pacing guides.

Guaranteed Curriculum

Quarter	Levels of Performance	Team A	Team B	Team C	Team D	Team E	Team F	Average
1	Learning = 1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Literal = 2							
	Refined =3							
	Internalized =4							
2	Learning = 1	3	3	3	3	3	3	2.8
	Literal = 2							
	Refined =3							
	Internalized =4							
3	Learning = 1	3	3	3	3	3	3	2.8
	Literal = 2							
	Refined =3							
	Internalized =4							
4	Learning = 1							
	Literal = 2							
	Refined =3							
	Internalized =4							



Magnet – School Level Q3/4 Report

2019-20

PROFESSIONAL LEARNING COMMUNITIES

COMMON ASSESSMENT			
Educators determine if each student has learned what we want them to learn.			
Learning	Literal	Refined	Internalized
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team uses benchmark assessments several times throughout the year. Team does not review or make reference to specific benchmark data that relates to the essential learning focus. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team analyzes student work and assessments and discusses common criteria. Some team members administer common assessment tools based on team discussions of common criteria. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team consistently applies common criteria to assess student work and discuss formative instructional practices. Team discusses common formative assessments at the Focus stage of the Inquiry Cycle; administers CFA in the Teach stage of the Inquiry Cycle; analyzes results together at the Assess stage of the Inquiry Cycle; and implements targeted re-teaching or enrichment based on collective data analysis in the Respond stage of the Inquiry Cycle. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team consistently utilizes formative instructional practices, including common assessments, to gather evidence of student learning. Team consistently uses assessment results to reflect on teacher's own strengths and areas for refinement as practitioners. Team consistently uses assessment results for the purpose of continually refining equitable access to curriculum for all learners.

Common Assessment

Quarter	Levels of Performance	Team A	Team B	Team C	Team D	Team E	Team F	Average
1	Learning = 1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Literal = 2							
	Refined =3							
	Internalized =4							
2	Learning = 1	2	3	2	2	2	3	1.8
	Literal = 2							
	Refined =3							
	Internalized =4							
3	Learning = 1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2.0
	Literal = 2							
	Refined =3							
	Internalized =4							
4	Learning = 1							
	Literal = 2							
	Refined =3							
	Internalized =4							



Magnet – School Level Q3/4 Report

2019-20

PROFESSIONAL LEARNING COMMUNITIES

ENSURING LEARNING			
Educators respond when some students have not learned it.			
Learning	Literal	Refined	Internalized
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team does not collectively discuss potential specific difficulties in student understanding of the essential learning. Team uses school/district classes, established “pull out” or afterschool programs, and curriculum resources when students are identified for intervention. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team usually waits until after Tier 1 instruction to determine appropriate response to students struggling to understand the essential learning. Team provides students with additional time and support that does not remove students from new direct instruction when they experience difficulty. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At the Focus stage of the Inquiry Cycle, team discusses in specific terms the demands of the essential learning, anticipates the needs of current students, and plans for differentiated groups in the course of Tier 1 instruction. Team develops and utilizes a timely, directive, and systemic plan for students when they experience difficulty. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team members analyze patterns in content challenges and student difficulties that are specific to current students in order to ensure equitable supports and access to curriculum. Team coordinates a flexible, supportive, and proactive system of intervention for students who experience difficulty.

Ensuring Learning

Quarter	Levels of Performance	Team A	Team B	Team C	Team D	Team E	Team F	Average
1	Learning = 1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Literal = 2							
	Refined =3							
	Internalized =4							
2	Learning = 1	3	3	2	2	3	3	2.6
	Literal = 2							
	Refined =3							
	Internalized =4							
3	Learning = 1	3	3	3	2	2	3	2.5
	Literal = 2							
	Refined =3							
	Internalized =4							
4	Learning = 1							
	Literal = 2							
	Refined =3							
	Internalized =4							



Magnet – School Level Q3/4 Report

2019-20

PROFESSIONAL LEARNING COMMUNITIES

ENRICHING LEARNING			
Educators extend and enrich the learning for students who have demonstrated mastery.			
Learning	Literal	Refined	Internalized
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team does not collectively discuss anticipated differences in the rates of student understanding of the essential learning. Team uses school/district classes, established “pull out” or afterschool programs, and curriculum resources for identified students. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team usually waits until after Tier 1 instruction to determine appropriate response to students who already understand the essential learning. Team provides students with additional time and support for enrichment during the school day for those who have moved beyond the essential learning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At the Focus stage of the Inquiry Cycle, team discusses in specific terms the demands of the essential learning, anticipates the needs of current students, and plans for differentiated groups in the course of Tier 1 instruction. Team develops and utilizes a timely, directive, and systemic plan for students who have moved beyond the essential learning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team members analyze patterns specific to current students in order to ensure opportunities to advance in the curriculum. Team coordinates a flexible, supportive, and proactive system of intervention for students who have moved beyond the essential learning.

Enriching Learning

Quarter	Levels of Performance	Team A	Team B	Team C	Team D	Team E	Team F	Average
1	Learning = 1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Literal = 2							
	Refined =3							
	Internalized =4							
2	Learning = 1	2	3	1	2	2	3	2.16
	Literal = 2							
	Refined =3							
	Internalized =4							
3	Learning = 1	2	2	2	3	3	2	2.5
	Literal = 2							
	Refined =3							
	Internalized =4							
4	Learning = 1							
	Literal = 2							
	Refined =3							
	Internalized =4							



Magnet – School Level Q3/4 Report

2019-20

PROFESSIONAL LEARNING COMMUNITIES

PLCS: ANALYSIS OF NEEDS AND PROGRESS

PLC – Phases of Development

Component	Quarter 1 Average Phase of Development	Quarter 2 Average Phase of Development	Quarter 3 Average Phase of Development
Collaborative Culture	N/A	2.1	2.2
Guaranteed Curriculum	N/A	2.8	2.8
Common Assessment	N/A	1.8	2.0
Ensuring Learning	N/A	2.6	2.5
Enriching Learning	N/A	2.1	2.5

PLC – Needs Analysis

What additional PLC resources, information, or PD activities would most benefit you in supporting the work of Professional Learning Communities at your site? List at least three. (Example: protocols for analyzing student data; protocols for analyzing student work; how to make an action plan; how to work collaboratively as a team, ideas for intervention/enrichment opportunities, etc. Name at least 3)

- 1. Assessment: Create data binders with data from benchmark assessments**
- 2. Assessment: Training/Time on analyzing student scores and adjusting instruction**
- 3. Protocols: Begin new quarter with reviewing rubric for PLC with teachers**

PLC – Planning Next Steps

Review the “Critical Focus Area: High Functioning Professional Learning Communities” and the accompanying “Critical Focus Area Action Steps” section of your school’s 2017-18 Magnet School Plan.

Reflect on the progress (if any) that has been made in achieving these action steps. Identify next steps.

Quarter 1	Data was not collected. Mansfeld did not have a Magnet Coordinator until Oct 28.
Quarter 2	Next steps: revisit the PLC rubric with teachers so they better understand the need for fidelity. CSP to create data binders. Give specific PLC time for discussions on teach-reteach strategies.
Quarter 3/4	Next Steps: Continue to work with teachers on developing common assessments and to implement PLC time with more fidelity towards alignment of guaranteed curriculum.
For 2020/21	Focus on creating sustainability and fidelity of PLCs towards common goal of creating a school-wide enduring and enriched learning environment.



MAGNET 2019-20

SCHOOL LEVEL QUARTERLY REPORT

SCHOOL NAME: Palo Verde High Magnet	MAGNET THEME(S): STEAM
--	-------------------------------

MAGNET LEADERSHIP TEAM MEMBERS	
NAME	TITLE
Eric Brock	Principal
Jenn Maynard	Magnet Coordinator
Kevin Amidan	Assistant Principal
Judy Mitchell	Assistant Principal
Angela Tenace	Dean
Victoria Leon	CSP
Melissa Walker	CSP
Scott Eisenberg	MTSS Facilitator
Jenn O'Dell	Data Interventionist

MAGNET LEADERSHIP TEAM MEETINGS	
DATE	# MINUTES MET
08-05-19	25 minutes (re: Magnet items)
08-12-19	15 minutes (re: Magnet items)
08-19-19	20 minutes (re: Magnet items)
08-26-19	20 minutes (re: Magnet items)
09-09-19	15 minutes (re: Magnet items)
09-16-19	25 minutes (re: Magnet items)
09-23-19	20 minutes (re: Magnet items)
09-30-19	25 minutes (re: Magnet items)
10-14-19	20 minutes (re: Magnet items)
10-21-19	20 minutes (re: Magnet items)
10-28-19	20 minutes (re: Magnet items)
11-04-19	10 minutes (re: Magnet items)
11-12-19	20 minutes (re: Magnet items)
11-18-19	20 minutes (re: Magnet items)
11-25-19	10 minutes (re: Magnet items)
12-02-19	20 minutes (re: Magnet items)
12-09-19	15 minutes (re: Magnet items)
12-16-19	20 minutes (re: Magnet items)
01-06-20	10 minutes (re: Magnet items)



MAGNET 2019-20

SCHOOL LEVEL QUARTERLY REPORT

01-13-20	20 minutes (re: Magnet items)
01-21-20	15 minutes (re: Magnet items)
01-27-20	20 minutes (re: Magnet items)
02-03-20	10 minutes (re: Magnet items)
02-10-20	15 minutes (re: Magnet items)
02-17-20	5 minutes (re: Magnet items)
02-24-20	10 minutes (re: Magnet items)
03-02-20	15 minutes (re: Magnet items)
03-09-20	20 minutes (re: Magnet items)



INTEGRATION

Recruitment: Record actions taken this quarter to support your integration goal. Include tours, phone inquiries, mailings, school visits, other recruitment activities conducted by your site. Include District recruitment events and mailings that were specific to your magnet program. Insert additional lines as needed. Keep appropriate documentation (recruitment log) on site for review.

COMMUNICATION

Activity: Recruitment Mailings/Fliers

(Record the # of school/district generated magnet mailings. Examples: 100 surveys to neighborhood parents, 500 open house postcards. Dropping off fliers at schools counts as mailings.)

Range	# Mailings/ Fliers	# of responses	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	700+	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visits to 2-3 middle schools (rotating through east side TUSD middle schools and charters) per week approximately 25 flyers and 5-10 newsletters picked up from students each time. Left 25 flyers on display areas of middle schools during each visit. • Also distributed flyers and newsletters every other week to new DM airmen and women during their Right Start events. • Dropped hard copies of School Choice East event flyers to east side charter schools.
Quarter 2	~150 700+	3 14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participated in two separate STEM Night events (Mansfeld on Nov. 19 and Erickson Elementary on Nov. 26th) • Visits to 2-3 middle schools (rotating through east side TUSD middle schools and charters) per week approximately 25 flyers and 5-10 newsletters picked up from students each time. Left 25 flyers on display areas of middle schools during each visit. • Also distributed flyers and newsletters every other week to new DM airmen and women during their Right Start events. • Flyers to additional Charters (Tucson Country Day, Our Mother of Sorrows, Lehman Academy)
Quarter 3/4	175 3879 500+	0 11 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flyers mailed to all 8th grade families in TUSD regarding Future Freshman Night • Visits to 2-3 middle schools (rotating through east side TUSD middle schools and charters) per week approximately 10 flyers and 2-4 newsletters picked up from students each time. Left 15 flyers on display areas of middle schools during each visit. • Also distributed flyers and newsletters every other week to new DM airmen and women during their Right Start events. • Dropped hard copies of Future Freshman event flyers to select east side middle schools.



INTEGRATION

Totals	6000+	~50	
Activity: Recruitment Related Phone Calls			
Range	#	# ParentLink (recruitment)	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	35	6 (admin)	Follow up calls for families who took a tour of PV's campus. Calls to Right Start Coordinator, middle school contacts, etc.
Quarter 2	100+	3 (admin)	Follow up with families who had tours (22). Called all families who left contact information at STEM Nights (Mansfeld and Erickson). Called all families who left contact info. at Children's Museum (11-06-19) event. Coordinated with various counselors at Charters and Middle Schools, spoke with DM Right Start Event Coordinator.
Quarter 3/4	30+	5 (admin)	Follow up calls with families interested in Future Freshman Night. Follow up calls for people interested in tours. Calls to middle school contacts, etc.
Totals	165+	14	
Activity: Retention Related Phone Calls			
Range	#	# ParentLink (retention)	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	45	6 (admin)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Magnet student schedule change follow-ups at beginning of year. • Follow-up calls for bus pass questions. • Called families of Sky School participants to confirm participation and reminders.
Quarter 2	39	5 (admin)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Magnet student schedule change follow-ups. • Magnet MTSS students – parent contact and/or follow up. • Follow-up calls for bus pass questions.
Quarter 3/4	46	4 (admin)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Magnet student registration questions • Magnet MTSS students – parent contact and/or follow up. • Follow-up calls for bus pass questions.
Totals	130	15	



INTEGRATION

Activity: Recruitment - Electronic Communication

Range	Outgoing e-mails	Incoming e-mails	Social media (ie: # posts)	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	100+ (each email might contain more than 1 contact)	47	50+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Follow-up emails for all tour families (11). Answering questions sent to MC from random interested individuals. Emailed Magnet Focus monthly newsletter to all Magnet families (approx. 200 have email addresses) and fielded some questions about items included. Facebook posts made by MC: School Choice East event, ASU's Sustainability Program, Pima CC partnership with Earn to Learn article, Tech 4 Success, Monsieur Aristide Pessingua visitor for French and ELA classes, Forensics Mock Crime Scene, PV Tree Club Speaking for the Trees, University of Arizona Pell Pledge Grant, Dual Credit Anatomy Class Chemical Reaction Lab, visit to Secrist, visit to Dietz, national recognition by Arbor Day Foundation, DM's Right Start event, College Application Resource Seminar information. <i>(Other individuals posted about sports programs, cheerleading, community events, our daily bulletin, etc.)</i>
Quarter 2	100+ (each email might contain more than 1 contact)	100+	50+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Follow-up emails for all tour families (22). Answering questions sent to MC from random interested individuals. Created and emailed Magnet Focus monthly newsletter to all Magnet families (approx. 200 have email addresses) and fielded some questions about items included. Emailed PV Magnet Focus monthly newsletter to Counselors and Admin of feeder middle schools Many Facebook posts made: https://www.facebook.com/PaloVerdeHighMagnetSchool/
Quarter 3/4	200+ (each email might contain more than 1 contact)	100+	50+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Answering questions regarding Future Freshman Night. Emailed Magnet Focus newsletter to Magnet families (approx. 200 have email addresses). Emailed PV Magnet Focus newsletter to Counselors and Admin of various middle schools. Many Facebook posts made: https://www.facebook.com/PaloVerdeHighMagnetSchool/

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report**INTEGRATION**

Totals	400+	250+	150+	
Activity: Retention - Electronic Communication				
Range	Outgoing e-mails	Incoming e-mails	Social media (ie: # posts)	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	100+	~75	50+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emailed Magnet Focus monthly newsletter to all Magnet families (approx. 200 have email addresses) and fielded some questions about items included. Conversations with families regarding programming, schedules, classes, etc. Answered questions regarding Sky School to participants and/or participant families Facebook posts made by MC: School Choice East event, ASU's Sustainability Program, Pima CC partnership with Earn to Learn article, Tech 4 Success, Monsieur Aristide Pessingua visitor for French and ELA classes, Forensics Mock Crime Scene, PV Tree Club Speaking for the Trees, University of Arizona Pell Pledge Grant, Dual Credit Anatomy Class Chemical Reaction Lab, visit to Secrist, visit to Dietz, national recognition by Arbor Day Foundation, DM's Right Start event, College Application Resource Seminar information. <i>(Other individuals posted about sports programs, cheerleading, community events, our daily bulletin, etc.)</i>
Quarter 2	150+	100+	50+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emailed Magnet Focus monthly newsletter to all Magnet families (approx. 200 have email addresses) and fielded some questions about items included. Conversations with families regarding programming, schedules, classes, etc. Answered questions regarding Sky School to participants and/or participant families Facebook posts made by MC: Student of the Quarter assembly, Eastern AZ Band Day, Sky School trip, Drama play (I Hate Shakespeare), UA Band Days, AZ Choral Educator's Fall Choral Festival, TUSD Band Exhibition, PV's Tortoise from Southern AZ's Reptile Rescue and Education Center, Newsletter, Children's Museum event, Construction Career Days (CTE students), High School EXPO, UA Tuition options, PV Teachers' visit to Secrist to promote programs, PV's participation in Erickson STEM night, Jubileers Holiday performance, Jubileers at zoo, PV artwork, PV Holiday music performance for elementary/middle schools, Holiday concert, Tucson Leadership Program for girls.

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

INTEGRATION

Magnet Programs



				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (Other individuals posted about sports programs, cheerleading, community events, our daily bulletin, etc.)
Quarter 3/4	125	50	50	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emailed Magnet Focus monthly newsletter to all Magnet families (approx. 200 have email addresses) and fielded some questions about items included. Conversations with families regarding programming, schedules, classes, etc. for the 2020-2021 school year. Many Facebook posts made: https://www.facebook.com/PaloVerdeHighMagnetSchool/
Totals	375+	~225	150+	



INTEGRATION

RECRUITMENT ACTIVITIES AND EVENTS

Activity: On-Site Recruitment

(For example, open house, classes visiting from feeder schools, student shadowing)

Range	Activity	# of participants	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	Registration Curriculum Night Open House Tours Honor Roll/AP assembly	~40 ~45 ~60 11 25	Families could come to campus, pick up schedules, see campus, etc. Planned for existing families, but tables were set up with information for younger siblings, etc. School-wide Open House night Family/student tours Current families attended, but some brought younger siblings
Quarter 2	School Choice East event Tours Student of Quarter assembly Holiday Program for feeder schools	~100 22 ~45 ~150	Families from east Tucson could come to PV for information about TUSD east side schools. MC provided 22 tours to interested families. Families attended to support their children who were nominated. Students from feeders (Kellond, Wheeler and Dietz) invited to PV for Musical Holiday Performance
Quarter 3/4	Winter Assembly Tours	~150 16	Fine Arts Department performed their Winter Assembly MC provided 16 tours to interested families.
Totals		500+	

Activity: Off-Site Recruitment

(For example, school visits, brochures left at a business or school, fliers posted at community centers. **Do not include District recruitment events**)

Range	Activity	# Brochures/ rack cards distributed	# of responses	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Visit east side middle schools during their lunches 	700+	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Visits to 2-3 middle schools (rotating through east side TUSD middle schools, public and charters) per week approximately 25 flyers and

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

INTEGRATION



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attend DM’s Right Start event – (bi-weekly) Attended Secrist’s Open House night 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5-10 newsletters picked up from students each time. Left 25 flyers on display areas of middle schools during each visit. Also distributed flyers and newsletters every other week to new DM airmen and women during their Right Start event.
Quarter 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MC visited east side middle schools during their lunches Team of PV teachers to Secrist Attend DM’s Right Start event – (bi-weekly) Various off-campus engagements performed by music students Mansfeld STEM Night 	700+	19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Visits to 2-3 middle schools (rotating through east side TUSD middle schools, public and charters) per week approximately 25 flyers and 5-10 newsletters picked up from students each time. Left 25 flyers on display areas of middle schools during each visit. 5 teachers and MC traveled to Secrist to showcase programming to 8th grade students. Also distributed flyers and newsletters every other week to new DM airmen and women during their Right Start event. Performances by Jubileers, Treblettes, Concert Choir, etc. Engineering Teacher and MC attended Mansfeld’s STEM Night on Nov. 19th
Quarter 3/4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some PV teachers and MC traveled to Secrist Middle School Marching Band and Jubileers Choir travel to 3 middle schools MC, students, athletes, and AP attended Fickett’s Mega Night Various STEM Nights 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Entire 8th grade of Secrist All 8th graders at Borman, La Paloma Golf Links, and Secrist 500+ 	45+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PV teachers (Engineering, Film/TV, French, Marine Bio/Biology, Anatomy, Computer Science) traveled to Secrist Middle School to present about their class offerings. All 8th grade students rotated through all stations. Band and Jubileer groups (along with their teachers and MC) traveled to three middle schools to perform. PV attended Fickett’s Mega Night MC attended Steele’s STEM Night MC attended Borman’s STEM Night




Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

INTEGRATION

Totals		2000+	~70	
Activity: Tours				
(Record the number of potential applicants. For example, if one parent comes for a tour with two potential student applicants, count the number as 2. Include shadowing.)				
Range	# Students	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.		
Quarter 1	11	In total, 11 families (each with one child) have come through requesting a tour during the 1 st quarter.		
Quarter 2	22	Twenty-two families (students) have requested a tour of PV during the 2 nd quarter. 8 of these students are of high school age and registered and started at PV.		
Quarter 3/4	18	Eighteen families (students) requested a tour of PV during the 3 rd quarter.		
Totals	51			



INTEGRATION

Retention: Retention: Access the Synergy report “U-STU-2: Daily Enrollment by Student Demographics.” Use your  Snipping Tool to take a screen shot of **Day 40 SY 2017-18, Day 100 SY 2017-18, Day 40 SY 2018-19, and Day 100 SY 2018-19.** Insert the screens in the space below, then fill out the reflection. [HINT: Shrink the Synergy window to 75%. Capture the date on top of the table as well.]

STUDENT RETENTION

Are there any noteworthy differences or trends that you notice when analyzing this data?

Reflection: As a whole, Palo Verde has had a decline in student enrollment over the last few years. That being said, the percentages of the different ethnicities have stayed very constant and we have maintained our integrated status. All ethnic percentages have stayed within 2% of what they’ve been. Many new charter schools have opened over the last few years and some of the students who should attend our school have chosen the charter route for their high school education. Another issue we face is the fact that the middle school enrollment from our main feeders has also declined over the last few years, which means there are less students promoting from a TUSD 8th grade middle school. TUSD Middle School enrollment on day 40 has been as follows (2016=6782, 2017=6663, 2018=6588, 2019=6472). One of our main feeders (Booth-Fickett) has also had a steady decline of 8th graders over the last four years (2016=219, 2017=210, 2018=148, 2019=150). We are hopeful that these numbers will being to increase again due to full staffing of teachers.

**Daily Enrollment by Grade, Gender and USP Ethnicity
 620 - Palo Verde High Magnet School**

On: 09/28/2017 (Day 40 SY 2017-18)

Grade	White/Anglo		African American		Hispanic		Native American		Asian American		Multi-racial		Total		
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	Total
08	1	0	1	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	2	8
	12.5%	0.0%	12.5%	0.0%	37.5%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.5%	0.0%	75.0%	25.0%	
09	17	39	21	16	50	62	2	2	5	2	4	9	99	130	229
	7.4%	17.0%	9.2%	7.0%	21.8%	27.1%	0.9%	0.9%	2.2%	0.9%	1.7%	3.9%	43.2%	56.8%	
10	33	32	23	36	75	79	3	2	6	7	4	5	144	161	305
	10.8%	10.5%	7.5%	11.8%	24.6%	25.9%	1.0%	0.7%	2.0%	2.3%	1.3%	1.6%	47.2%	52.8%	
11	36	39	30	41	79	89	0	7	7	10	14	5	166	191	357
	10.1%	10.9%	8.4%	11.5%	22.1%	24.9%	0.0%	2.0%	2.0%	2.8%	3.9%	1.4%	46.5%	53.5%	
12	29	32	25	20	61	52	0	2	2	4	6	6	123	116	239
	12.1%	13.4%	10.5%	8.4%	25.5%	21.8%	0.0%	0.8%	0.8%	1.7%	2.5%	2.5%	51.5%	48.5%	
Total	116	142	100	113	268	284	5	13	20	23	29	25	538	600	1138
	10.2%	12.5%	8.8%	9.9%	23.6%	25.0%	0.4%	1.1%	1.8%	2.0%	2.5%	2.2%	47.3%	52.7%	
	258		213		552		18		43		54		1138		
	22.7%		18.7%		48.5%		1.6%		3.8%		4.7%		100.0%		

**Daily Enrollment by Grade, Gender and USP Ethnicity
 620 - Palo Verde High Magnet School**

On: 01/19/2018 (Day 100 SY 2017-18)

Grade	White/Anglo		African American		Hispanic		Native American		Asian American		Multi-racial		Total		
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	Total
08	1	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	2	7
	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	42.9%	28.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	71.4%	28.6%	
09	17	37	21	16	43	58	2	1	4	2	5	8	92	122	214
	7.9%	17.3%	9.8%	7.5%	20.1%	27.1%	0.9%	0.5%	1.9%	0.9%	2.3%	3.7%	43.0%	57.0%	
10	30	34	19	37	63	73	3	0	6	6	4	5	125	155	280
	10.7%	12.1%	6.8%	13.2%	22.5%	26.1%	1.1%	0.0%	2.1%	2.1%	1.4%	1.8%	44.6%	55.4%	
11	30	38	28	38	72	80	0	7	7	7	13	4	150	174	324
	9.3%	11.7%	8.6%	11.7%	22.2%	24.7%	0.0%	2.2%	2.2%	2.2%	4.0%	1.2%	46.3%	53.7%	
12	30	29	24	17	59	47	0	2	1	4	6	6	120	105	225
	13.3%	12.9%	10.7%	7.6%	26.2%	20.9%	0.0%	0.9%	0.4%	1.8%	2.7%	2.7%	53.3%	46.7%	
Total	108	138	92	108	240	260	5	10	18	19	29	23	492	558	1050
	10.3%	13.1%	8.8%	10.3%	22.9%	24.8%	0.5%	1.0%	1.7%	1.8%	2.8%	2.2%	46.9%	53.1%	
	246		210		500		15		27		32		1050		
	22.9%		19.0%		47.8%		1.4%		2.5%		2.9%		100.0%		



INTEGRATION

**Daily Enrollment by Grade, Gender and USP Ethnicity
 620 - Palo Verde High Magnet School**

On: 09/27/2018 (Day 40 SY 2018-19)

Grade	White/Anglo		African American		Hispanic		Native American		Asian American		Multi-racial		Total		Total
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	
09	27	34	16	19	43	57	1	0	3	4	6	4	96	118	214
	12.6%	15.9%	7.5%	8.9%	20.1%	26.6%	0.5%	0.0%	1.4%	1.9%	2.8%	1.9%	44.9%	55.1%	
10	19	36	23	16	42	49	2	1	4	3	4	5	94	110	204
	9.3%	17.6%	11.3%	7.8%	20.6%	24.0%	1.0%	0.5%	2.0%	1.5%	2.0%	2.5%	46.1%	53.9%	
11	29	29	25	37	62	67	2	2	4	5	4	5	126	145	271
	10.7%	10.7%	9.2%	13.7%	22.9%	24.7%	0.7%	0.7%	1.5%	1.8%	1.5%	1.8%	46.5%	53.5%	
12	34	34	23	36	66	72	0	5	7	5	15	4	145	156	301
	11.3%	11.3%	7.6%	12.0%	21.9%	23.9%	0.0%	1.7%	2.3%	1.7%	5.0%	1.3%	48.2%	51.8%	
Total	109	133	87	108	213	245	5	8	18	17	29	18	461	529	990
	11.0%	13.4%	8.8%	10.9%	21.5%	24.7%	0.5%	0.8%	1.8%	1.7%	2.9%	1.8%	46.6%	53.4%	

**Daily Enrollment by Grade, Gender and USP Ethnicity
 620 - Palo Verde High Magnet School**

On: 01/17/2019 (Day 100 SY 2018-19)

Grade	White/Anglo		African American		Hispanic		Native American		Asian American		Multi-racial		Total		Total
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	
09	29	30	18	17	41	56	2	0	5	3	5	4	100	110	210
	13.8%	14.3%	8.6%	8.1%	19.5%	26.7%	1.0%	0.0%	2.4%	1.4%	2.4%	1.9%	47.6%	52.4%	
10	17	33	21	15	36	48	2	1	3	3	4	5	83	105	188
	9.0%	17.6%	11.2%	8.0%	19.1%	25.5%	1.1%	0.5%	1.6%	1.6%	2.1%	2.7%	44.1%	55.9%	
11	27	29	27	34	68	64	2	2	4	5	5	6	133	140	273
	9.9%	10.6%	9.9%	12.5%	24.9%	23.4%	0.7%	0.7%	1.5%	1.8%	1.8%	2.2%	48.7%	51.3%	
12	33	30	20	34	64	66	0	5	7	5	11	4	135	144	279
	11.8%	10.8%	7.2%	12.2%	22.9%	23.7%	0.0%	1.8%	2.5%	1.8%	3.9%	1.4%	48.4%	51.6%	
Total	106	122	86	100	209	234	6	8	19	16	25	19	451	499	950
	11.2%	12.8%	9.1%	10.5%	22.0%	24.6%	0.6%	0.8%	2.0%	1.7%	2.6%	2.0%	47.5%	52.5%	

**Daily Enrollment by Grade, Gender and USP Ethnicity
 620 - Palo Verde High Magnet School**

On: 09/26/2019 (Day 40 SY 2019-20)

Grade	White/Anglo		African American		Hispanic		Native American		Asian American		Multi-racial		Total		Total
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	
09	22	26	21	11	27	57	1	2	3	2	3	4	77	102	179
	12.3%	14.5%	11.7%	6.1%	15.1%	31.8%	0.6%	1.1%	1.7%	1.1%	1.7%	2.2%	43.0%	57.0%	
10	27	28	20	16	34	46	2	0	4	2	4	4	91	96	187
	14.4%	15.0%	10.7%	8.6%	18.2%	24.6%	1.1%	0.0%	2.1%	1.1%	2.1%	2.1%	48.7%	51.3%	
11	15	25	23	14	30	38	1	2	3	2	4	5	76	86	162
	9.3%	15.4%	14.2%	8.6%	18.5%	23.5%	0.6%	1.2%	1.9%	1.2%	2.5%	3.1%	46.9%	53.1%	
12	28	34	21	31	60	67	2	2	5	4	3	6	119	144	263
	10.6%	12.9%	8.0%	11.8%	22.8%	25.5%	0.8%	0.8%	1.9%	1.5%	1.1%	2.3%	45.2%	54.8%	
Total	92	113	85	72	151	208	6	6	15	10	14	19	363	428	791
	11.6%	14.3%	10.7%	9.1%	19.1%	26.3%	0.8%	0.8%	1.9%	1.3%	1.8%	2.4%	45.9%	54.1%	
	205		157		359		12		25		33		791		
	25.9%		19.8%		45.4%		1.5%		3.2%		4.2%		100.0%		

**Daily Enrollment by Grade, Gender and USP Ethnicity
 620 - Palo Verde High Magnet School**

On: 01/16/2020 (Day 100 SY 2019-20)

Grade	White/Anglo		African American		Hispanic		Native American		Asian American		Multi-racial		Total		Total
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	
09	19	24	20	10	26	49	1	2	3	2	2	3	71	90	161
	11.8%	14.9%	12.4%	6.2%	16.1%	30.4%	0.6%	1.2%	1.9%	1.2%	1.2%	1.9%	44.1%	55.9%	
10	25	23	20	14	31	46	2	0	4	2	5	4	87	89	176
	14.2%	13.1%	11.4%	8.0%	17.6%	26.1%	1.1%	0.0%	2.3%	1.1%	2.8%	2.3%	49.4%	50.6%	
11	14	27	23	15	31	37	1	0	3	2	4	5	76	86	162
	8.6%	16.7%	14.2%	9.3%	19.1%	22.8%	0.6%	0.0%	1.9%	1.2%	2.5%	3.1%	46.9%	53.1%	
12	28	29	22	33	56	62	2	2	5	4	3	6	116	136	252
	11.1%	11.5%	8.7%	13.1%	22.2%	24.6%	0.8%	0.8%	2.0%	1.6%	1.2%	2.4%	46.0%	54.0%	
Total	86	103	85	72	144	194	6	4	15	10	14	18	350	401	751
	11.5%	13.7%	11.3%	9.6%	19.2%	25.8%	0.8%	0.5%	2.0%	1.3%	1.9%	2.4%	46.6%	53.4%	
	189		157		338		10		25		32		751		
	25.2%		20.9%		45.0%		1.3%		3.3%		4.3%		100.0%		



MAGNET 2019-20

SCHOOL LEVEL QUARTERLY REPORT

SCHOOL NAME: Roskruge Bilingual Magnet K-8

MAGNET THEME(S): Dual Language

MAGNET LEADERSHIP TEAM MEMBERS

NAME	TITLE
Yvonne Torres	Principal
Clarinda Rubio	Magnet Coordinator
Nora Jaramillo	Assistant Principal
DoraLee Quintero	Counselor
Cassandra Martinez	Cross Curriculum Specialist Teacher
Marvin Beckwith	Behavior Interventionist
Lourdes Cirerol	5 th Gr. Teacher
Daniel Manship	6 th Gr. Social Studies Teacher
Carmen Griffin	8 th Gr. Science Teacher

MAGNET LEADERSHIP TEAM MEETINGS

DATE	# MINUTES MET
Aug. 21 st , 2019	40
Sept. 18 th , 2019	45
Oct. 14 th , 2019	35
Oct. 28 th , 2019	30
Nov. 12 th , 2019	45
Nov. 26 th , 2019	35
Dec. 2 nd , 2019	30
Dec. 9 th , 2019	35
Dec. 18 th , 2019	40
Jan. 7 th , 2020	35
Jan. 28 th , 2020	45
Feb. 4 th , 2020	30
Feb. 25 th , 2020	40
March 3 rd , 2020	35
March 10 th , 2020	25
March 12 th , 2020	30



Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

INTEGRATION

Recruitment: Record actions that taken this quarter to support your integration goal. Include tours, phone inquiries, mailings, school visits, other recruitment activities conducted by your site. Include District recruitment events and mailings that were specific to your magnet program. Insert additional lines as needed. Keep appropriate documentation (recruitment log) on site for review.

COMMUNICATION

Activity: Recruitment Mailings/Fliers

(Record the # of school/district generated magnet mailings. Examples: 100 surveys to neighborhood parents, 500 open house postcards. Dropping off fliers at schools counts as mailings.)

Range	# Mailings/ Fliers	# of responses	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	50	64	Davis Bilingual Magnet 5 th gr. "pipeline" parent meeting flier
Quarter 2	100 500	15 35	Flyers at University of Arizona, two daycare centers Labeled 500 pieces of candy for Boo Bash with our school name, address, phone number, website and label.
Quarter 3/4	55	8	The Community Schools and Preschool Programs Department at Schumaker and Brichta Elementary Schools.
Totals	705	122	

Activity: Recruitment Related Phone Calls

Range	#	# ParentLink (recruitment)	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	7	2 (Davis)	Called parents from lists of family engagement sign-in sheet, Davis Bilingual Magnet ParentLink (parent meeting & pipeline letter)
Quarter 2	38		Called parents from lists of event sign-in sheets.
Quarter 3/4	62	1 (Davis)	Called parents from 2020-2021 School Placement Report that had been offered placement and had not made a decision. Davis ParentLink reminder for the parents of 5 th graders that had submitted pipeline letter to complete online registration.
Totals	107	3	

Activity: Retention Related Phone Calls/Mailings/Fliers

Range	#	# ParentLink (retention)	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1		11	Upcoming school events/information: school survey, open house early dismissal, rainy day schedule,



MAGNET 2019-20

SCHOOL LEVEL QUARTERLY REPORT

SCHOOL NAME: Tucson High Magnet School	MAGNET THEME(S): Fine and Performing Arts; Natural Science
---	---

MAGNET LEADERSHIP TEAM MEMBERS	
NAME	TITLE
Shawna Rodriguez	Principal
Kathleen Erickson	Magnet Coordinator
Mariel Hall	Magnet Counselor
Steven Martinez	Instructional Data Coach
Annessia Gutierrez	Admin. Office Manager
Kristina Grebloski	Curriculum Service Provider
Michelle Gower	Curriculum Service Provider

MAGNET LEADERSHIP TEAM MEETINGS	
DATE	# MINUTES MET
Budget meeting scheduled every Monday at 2:30 pm (August 5,12,19,26; September 9,16,23,30; October 14,21,28; November 4, 18, 25, December 2,9,16; January 6,13,27; February 3,10,17,24; March 2 and 9 th) Principal, Magnet Coordinator, Magnet Counselor, and Admin Assistant meet to discuss magnet issues including budget. Other members of Magnet Leadership team attend depending on agenda)	30-60 minutes
Magnet meeting every Monday at 3:00 following budget meeting; Principal, Magnet Coordinator, and Magnet Counselor discuss recruitment, current magnet student issues, magnet reports, magnet award status, etc. Other members of Magnet Leadership team attend depending on agenda. Dates are as listed above.	30-60 minutes
Instructional Council (comprised of Administration, Magnet team, and department chairs) meets every Tuesday at 2:00 Topics discussed include professional development,	1.5 hours, depending on current events on campus magnet issues may be discussed between 20 minutes to the entire time.

MAGNET 2019-20

SCHOOL LEVEL QUARTERLY REPORT

Magnet Programs



concerns from faculty and administration, celebrations, and all magnet issues including recruiting, retention, and status of magnet students and programs.	



Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

INTEGRATION

Recruitment: Record actions taken this quarter to support your integration goal. Include tours, phone inquiries, mailings, school visits, other recruitment activities conducted by your site. Include District recruitment events and mailings that were specific to your magnet program. Insert additional lines as needed. Keep appropriate documentation (recruitment log) on site for review.

COMMUNICATION

Activity: Recruitment Mailings/Fliers

(Record the # of school/district generated magnet mailings. Examples: 100 surveys to neighborhood parents, 500 open house postcards. Dropping off fliers at schools counts as mailings.)

Range	# Mailings/ Fliers	# of responses	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	125	5	Over 100 flyers were distributed at Khalsa, Dodge, and Magee Middle schools during magnet themed workshops that were conducted during instructional hours. Magnet Coordinator, Magnet Counselor, and Science teacher attended the Khalsa Montessori School High School information night.
Quarter 2	5,496	Over 300 families at Magnet Open House	During the first week of October, postcards were sent through the U.S. Post Office to TUSD and non-TUSD 8 th grade families inviting them to Tucson High's Magnet Open House held on October 30 th . Over 80 teachers, 7 counselors and administration were on campus to help recruit families to Tucson High Magnet School for the 2020-21 school year.
Quarter 3/4	703	125+ families attended New Student Night	During the last week of January, letters were sent through the U.S. Post Office held on February 11. The purpose of this event is to help incoming students select course for the 2020-21 school year. 2-3 teachers from each department, 7 counselors and administration were on site to answer questions regarding course selection choices/placement.
Totals	6,324	430+	

Activity: Recruitment Related Phone Calls

Range	#	# ParentLink (recruitment)	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	23	0	Magnet Coordinator and Magnet Counselor spoke with families interested in touring Tucson High and the date for our Magnet Open House.
Quarter 2	59	500+	Middle School principals were requested to place ParentLink calls related to Magnet Open House; Magnet Coordinator and Magnet Counselor fielded phone calls regarding Magnet Open House, tours, middle school workshops. Theatre teachers took ticket reservations for 2 nd quarter



Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

INTEGRATION

			performances. Music and dance teachers returned phone calls regarding 2 nd quarter performances.
Quarter 3/4	67	500+	Middle School principals were requested to place ParentLink calls related to the THMS New Student Night held on February 11. Magnet Coordinator and Magnet Counselor fielded phone calls regarding New Student Night, tours, middle school workshops, and the magnet application and lottery processes. Theatre teachers took advance reservations for upcoming 4 th quarter play. Music and dance teachers returned phone calls regarding 3 rd quarter performances.
Totals	149	1,000+	

Activity: Retention Related Phone Calls

Range	#	# ParentLink (retention)	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	10	8 Parent Link phone calls x 3,300 students = 26,400 families	Magnet Coordinator and Magnet Counselor spoke with current families who had issues with their student's 2019-20 schedule. Most of this correspondence is below under electronic communication. Tucson High principal regularly places ParentLink phone calls to inform current families about schedule changes, Back to School Night, Parent/Teacher conferences, progress reports and final grade deadlines, etc.
Quarter 2	38	8 Parent Link phone calls x 3,225 students = 25,800	Magnet Coordinator and Magnet Counselor spoke with current families regarding classes, teachers, etc., for the 2019-20 school year. Most is through electronic correspondence listed below. Tucson High principal regularly places ParentLink phone calls regarding security issues, holiday break reminders, fundraisers, etc. With each ParentLink phone call the principal reaches approximately 3,225 families.
Quarter 3/4	32	8 Parent Link phone calls x 3,200 students = 25,600	Magnet Coordinator and Magnet Counselor spoke with current families regarding classes and course selection process for the 2020-21 school year. Most is through electronic correspondence listed below. Tucson High principal regularly places ParentLink phone calls regarding security issues, holiday break reminders, performances, fundraisers, Parent Teacher conferences, etc. With each ParentLink phone call the principal reaches approximately 3,200 families. (enrollment down slightly at the beginning of 3 rd quarter)
Totals	80	77,800	



INTEGRATION

Activity: Recruitment - Electronic Communication				
Range	Outgoing e-mails	Incoming e-mails	Social media (ie: # posts)	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	175	55	45	Magnet Coordinator posts at least weekly on Tucson High Magnet Programs FB page. Magnet teachers post frequently on their own Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, and SnapChat accounts. Emails were sent to district and charter/private middle schools offering workshops in classrooms related to the THMS magnet themes. Magnet Counselor and Magnet Coordinator responded to emails requesting tours, information about Magnet Open House, and Open Enrollment application questions.
Quarter 2	413	247	92	See description for Quarter 1. Emails increased due to questions regarding Magnet Open House, Open Enrollment/Magnet application process, scheduling tours, etc. Social media posts increased due to performance advertisements, Magnet Open House flyers on various websites, etc.
Quarter 3/4	809	324	100+	Emails included information regarding New Student Night; Open Enrollment/Magnet application questions; questions regarding course selection/registration process for the 2020-2021 school year. Magnet Coordinator and Magnet Counselor emailed families individually as they were accepted through the Open Enrollment process. Families began emailing student course selection sheet to Magnet Counselor for entry. Reflections from Quarter 1 also apply.
Totals	1,397	626	237+	

Activity: Retention - Electronic Communication				
Range	Outgoing e-mails	Incoming e-mails	Social media (ie: # posts)	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	325	326	47	Due to an increase in magnet students who received acceptance letters days before the first day of school, the THMS Magnet Counselor and Magnet Coordinator were inundated with questions regarding course selection, registration, etc. Magnet Coordinator sent out Magnet Newsletter to all families with ParentVue accounts. Magnet Coordinator and magnet teachers posted on various social media platforms.

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report**INTEGRATION**

Magnet Programs



Quarter 2	6,400	50 +-	75+	Magnet Coordinator and Magnet Counselor send Magnet newsletters to current families highlighting specific students as well as successes related to magnet programs twice per quarter. By 2 nd quarter, most families have established relationships with teachers and students have settled into schedules so retention email is not as high. Magnet Counselor communicated with current magnet parents regarding classroom issues. Magnet Coordinator and teachers posted on various THMS Facebook and Instagram accounts regarding performances, Magnet Open House, etc. (and obviously these posts were shared to many other sites by parents, students and schools)
Quarter 3/4	6,400+	200+	75+	Magnet Coordinator and Magnet Counselor sent Magnet newsletters to current families highlighting specific students, magnet programs successes, and important upcoming dates, twice per quarter. (3,200 families x 2 = 6,400) During 3 rd quarter retention emails focus on questions regarding the course selection process for current families occurring at the end of January/beginning of February. Magnet Coordinator and magnet teachers post on various THMS Facebook, Instagram and Twitter account regarding performances and fundraisers, New Student Night, Parent/Teacher conferences, etc. Magnet teachers posted on various THMS Facebook, Instagram and Twitter accounts regarding performances, science competitions, etc. (and obviously these are re-posted at an exponential level)
Totals	13,126	576+	197+	



INTEGRATION

RECRUITMENT ACTIVITIES AND EVENTS

Activity: On-Site Recruitment

(For example, open house, classes visiting from feeder schools, student shadowing)

Range	Activity	# of participants	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	3 events	410	El Grito performance by Folklorico and Mariachi programs in auditorium; Choir concert in auditorium; Magnet Coordinators meeting including tour at THMS.
Quarter 2	13 events: Magnet Open House; “Dog Lady” in Little Theatre; Steel Drums, Orchestra, Choir, Mariachi, Guitar, Piano, Marching Band, Jazz Band, Dance and Folklorico concerts all held in Auditorium during 2 nd quarter. Tucson High Orchestra also hosted the ABODA conference and competition in October.	5,000 +	In addition to Magnet Open House and Fine Arts performances on the THMS campus, all musical groups participated in fall and holiday community events such as Mariachi Conference in Las Cruces, N.M.; Parade of Lights; Winterhaven Festival of Lights; Tohono Chul Luminarias Christmas Lights; Las Posadas celebrations; senior citizen and nursing home performances, etc. In October, Tucson High Orchestra hosted an orchestra conference and competition that brought hundreds of Tucson area orchestra students to our campus.
Quarter 3/4	11 events: New Student Night; Parent Teacher conferences, Curriculum Night, Band, Choir, Steel Drums, Dance, and Folklorico concerts all held in Auditorium during 3 rd quarter. Orchestra and Choir departments hosted State competitions on the	4,500+	In addition to New Student Night for incoming families and Fine Art performances in the auditorium open to the THMS and general community, THMS hosted the Southern Arizona Music competition on its campus. THMS Counselors hosted a Curriculum Night for families to answer questions regarding 2020-21 course selection choices for current students. Parent Teacher conferences occurred on February 13 th . And on February 7, the Tucson High Magnet School Parent/Teacher Association hosted its annual Fine Arts fundraiser “Get Sweet” which raises money for the performing arts classes.



Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

INTEGRATION

	THMS campus. And on February 7 the Tucson High Magnet School Parent/Teacher Association hosted “Get Sweet” a performance fundraiser for the Fine Arts programs.		
Totals	16	9,910+	

Activity: Off-Site Recruitment
 (For example, school visits, brochures left at a business or school, fliers posted at community centers. **Do not include District recruitment events**)

Range	Activity	# Brochures/ rack cards distributed	# of responses	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	Middle School Workshops (4)	235	12	Magnet-themed workshops held at Khalsa, Magee and Dodge Middle Schools. Two workshops were held at Dodge during 1 st quarter.
Quarter 2	High School Information Nights/Lunches at: Math and Science Success Academy; Pistor; St. Michael’s Day School; Academy of Math and Science; Southside Community School and Imago Dei Middle School. Fine Arts or Science Workshops at: Dodge (3x) Khalsa, Magee, and Utterback. (12)	800	This number is reflected in number of tours, phone calls, and emails.	Tucson High continues to maintain active relationships with TUSD and non-TUSD middle and high schools
Quarter 3/4	High School Information Nights at: Mansfeld and Booth-Fickett Middle	100+	Reflected in tours, phone calls	Magnet Coordinator and Magnet Counselor attended STEM night at Mansfeld and MEGA night at Booth-Fickett middle schools. Magnet Coordinator and Magnet Counselor accompanied Tucson High Science



Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

INTEGRATION


	Schools; Science workshop at: Khalsa Montessori School (3)		and emails.	teacher as he conducted a Science lab with 8 th grade students at Khalsa Montessori School.
Totals	19	1,135+	12 +	
Activity: Tours				
(Record the number of potential applicants. For example, if one parent comes for a tour with two potential student applicants, count the number as 2. Include shadowing.)				
Range	# Students	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.		
Quarter 1	6	Tours were given to students from Catalina Foothills School District; students from Khalsa, Satori and Paulo Friere charter schools, and students from TUSD middle schools.		
Quarter 2	25; 100+; 20	25 tours were given by the Magnet Coordinator and/or the Magnet Counselor; over 100 families were given tours by THMS Student Council and National Honor Society students the evening of Tucson High Magnet Open House; 20 students Drachman Montessori 8 th graders toured the campus who visited Orchestra class. Tours included TUSD students as well as students currently enrolled at Khalsa Montessori, San Miguel High School, Lehman Academy, Sonoran Science Academy, BASIS, and Catalina Foothills and Sunnyside school district middle and high schools.		
Quarter 3/4	38; 4	38 tours were given by the Magnet Coordinator and/or Magnet Counselor to families from TUSD middle schools as well as Paulo Friere Charter School, The Gregory School, Lemman Academy, Southside Community School, Mother of Sorrows Catholic School, Tanque Verde High School and Marana High School. Some of these tours were conducted in Spanish by the Magnet Counselor. Magnet Coordinator and Magnet Counselor gave a tour to 4 educators visiting from South Korea accompanied by their translator.		
Totals	193+			

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

INTEGRATION

Magnet Programs



Retention: Access the Synergy report “U-STU-2: Daily Enrollment by Student Demographics.” **ENTRY GRADE / ALL GRADES** Use your  Snipping Tool to take a screen shot of **Day 40 SY 2018-19, Day 100 SY 2018-19, Day 40 SY 2019-20, and Day 100 SY 2019-20**. Insert the screens in the space below, then fill out the reflection. [HINT: Shrink the Synergy window to 75%. Capture the date on top of the table as well.]



Date: 9/27/2018 3:10:44 PM

Daily Enrollment by Grade, Gender and USP Ethnicity

660 - Tucson High Magnet School

On: 09/27/2018 (Day 40 SY 2018-19)

Grade	White/Anglo		African American		Hispanic		Native American		Asian American		Multi-racial		Total		Total
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	
09	58	74	45	35	266	282	28	30	11	11	19	16	427	448	875
	6.6%	8.5%	5.1%	4.0%	30.4%	32.2%	3.2%	3.4%	1.3%	1.3%	2.2%	1.8%	48.8%	51.2%	
10	69	66	41	37	291	267	17	12	8	5	11	11	437	398	835
	8.3%	7.9%	4.9%	4.4%	34.9%	32.0%	2.0%	1.4%	1.0%	0.6%	1.3%	1.3%	52.3%	47.7%	
11	65	57	43	30	222	243	13	12	4	5	9	9	356	356	712
	9.1%	8.0%	6.0%	4.2%	31.2%	34.1%	1.8%	1.7%	0.6%	0.7%	1.3%	1.3%	50.0%	50.0%	
12	54	48	28	22	270	259	12	6	9	5	11	7	384	347	731
	7.4%	6.6%	3.8%	3.0%	36.9%	35.4%	1.6%	0.8%	1.2%	0.7%	1.5%	1.0%	52.5%	47.5%	
Total	246	245	157	124	1049	1051	70	60	32	26	50	43	1604	1549	3153
	7.8%	7.8%	5.0%	3.9%	33.3%	33.3%	2.2%	1.9%	1.0%	0.8%	1.6%	1.4%	50.9%	49.1%	
	491		281		2100		130		58		93		3153		
	15.6%		8.9%		66.6%		4.1%		1.8%		2.9%		100.0%		

INTEGRATION



TUCSON UNIFIED
SCHOOL DISTRICT

Date: 9/27/2019 3:01:25 PM

Daily Enrollment by Grade, Gender and USP Ethnicity

660 - Tucson High Magnet School

On: 01/17/2019 (Day 100 SY 2018-19)

Grade	White/Anglo		African American		Hispanic		Native American		Asian American		Multi-racial		Total		Total
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	
09	59	74	42	34	257	271	31	26	10	11	18	16	417	432	849
	6.9%	8.7%	4.9%	4.0%	30.3%	31.9%	3.7%	3.1%	1.2%	1.3%	2.1%	1.9%	49.1%	50.9%	
10	67	66	40	33	281	253	16	11	8	6	10	11	422	380	802
	8.4%	8.2%	5.0%	4.1%	35.0%	31.5%	2.0%	1.4%	1.0%	0.7%	1.2%	1.4%	52.6%	47.4%	
11	65	57	40	25	213	226	14	12	4	4	9	6	345	330	675
	9.6%	8.4%	5.9%	3.7%	31.6%	33.5%	2.1%	1.8%	0.6%	0.6%	1.3%	0.9%	51.1%	48.9%	
12	49	44	25	21	253	249	10	6	9	5	10	7	356	332	688
	7.1%	6.4%	3.6%	3.1%	36.8%	36.2%	1.5%	0.9%	1.3%	0.7%	1.5%	1.0%	51.7%	48.3%	
Total	240	241	147	113	1004	999	71	55	31	26	47	40	1540	1474	3014
	8.0%	8.0%	4.9%	3.7%	33.3%	33.1%	2.4%	1.8%	1.0%	0.9%	1.6%	1.3%	51.1%	48.9%	
	481		260		2003		126		57		87		3014		
	16.0%		8.6%		66.5%		4.2%		1.9%		2.9%		100.0%		

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

INTEGRATION

Magnet Programs



TUCSON UNIFIED
SCHOOL DISTRICT

Date: 9/27/2019 3:14:27 PM

Daily Enrollment by Grade, Gender and USP Ethnicity

660 - Tucson High Magnet School

On: 09/26/2019 (Day 40 SY 2019-20)

Grade	White/Anglo		African American		Hispanic		Native American		Asian American		Multi-racial		Total		
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	Total
09	72	65	39	39	343	326	28	21	3	4	18	19	503	474	977
	7.4%	6.7%	4.0%	4.0%	35.1%	33.4%	2.9%	2.1%	0.3%	0.4%	1.8%	1.9%	51.5%	48.5%	
10	67	65	40	35	255	279	24	26	9	11	16	16	411	432	843
	7.9%	7.7%	4.7%	4.2%	30.2%	33.1%	2.8%	3.1%	1.1%	1.3%	1.9%	1.9%	48.8%	51.2%	
11	66	66	33	32	282	243	15	12	7	7	12	9	415	369	784
	8.4%	8.4%	4.2%	4.1%	36.0%	31.0%	1.9%	1.5%	0.9%	0.9%	1.5%	1.1%	52.9%	47.1%	
12	68	57	43	25	219	236	15	15	6	5	9	7	360	345	705
	9.6%	8.1%	6.1%	3.5%	31.1%	33.5%	2.1%	2.1%	0.9%	0.7%	1.3%	1.0%	51.1%	48.9%	
Total	273	253	155	131	1099	1084	82	74	25	27	55	51	1689	1620	3309
	8.3%	7.6%	4.7%	4.0%	33.2%	32.8%	2.5%	2.2%	0.8%	0.8%	1.7%	1.5%	51.0%	49.0%	
	526		286		2183		156		52		106		3309		
	15.9%		8.6%		66.0%		4.7%		1.6%		3.2%		100.0%		

INTEGRATION



Daily Enrollment by Grade, Gender and USP Ethnicity

660 - Tucson High Magnet School

On: 01/16/2020 (Day 100 SY 2019-20)

Grade	White/Anglo		African American		Hispanic		Native American		Asian American		Multi-racial		Total		Total
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	
09	72	62	36	40	332	324	23	17	2	4	18	19	483	466	949
	7.6%	6.5%	3.8%	4.2%	35.0%	34.1%	2.4%	1.8%	0.2%	0.4%	1.9%	2.0%	50.9%	49.1%	
10	63	64	38	33	248	273	25	23	8	12	15	16	397	421	818
	7.7%	7.8%	4.6%	4.0%	30.3%	33.4%	3.1%	2.8%	1.0%	1.5%	1.8%	2.0%	48.5%	51.5%	
11	68	63	31	26	277	236	13	12	9	10	11	9	409	356	765
	8.9%	8.2%	4.1%	3.4%	36.2%	30.8%	1.7%	1.6%	1.2%	1.3%	1.4%	1.2%	53.5%	46.5%	
12	66	54	43	26	215	232	14	15	6	5	8	6	352	338	690
	9.6%	7.8%	6.2%	3.8%	31.2%	33.6%	2.0%	2.2%	0.9%	0.7%	1.2%	0.9%	51.0%	49.0%	
Total	269	243	148	125	1072	1065	75	67	25	31	52	50	1641	1581	3222
	8.3%	7.5%	4.6%	3.9%	33.3%	33.1%	2.3%	2.1%	0.8%	1.0%	1.6%	1.6%	50.9%	49.1%	
	512		273		2137		142		56		102		3222		
	15.9%		8.5%		66.3%		4.4%		1.7%		3.2%		100.0%		

STUDENT RETENTION

Are there any noteworthy differences or trends that you notice when analyzing this data?

Reflection Quarter 1: The Tucson High whole school enrollment continues to increase. Despite the increase of students, Tucson High remains integrated in accordance with the requirements of the Unitary Status Plan. However, due to the district’s decision to accept more 9th grade magnet students during the 2019-20 school year (an increase of 102 9th graders from the 2018-19 school year) the 2019-20 9th grade class is not as integrated as the 2018-19 9th grade class. (68.5% Hispanic v. 62.6%) This trend must be monitored to ensure Tucson High’s integrated status.

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report**INTEGRATION**

Magnet Programs



Reflection Quarter 2: On the 100th day of this school year, Tucson High enrollment is down 87 students from the 40th day of this school year. At the end of 1st semester Tucson High historically has students leaving as well as students transferring in from University High School, Catalina Foothills School District, etc. Although the overall school enrollment is integrated at 66.3% Hispanic, the freshman class is inching closer to being racially concentrated. 40th day data from this school year has the 9th grade class at 68.5% Hispanic; the 100th day data reflects the 9th grade class at 69.1% Hispanic. The 2018-19 9th grade class on the 40th day reflected 62.6% Hispanic with 100th day data reflecting 9th grade Hispanic enrollment at 62.2%. Total enrollment from 2018-19 to 2019-20 enrollment on the 100th day is up 208 students. This is only the 3rd school year Tucson High has been able to claim integrated status due to targeted recruitment, weighted applications based on ethnicity, and a waiting list for Tucson High Magnet School acceptance.

MAGNET 2019-20

SCHOOL LEVEL QUARTERLY REPORT



SCHOOL NAME: Tully	MAGNET THEME(S): GATE
---------------------------	------------------------------

MAGNET LEADERSHIP TEAM MEMBERS	
NAME	TITLE
Sean Wilken	Principal
Michelle McCollum	Magnet Coordinator
Bob Huey	Math Interventionist
Jeffrey Proctor	Counselor
Anthony Goreta	5 th Grade Teacher
Jessica Harwood	1-2 ELD Teacher
Deb Dietrich	1 st Grade Teacher
Alexandra DeVaughn	2 nd Grade Teacher
Jeff Simpson	OMA Teacher

MAGNET LEADERSHIP TEAM MEETINGS	
DATE	# MINUTES MET
6/24/19	20
7/16/19	20
9/24/19	30
10/2/10	60
10/15/19	30
11/20/19	30
12/4/19	45
12/20/19	45
1/8/20	30
1/15/20	45
1/29/20	20
2/12/20	45
4/4-5/20 Leadership meetings will occur Via Zoom every Friday morning	60 are scheduled for these meetings



INTEGRATION

Recruitment: Record actions taken this quarter to support your integration goal. Include tours, phone inquiries, mailings, school visits, other recruitment activities conducted by your site. Include District recruitment events and mailings that were specific to your magnet program. Insert additional lines as needed. Keep appropriate documentation (recruitment log) on site for review.

COMMUNICATION

Activity: Recruitment Mailings/Fliers

(Record the # of school/district generated magnet mailings. Examples: 100 surveys to neighborhood parents, 500 open house postcards. Dropping off fliers at schools counts as mailings.)

Range	# Mailings/ Fliers	# of responses	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	40	4	Dropped off fliers to Brichta early Learning Center and Little Angels Pre-school
Quarter 2	0	0	
Quarter 3/4	87	4	Dropped off fliers to attend our Star Party with U of A scientist.
Totals	127	8	

Activity: Recruitment Related Phone Calls

Range	#	# ParentLink (recruitment)	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	12	0	Magnet Coordinator followed up with a phone call to 7 parents/guardians who called for information and 5 phone calls to parents who gave me their information at district recruitment events.
Quarter 2	22	0	Magnet Coordinator followed up with phone calls from interested parents who attended the district recruitment fairs.
Quarter 3/4	31	2	Followed up with contacts from recruitment events
Totals	65	2	

Activity: Retention Related Phone Calls

Range	#	# ParentLink (retention)	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	75	0	Our Registrar/Attendance Tech calls parents/guardians am and pm daily for absences. If there is a chronic absenteeism and we are unable to talk to the parents/guardians, she will contact DES both by phone and by email.

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report**INTEGRATION**

Magnet Program



Quarter 2	47		Our Registrar/Attendance Tech calls parents/guardians am and pm daily for absences. If there is a chronic absenteeism and we are unable to talk to the parents/guardians, she will contact DES both by phone and by email.
Quarter 3/4	27		The registrar made phone calls and sent emails and texts to parents of students who were chronic absences the first week back (semester 2).
Totals	149		

Activity: Recruitment - Electronic Communication

Range	Outgoing e-mails	Incoming e-mails	Social media (ie: # posts)	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	22	6	10	Outgoing emails were sent to potential Tully families who gave me emails at our two recruiting events
Quarter 2	11	3	23	Email's were sent out to families who attended district recruitment events, as well as FaceBook posts sharing events that happened on campus.
Quarter 3/4		0	0	
Totals	33	9	33	

Activity: Retention - Electronic Communication

Range	Outgoing e-mails	Incoming e-mails	Social media (ie: # posts)	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	14	0	0	About 5% of our families who do not answer phone calls from our Registrar/Attendance Tech do respond to an email that she will send out for the absences. She knows the families who will respond by email. Our Registrar/Attendance Tech has been here for 30 years. She knows the parents and is willing to reach out continually until she gets the information. Parents know her policy and respect the communication from her.
Quarter 2	21	0	0	About 5% of our families who do not answer phone calls from our Registrar/Attendance Tech do respond to an email that she will send out for the absences. She knows the families who will respond by email. Our Registrar/Attendance Tech has been here for 30 years. She knows the parents and is willing to reach out continually until she gets the information. Parents know her policy and respect the communication from her.



INTEGRATION

Quarter 3/4	17	0	0	About 5% of our families who do not answer phone calls from our Registrar/Attendance Tech do respond to an email that she will send out for the absences. She knows the families who will respond by email. Our Registrar/Attendance Tech has been here for 30 years. She knows the parents and is willing to reach out continually until she gets the information. Parents know her policy and respect the communication from her.
Totals	52	0	0	

RECRUITMENT ACTIVITIES AND EVENTS

Activity: On-Site Recruitment

(For example, open house, classes visiting from feeder schools, student shadowing)

Range	Activity	# of participants	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	Meet the Teacher	132	We had a good showing at both of our back to school events.
	Open House	109	
	Walk/Bike to School	15	Parents had the opportunity to have breakfast with their student(s) once they got to school.
Quarter 2	Middle School Night	6	We hosted 3 middle schools to talk to our 5 th grade students who will be moving up to middle school next year.
	Family Literacy Night	10	
Quarter 3/4	Star Party	32	We had scientists from the U of A bring telescopes to Tully and invited the community. We had a several families bring friends.
	Healthy Breakfast		
Totals		256	

Activity: Off-Site Recruitment(For example, school visits, brochures left at a business or school, fliers posted at community centers. **Do not include District recruitment events**)

Range	Activity	# Brochures/ rack cards distributed	# of responses	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.




INTEGRATION

Quarter 1	Dropped off brochures at Brichta & Little Angels Pre-School	25	2	We are increasing our efforts to recruit students from Brichta Early Learning Center, and surrounding preschools and daycares.
Quarter 2	Recruitment fair at Brichta.	14	14	Magnet Coordinator talked to 14 individual families who will have kindergartners next year about the opportunities for their children at Tully
Quarter 3/4		0	0	
Totals		39	16	

Activity: Tours

(Record the number of potential applicants. For example, if one parent comes for a tour with two potential student applicants, count the number as 2. Include shadowing.)

Range	# Students	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	6	Four families came for a tour this quarter
Quarter 2	14	We had 7 tours as a result of our recruitment fair at Brichta, along with walk-in families interested in Tully.
Quarter 3/4	16	7 families came in for tours after they received their Open Enrollment letters.
Totals	29	

Retention: Retention: Access the Synergy report “U-STU-2: Daily Enrollment by Student Demographics.” Use your  Snipping Tool to take a screen shot of **Day 40 SY 2017-18, Day 100 SY 2017-18, Day 40 SY 2018-19, and Day 100 SY 2018-19**. Insert the screens in the space below, and then fill out the reflection. [HINT: Shrink the Synergy window to 75%. Capture the date on top of the table as well.]

STUDENT RETENTION

Are there any noteworthy differences or trends that you notice when analyzing this data?

Reflection:**Quarter 1**

Our enrollment is down from the first 40 days of the 2018-2019 SY by 35 students. There are a couple things that could account for this drop in enrollment. The largest apartment complex in our neighborhood is undergoing a major remodel. Families were displaced for several weeks at a time. A number of these families chose to move permanently. We have a new principal this year. This is our second year in a row with a new

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report

INTEGRATION

Magnet Program



principal, and it is possible some families chose to leave. The largest population that dropped enrollment is our Hispanic students, where we lost 27 students.

Quarter 2

Our enrollment has stayed consistent this quarter.

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report**INTEGRATION**

Magnet Program

**Daily Enrollment by Grade, Gender and USP Ethnicity****419 - Tully Elementary Magnet**

On: 09/27/2018 (Day 40 SY 2018-19)

Grade	White/Anglo		African American		Hispanic		Native American		Asian American		Multi-racial		Total		
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	Total
KG	2	4	2	2	10	13	1	1	0	1	1	0	16	21	37
	5.4%	10.8%	5.4%	5.4%	27.0%	35.1%	2.7%	2.7%	0.0%	2.7%	2.7%	0.0%	43.2%	56.8%	
01	6	4	3	2	13	16	1	2	0	0	1	2	24	26	50
	12.0%	8.0%	6.0%	4.0%	26.0%	32.0%	2.0%	4.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.0%	4.0%	48.0%	52.0%	
02	4	3	2	2	12	16	0	1	1	0	0	0	19	22	41
	9.8%	7.3%	4.9%	4.9%	29.3%	39.0%	0.0%	2.4%	2.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	46.3%	53.7%	
03	6	5	6	5	20	19	4	0	0	2	0	0	36	31	67
	9.0%	7.5%	9.0%	7.5%	29.9%	28.4%	6.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.0%	0.0%	0.0%	53.7%	46.3%	
04	2	3	4	3	16	20	0	3	1	1	1	1	24	31	55
	3.6%	5.5%	7.3%	5.5%	29.1%	36.4%	0.0%	5.5%	1.8%	1.8%	1.8%	1.8%	43.6%	56.4%	
05	4	1	5	4	18	22	3	2	0	0	1	0	31	29	60
	6.7%	1.7%	8.3%	6.7%	30.0%	36.7%	5.0%	3.3%	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%	0.0%	51.7%	48.3%	
Total	24	20	22	18	89	106	9	9	2	4	4	3	150	160	310
	7.7%	6.5%	7.1%	5.8%	28.7%	34.2%	2.9%	2.9%	0.6%	1.3%	1.3%	1.0%	48.4%	51.6%	
	44		40		195		18		6		7		310		
	14.2%		12.9%		62.9%		5.8%		1.9%		2.3%		100.0%		

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report**INTEGRATION**

Magnet Program

**Daily Enrollment by Grade, Gender and USP Ethnicity****419 - Tully Elementary Magnet**

On: 01/17/2019 (Day 100 SY 2018-19)

Grade	White/Anglo		African American		Hispanic		Native American		Asian American		Multi-racial		Total		
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	Total
KG	1	4	3	2	10	15	1	1	0	1	1	0	16	23	39
	2.6%	10.3%	7.7%	5.1%	25.6%	38.5%	2.6%	2.6%	0.0%	2.6%	2.6%	0.0%	41.0%	59.0%	
01	6	3	3	2	13	19	1	2	0	0	1	2	24	28	52
	11.5%	5.8%	5.8%	3.8%	25.0%	36.5%	1.9%	3.8%	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%	3.8%	46.2%	53.8%	
02	4	3	2	2	11	17	0	1	1	0	0	0	18	23	41
	9.8%	7.3%	4.9%	4.9%	26.8%	41.5%	0.0%	2.4%	2.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	43.9%	56.1%	
03	6	4	5	5	20	19	4	0	0	2	0	0	35	30	65
	9.2%	6.2%	7.7%	7.7%	30.8%	29.2%	6.2%	0.0%	0.0%	3.1%	0.0%	0.0%	53.8%	46.2%	
04	1	3	4	2	16	19	0	3	1	1	1	1	23	29	52
	1.9%	5.8%	7.7%	3.8%	30.8%	36.5%	0.0%	5.8%	1.9%	1.9%	1.9%	1.9%	44.2%	55.8%	
05	5	1	6	4	17	22	3	2	0	0	1	0	32	29	61
	8.2%	1.6%	9.8%	6.6%	27.9%	36.1%	4.9%	3.3%	0.0%	0.0%	1.6%	0.0%	52.5%	47.5%	
Total	23	18	23	17	87	111	9	9	2	4	4	3	148	162	310
	7.4%	5.8%	7.4%	5.5%	28.1%	35.8%	2.9%	2.9%	0.6%	1.3%	1.3%	1.0%	47.7%	52.3%	
	41		40		198		18		6		7		310		
	13.2%		12.9%		63.9%		5.8%		1.9%		2.3%		100.0%		

Magnet 2019-20 – School Level Quarterly Report**INTEGRATION**

Magnet Program

**Daily Enrollment by Grade, Gender and USP Ethnicity****419 - Tully Elementary Magnet**

On: 09/26/2019 (Day 40 SY 2019-20)

Grade	White/Anglo		African American		Hispanic		Native American		Asian American		Multi-racial		Total		
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	Total
KG	4	2	2	5	11	12	1	0	1	3	1	0	20	22	42
	9.5%	4.8%	4.8%	11.9%	26.2%	28.6%	2.4%	0.0%	2.4%	7.1%	2.4%	0.0%	47.6%	52.4%	
01	2	7	4	2	14	15	0	2	0	2	0	0	20	28	48
	4.2%	14.6%	8.3%	4.2%	29.2%	31.3%	0.0%	4.2%	0.0%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	41.7%	58.3%	
02	4	3	4	3	13	16	1	2	0	0	1	2	23	26	49
	8.2%	6.1%	8.2%	6.1%	26.5%	32.7%	2.0%	4.1%	0.0%	0.0%	2.0%	4.1%	46.9%	53.1%	
03	3	4	2	3	9	16	0	1	0	0	1	0	15	24	39
	7.7%	10.3%	5.1%	7.7%	23.1%	41.0%	0.0%	2.6%	0.0%	0.0%	2.6%	0.0%	38.5%	61.5%	
04	4	5	3	5	16	14	3	0	1	2	0	0	27	26	53
	7.5%	9.4%	5.7%	9.4%	30.2%	26.4%	5.7%	0.0%	1.9%	3.8%	0.0%	0.0%	50.9%	49.1%	
05	1	2	3	0	16	16	0	2	1	1	1	1	22	22	44
	2.3%	4.5%	6.8%	0.0%	36.4%	36.4%	0.0%	4.5%	2.3%	2.3%	2.3%	2.3%	50.0%	50.0%	
Total	18	23	18	18	79	89	5	7	3	8	4	3	127	148	275
	6.5%	8.4%	6.5%	6.5%	28.7%	32.4%	1.8%	2.5%	1.1%	2.9%	1.5%	1.1%	46.2%	53.8%	
	41		36		168		12		11		7		275		
	14.9%		13.1%		61.1%		4.4%		4.0%		2.5%		100.0%		