

APPENDIX II – 3



MAGNET 2017-18

SCHOOL LEVEL QUARTERLY REPORT

SCHOOL NAME: Mansfeld Magnet Middle School

MAGNET THEME(S): STEM

MAGNET LEADERSHIP TEAM MEMBERS

NAME	TITLE
Richard Sanchez	Principal
Kirstin Bittel	Magnet Coordinator
Miriam Mack	6 th Grade
Leticia Lozano	7 th Grade
Maria Balaguer	8 th Grade
Lisa Bradford	Elective
DaNel Hogan	Director STEMAZing Project
Jill Williams	Director WISE
Tammy Rosen	Parent

MAGNET LEADERSHIP TEAM MEETINGS

DATE	# MINUTES MET
8/23	60
10/25	60
11/1	60
11/8	60
11/22	120
1/24	60
2/28	60
4/11	60
4/30	60



Magnet 2017-18 – School Level Quarterly Report

INTEGRATION

Recruitment: What actions have been taken this quarter that support your integration goal? Include tours, phone inquiries, mailings, school visits, other recruitment activities conducted by your site. You do not need to report District recruitment events. Insert additional lines as needed. Keep appropriate documentation (recruitment log) on site for review.

COMMUNICATION

Activity: Recruitment Mailings

(Record the # of school generated magnet mailings. Examples: 100 surveys to neighborhood parents, 500 open house postcards. Only record mailings done by your school – not for your school through the Communications Dept.)

Range	# Mailings	# of responses	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	1	14 families	Fliers distributed at Hughes, Borton, and Carrillo regarding STEM Night.
Quarter 2	0		Open House mailings sent out through central
Quarter 3/4	0		
Totals	1	14	

Activity: Recruitment Related Phone Calls

Range	Outgoing phone calls	Incoming Phone calls	# ParentLink (recruitment)	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	20	26	0	Many calls early in the year were families within Mansfeld boundaries that started at another school, were unhappy and wanted to enroll here.
Quarter 2	33	42	0	Many tour requests, a significant number were students in common K-8 (Maxwell and Robbins) boundaries wanting to switch schools mid year.
Quarter 3/4	36	36	0	Lots of shadow requests, we have filled all but 1 shadow date, will be unable to fulfill requests next quarter. Most are GATE requests
Totals	89	104	0	

Activity: Retention Related Phone Calls

Range	Outgoing phone calls	Incoming Phone calls	# ParentLink (retention)	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1			5907	Parent Link messages. Incoming to Magnet Coordinator not tracked Q1
Quarter 2			1659	Parent Link Calls. Inquires to Magnet Coordinator are largely emails.



Magnet 2017-18 – School Level Quarterly Report

INTEGRATION

Quarter 3/4			5194	Parent Link messages. 1) Welcome Back message 2) Notice about conferences and ½ days 3) Information above site rumor to parents 4) Message about new front entry protocol Inquires to Magnet Coordinator are largely emails.
Totals			12,760	
Activity: Recruitment - Electronic Communication				
Range	Outgoing e-mails	Incoming e-mails	Social media (type/# posts)	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	~17	17	Facebook - 48	Assuming a reply for each email, although I did not save outgoing emails.
Quarter 2	~94	94	Facebook – 52 Mail Chimp - 1	Assuming a reply for each email, although I did not save outgoing emails.
Quarter 3/4	~140	72	Facebook – 60 Mail Chimp - 0	Assuming a reply for each email, although I did not save outgoing emails. Includes email to accepted families regarding Pre-Registration nights in April.
Totals	251	183	161	
Activity: Retention - Electronic Communication				
Range	Outgoing e-mails	Incoming e-mails	Social media (type/# posts)	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	~6	6	Facebook – 48 Mail Chimp-1	Probably more than this...I only saved a few related to fundraising
Quarter 2	~8	8	Facebook – 52 Mail Chimp - 1	Assuming a reply for each email, although I did not save outgoing emails.
Quarter 3/4	~17	17	Facebook – 60 Mail Chimp - 0	Assuming a reply for each email, although I did not save outgoing emails.
Totals	31	31	162	



Magnet 2017-18 – 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	Q1 STEM Night	283	14 non-Mansfeld families attended. Many Mansfeld families bring younger siblings as well.
Quarter 2	Magnet Open House Q2 STEM Night	192 ~36	7 non-Mansfeld families attended. Many Mansfeld families bring younger siblings as well. 18 families at Open House, unusually low turnout. Possibly due to lateness in the season.
Quarter 3/4	Q3 STEM Night	130	2 non-Mansfeld families attended. Many Mansfeld families bring younger siblings as well.
Totals		641	

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	1. Packets at Carrillo Open House 2. Visited Carrillo to promote Q1 STEM Night 3. Carrillo Literacy Night	~62	?	1. A few tours scheduled as a result. 2. Dropped off fliers for 4 th and 5 th graders. 3. Mostly young families. Spoke with two serious families. Rest are long-term recruiting.
Quarter 2	1. Borton MS Night 2. Music Dept. Visit to 5 schools 3. Coffee with the Counselor @ Carrillo	~284	?	1. Lots of interest in the school 2. Music teacher reported students were excited to hear about the extensive music program at Mansfeld. 3. Good dialogue with families, only a few 5 th grade families in attendance.



Magnet 2017-18 – School Level Quarterly Report

INTEGRATION

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Fruchthendler MS Night 5. Hughes STEM Lesson 6. Lineweaver MS Night 7. Hughes MS Night 8. Carrillo Math Night 			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Increased interest from last year resulted in tours. 5. Met with 3 classes, 2 did a STEM activity and 1 did a MS Q and A 6. High levels of interest in the program 7. Not too many families in attendance this year. 8. Counselor attended. Predominately lower elementary families.
Quarter 3/4	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Hughes STEM Lesson (Jan) 2. Carrillo Cultures Night 3. Hughes STEM Lesson (Feb) 	~150	?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Met with 3 classes for a STEM Activity 2. Left 40 copies of African America Scientist Biography Coloring Sheets for Event. 3. Met with 3 classes for a STEM Activity
Totals	14	496		*At end of the year, tour data will be used to calculate which event yielded best visits to school.

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	7	Tours = 6 Hughes was the top requester this quarter. Hollinger, Robins, and a private school toured as well. A tour family brought friends to the Q1 STEM Night.
Quarter 2	512	Tours = 36 (Hughes, Carrillo, and Lineweaver parents were the most common tours) Shadows = 14 (Hughes and Lineweaver students were most common tours) 462 = Tours conducted by counselor as part of Level Up Program
Quarter 3/4	42	Tours = 22 (Borton, Robins, Carrillo, Hughes were the most common tours) Shadows = 31 (Hughes, Lineweaver, and Robins were most common shadows)
Totals	110	



Magnet 2017-18 – School Level Quarterly Report

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 2016-17, Day 100 SY 2016-17, Day 40 SY 2017-18, and Day 100 SY 2017-18.** 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.]

520 - Mansfeld Middle School

On: 09/29/2016 (Day 40 SY 2016-17)

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	23	11	14	105	86	5	10	1	1	4	3	141	137	278
	5.4%	8.3%	4.0%	5.0%	37.8%	30.9%	1.8%	3.6%	0.4%	0.4%	1.4%	1.1%	50.7%	49.3%	
07	10	19	13	9	109	106	7	8	4	4	3	3	146	149	295
	3.4%	6.4%	4.4%	3.1%	36.9%	35.9%	2.4%	2.7%	1.4%	1.4%	1.0%	1.0%	49.5%	50.5%	
08	18	12	11	6	99	82	6	3	1	0	1	4	136	107	243
	7.4%	4.9%	4.5%	2.5%	40.7%	33.7%	2.5%	1.2%	0.4%	0.0%	0.4%	1.6%	56.0%	44.0%	
Total	43	54	35	29	313	274	18	21	6	5	8	10	423	393	816
	5.3%	6.6%	4.3%	3.6%	38.4%	33.6%	2.2%	2.6%	0.7%	0.6%	1.0%	1.2%	51.8%	48.2%	
	97		64		587		39		11		18		816		
	11.9%		7.8%		71.9%		4.8%		1.3%		2.2%		100.0%		

520 - Mansfeld Middle School

On: 01/20/2017 (Day 100 SY 2016-17)

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	14	22	11	15	103	85	4	9	1	1	4	4	137	136	273
	5.1%	8.1%	4.0%	5.5%	37.7%	31.1%	1.5%	3.3%	0.4%	0.4%	1.5%	1.5%	50.2%	49.8%	
07	10	20	14	10	111	106	7	8	5	3	4	4	151	151	302
	3.3%	6.6%	4.6%	3.3%	36.8%	35.1%	2.3%	2.6%	1.7%	1.0%	1.3%	1.3%	50.0%	50.0%	
08	18	12	11	7	102	81	4	3	1	0	1	3	137	106	243
	7.4%	4.9%	4.5%	2.9%	42.0%	33.3%	1.6%	1.2%	0.4%	0.0%	0.4%	1.2%	56.4%	43.6%	
Total	42	54	36	32	316	272	15	20	7	4	9	11	425	393	818
	5.1%	6.6%	4.4%	3.9%	38.6%	33.3%	1.8%	2.4%	0.9%	0.5%	1.1%	1.3%	52.0%	48.0%	
	96		68		588		35		11		20		818		
	11.7%		8.3%		71.9%		4.3%		1.3%		2.4%		100.0%		

520 - Mansfeld Middle 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
06	34	35	15	16	102	106	4	8	5	2	4	5	164	172	336
	10.1%	10.4%	4.5%	4.8%	30.4%	31.5%	1.2%	2.4%	1.5%	0.6%	1.2%	1.5%	48.8%	51.2%	
07	16	20	13	18	107	100	5	7	2	0	5	3	148	148	296
	5.4%	6.8%	4.4%	6.1%	36.1%	33.8%	1.7%	2.4%	0.7%	0.0%	1.7%	1.0%	50.0%	50.0%	
08	14	18	16	9	129	114	7	7	6	4	4	4	176	156	332
	4.2%	5.4%	4.8%	2.7%	38.9%	34.3%	2.1%	2.1%	1.8%	1.2%	1.2%	1.2%	53.0%	47.0%	
Total	64	73	44	43	338	320	16	22	13	6	13	12	488	476	964
	6.6%	7.6%	4.6%	4.5%	35.1%	33.2%	1.7%	2.3%	1.3%	0.6%	1.3%	1.2%	50.6%	49.4%	
	137		87		658		38		19		25		964		
	14.2%		9.0%		68.3%		3.9%		2.0%		2.6%		100.0%		

520 - Mansfeld Magnet Middle 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
06	34	35	16	16	105	111	4	8	4	2	4	5	167	177	344
	9.9%	10.2%	4.7%	4.7%	30.5%	32.3%	1.2%	2.3%	1.2%	0.6%	1.2%	1.5%	48.5%	51.5%	
07	17	20	13	16	118	101	4	7	2	0	6	3	160	147	307
	5.5%	6.5%	4.2%	5.2%	38.4%	32.9%	1.3%	2.3%	0.7%	0.0%	2.0%	1.0%	52.1%	47.9%	
08	13	19	17	11	128	115	6	10	5	4	4	4	173	163	336
	3.9%	5.7%	5.1%	3.3%	38.1%	34.2%	1.8%	3.0%	1.5%	1.2%	1.2%	1.2%	51.5%	48.5%	
Total	64	74	46	43	351	327	14	25	11	6	14	12	500	487	987
	6.5%	7.5%	4.7%	4.4%	35.6%	33.1%	1.4%	2.5%	1.1%	0.6%	1.4%	1.2%	50.7%	49.3%	
	138		89		678		39		17		26		987		
	14.0%		9.0%		68.7%		4.0%		1.7%		2.6%		100.0%		



Magnet 2017-18 – School Level Quarterly Report

INTEGRATION

STUDENT RETENTION

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

Reflection: Mansfeld has increased its integration each year and it now officially integrated! We are now oversubscribed at every grade level. Enrollment continues to grow. Mansfeld feels ready to become a full (zero boundary) magnet school. As of the start of 3rd Quarter, Mansfeld continues to be oversubscribed. Science classes in 6th grade are at consensus for one teacher and over for the other. The sharing of boundaries between K-8 continues to be an issue with students leaving Maxwell, Robbins, and Roskruge mid-year to attend Mansfeld as they technically have 2 home schools. This puts an unnecessary strain on class sizes at Mansfeld and disrupts the learning for students.

Theme Visibility: Theme Visibility is not an emphasis area for SY 2017-18; 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	2018-19 SY
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	Student work is visible, but objectives and STEM practices are hit or miss.	Teachers are updating boards more regularly. An exemplar template has been mailed to staff to use.		
Magnet theme is noted in school				



Magnet 2017-18 – School Level Quarterly Report


INTEGRATION

communications/media.				
Teachers have specific areas of the campus and facility for magnet activities/lessons/presentations	Mansfeld has limited space and no area exists at this time.	Mansfeld has limited space and no area exists at this time.	Mansfeld has limited space and no area exists at this time.	
Magnet theme is incorporated into the school’s mission/vision statement.				
Evidence of family/community engagement/partnerships.				



Magnet 2017-18 – 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.

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: Mansfeld continues to outscore the district at each grade level. That gap between our score rose from 18.6% above in 6th grade to 28.6% in 8th grade. In Algebra the difference is even more marked, with Mansfeld students scoring 51.6% better than the district average. We continue to tutor students in order to increase our pass rate.










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

By Grade ▲	# Tested ◆	Participation Rate ◆	Avg. RS ◆	Avg. % Correct ◆	Avg. TS ◆	Proficient			Not Proficient		
						# ◆	% ◆	Avg. TS ◆	# ◆	% ◆	Avg. TS ◆
Tucson Unified School District	3210	93.9%	14.8	49.4% 	-	1479	46.1% 	-	1731	53.9% 	-
MANSFELD MIDDLE SCHOOL	323	96.1%	17.5	58.3% 	-	209	64.7% 	-	114	35.3% 	-
Grade 6	323	9.5%	17.5	58.3% 	-	209	64.7% 	-	114	35.3% 	-
1-1 of 1											

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	2996	89.5%	12.3	38.3% 	-	1078	36% 	-	1918	64% 	-
MANSFELD MIDDLE SCHOOL	267	89.9%	16.2	50.6% 	-	159	59.6% 	-	108	40.4% 	-
Grade 7	267	8.0%	16.2	50.6% 	-	159	59.6% 	-	108	40.4% 	-



Magnet 2017-18 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

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	2523	73.7%	12.4	41.2%	-	866	34.3%	-	1657	65.7%	-	
MANSFELD MIDDLE SCHOOL	256	77.3%	15.4	51.4%	-	161	62.9%	-	95	37.1%	-	
Grade 8	256	7.6%	15.4	51.4%	-	161	62.9%	-	95	37.1%	-	
1-1 of 1												

1718.TUSD.Algebra.HS.Q1Benchmark												
By Grade ▲	# Tested ⚡	Participation Rate ⚡	Avg. RS ⚡	Avg. % Correct ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡	Proficient			Not Proficient			
						# ⚡	% ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡	# ⚡	% ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡	
Tucson Unified School District	3573	17.0%	10.1	32.6%	-	1111	31.1%	-	2462	68.9%	-	
MANSFELD MIDDLE SCHOOL	52	8.3%	15.8	51.1%	-	43	82.7%	-	9	17.3%	-	
Grade 8	52	1.5%	15.8	51.1%	-	43	82.7%	-	9	17.3%	-	
1-1 of 1												

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: Mansfeld continues to outscore the district at each grade level. That gap between our score rose from 13.9% above in 6th grade to 33.6% in 8th grade. In Algebra the difference is even more marked, with Mansfeld students scoring 60.2% better than the district average. We continue to tutor students in order to increase our pass rate.

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



Magnet 2017-18 – 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	3124	91.5%	14.8	46.2%	65:36	1283	41.1%	67:49	1841	58.9%	64:03
MANSFELD MIDDLE SCHOOL	331	95.9%	17.3	54.1%	103:57	182	55%	99:32	149	45%	109:21
Grade 6	331	9.8%	17.3	54.1%	103:57	182	55%	99:32	149	45%	109:21

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	2888	85.9%	10.2	31.8%	83:56	962	33.3%	95:22	1926	66.7%	78:14
MANSFELD MIDDLE SCHOOL	292	95.1%	14	43.8%	128:27	160	54.8%	128:01	132	45.2%	128:57
Grade 7	292	8.8%	14	43.8%	128:27	160	54.8%	128:01	132	45.2%	128:57

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	2399	68.7%	9.8	32.7%	74:54	823	34.3%	90:23	1576	65.7%	66:49
MANSFELD MIDDLE SCHOOL	262	77.7%	13.9	46.4%	107:14	178	67.9%	105:24	84	32.1%	111:07
Grade 8	262	7.8%	13.9	46.4%	107:14	178	67.9%	105:24	84	32.1%	111:07

1718.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	3277	16.0%	9.7	30.4%	51:46	1185	36.2%	62:11	2092	63.8%	45:52
MANSFELD MIDDLE SCHOOL	56	8.7%	17.5	54.8%	103:50	54	96.4%	104:45	2	3.6%	79:03
Grade 8	56	1.7%	17.5	54.8%	103:50	54	96.4%	104:45	2	3.6%	79:03

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: Mansfeld continues to outscore the district at each grade level. 15.2% more Mansfeld 6th graders mastered the standards than the



Magnet 2017-18 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

district average. 26.9% more Mansfeld 7th graders passed at Mansfeld than the district average. 31.4% more 8th graders mastered the standards than did the district average. 63.3% more Algebra students mastered the standards than did the district average. Of note, Mansfeld’s passer rate continues to climb each year while the district average declines from 6th to 7th, rises slightly from 7th to 8th grade, then declines again between 8th and Algebra. We continue to provide tutoring as well as intervention classes to students who have not mastered the standards per the benchmark exam. The scores and differences between Mansfeld and TUSD are on par with last quarter’s results.

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 ▼	# ▼	% ▼	Avg. TS ▼
Tucson Unified School District	3129	89.6%	13.5	45.0%	65:40	1356	43.3%	70:06	1773	56.7%	62:16
MANSFELD MIDDLE SCHOOL	364	94.8%	16.1	53.7%	96:14	213	58.5%	94:54	151	41.5%	98:07
Grade 6	364	10.6%	16.1	53.7%	96:14	213	58.5%	94:54	151	41.5%	98:07

1718.TUSD.Math.07.Q3Benchmark

By Grade ▲	# Tested ▼	Participation Rate ▼	Avg. RS ▼	Avg. % Correct ▼	Avg. TS ▼	Proficient			Not Proficient		
						# ▼	% ▼	Avg. TS ▼	# ▼	% ▼	Avg. TS ▼
Tucson Unified School District	2948	86.0%	11.3	35.2%	81:42	1018	34.5%	95:57	1930	65.5%	74:12
MANSFELD MIDDLE SCHOOL	308	95.4%	15.6	48.9%	131:49	189	61.4%	132:38	119	38.6%	130:31
Grade 7	308	9.1%	15.6	48.9%	131:49	189	61.4%	132:38	119	38.6%	130:31

1718.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	3347	15.8%	11.9	39.6%	58:23	1169	34.9%	70:54	2178	65.1%	51:40
MANSFELD MIDDLE SCHOOL	57	8.3%	20.3	67.5%	115:39	56	98.2%	115:24	1	1.8%	130:00
Grade 8	57	1.6%	20.3	67.5%	115:39	56	98.2%	115:24	1	1.8%	130:00

1718.TUSD.Algebra.HS.Q3Benchmark



Magnet 2017-18 – 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	3347	15.8%	11.9	39.6%	58:23	1169	34.9%	70:54	2178	65.1%	51:40
MANSFELD MIDDLE SCHOOL	57	8.3%	20.3	67.5%	115:39	56	98.2%	115:24	1	1.8%	130:00
Grade 8	57	1.6%	20.3	67.5%	115:39	56	98.2%	115:24	1	1.8%	130:00

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 continues to outscore the district at each grade level. That gap between our score rose from 15.2% above in 6th grade to 15.6% in 7th grade. We only outscored the district by 5.7% in 8th grade. This may be in part due to the large number of refugee students in 8th grade. Our ELD department is planning a PD to support inclusive instructional strategies for ELD students. We continue to tutor students in order to increase our pass rate.

ELA – Q1 Benchmark Data

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	3023	88.5%	15	50.1%	-	962	31.8%	-	2061	68.2%	-
MANSFELD MIDDLE SCHOOL	313	93.2%	17.4	57.9%	-	147	47%	-	166	53%	-
Grade 6	313	9.2%	17.4	57.9%	-	147	47%	-	166	53%	-

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	3003	89.7%	14.7	49.0%	-	992	33%	-	2011	67%	-
MANSFELD MIDDLE SCHOOL	282	94.9%	16.3	54.5%	-	137	48.6%	-	145	51.4%	-
Grade 7	282	8.4%	16.3	54.5%	-	137	48.6%	-	145	51.4%	-

1718.TUSD.ELA.08.Q1Benchmark



Magnet 2017-18 – 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	2973	87.0%	11.7	39.0%	-	982	33%	-	1991	67%	-
MANSFELD MIDDLE SCHOOL	302	91.2%	13.2	44.1%	-	117	38.7%	-	185	61.3%	-
Grade 8	302	9.0%	13.2	44.1%	-	117	38.7%	-	185	61.3%	-

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: Mansfeld continues to outscore the district at each grade level (looking at the level of mastery). 25.7% more Mansfeld 6th graders mastered the standards than the district average. 15.7% more Mansfeld 7th graders passed at Mansfeld than the district average. 13.9% more 8th graders mastered the standards than did the district average. We continue to provide tutoring as well as intervention classes to students who have not mastered the standards per the benchmark exam. Also of note, both 6th and 8th grade showed significant growth over the Q1 mastery levels. 6th grade showed 17.2% more growth (comparing Q1 to Q2) while 8th grade showed 10.2% more growth.

ELA – Q2 Benchmark Data

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	2930	85.7%	13.2	35.8%	103:49	1128	38.5%	110:50	1802	61.5%	99:25
MANSFELD MIDDLE SCHOOL	316	93.8%	16.8	45.3%	166:54	203	64.2%	166:38	113	35.8%	167:24
Grade 6	316	9.4%	16.8	45.3%	166:54	203	64.2%	166:38	113	35.8%	167:24



Magnet 2017-18 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

1718.TUSD.ELA.07.Q2Benchmark

By Grade ▲	# Tested ◆	Participation Rate ◆	Avg. RS ◆	Avg. % Correct ◆	Avg. TS ◆	Proficient			Not Proficient		
						# ◆	% ◆	Avg. TS ◆	# ◆	% ◆	Avg. TS ◆
Tucson Unified School District	2886	86.1%	15	50.1% ■	67:57	977	33.9% ■	71:29	1909	66.1% ■	66:08
MANSFELD MIDDLE SCHOOL	280	91.2%	17.2	57.3% ■	118:03	139	49.6% ■	116:23	141	50.4% ■	119:42
Grade 7	280	8.4%	17.2	57.3% ■	118:03	139	49.6% ■	116:23	141	50.4% ■	119:42

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	2945	86.7%	12.6	40.6% ■	87:40	1030	35% ■	91:31	1915	65% ■	85:35
MANSFELD MIDDLE SCHOOL	311	91.7%	14.4	46.6% ■	125:23	152	48.9% ■	123:24	159	51.1% ■	127:16
Grade 8	311	9.3%	14.4	46.6% ■	125:23	152	48.9% ■	123:24	159	51.1% ■	127:16

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: Mansfeld continues to outscore the district at each grade level. 12.4% more Mansfeld 6th graders mastered the standards than the district average. 10.8% more Mansfeld 7th graders passed at Mansfeld than the district average. 13.4% more 8th graders mastered the standards than did the district average. We continue to provide tutoring as well as intervention classes to students who have not mastered the standards per the benchmark exam. The scores and differences between Mansfeld and TUSD are on par with last quarter's results.

ELA – Q3 Benchmark Data



Magnet 2017-18 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

1718.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	2946	84.4%	14.7	49.0%	76:52	1038	35.2%	79:34	1908	64.8%	75:23
MANSFELD MIDDLE SCHOOL	351	91.9%	16.5	55.2%	136:03	167	47.6%	131:58	184	52.4%	139:44
Grade 8	351	10.2%	16.5	55.2%	136:03	167	47.6%	131:58	184	52.4%	139:44

1718.TUSD.ELA.07.Q3Benchmark

By Grade ▲	# Tested ⚡	Participation Rate ⚡	Avg. RS ⚡	Avg. % Correct ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡	Proficient			Not Proficient		
						# ⚡	% ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡	# ⚡	% ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡
Tucson Unified School District	2919	85.1%	13.3	44.2%	70:24	844	28.9%	70:49	2075	71.1%	70:14
MANSFELD MIDDLE SCHOOL	297	92.0%	14.7	49.1%	133:07	118	39.7%	132:50	179	60.3%	133:19
Grade 7	297	8.8%	14.7	49.1%	133:07	118	39.7%	132:50	179	60.3%	133:19


1718.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	2980	85.7%	15.2	50.7%	76:37	1194	40.3%	80:00	1786	59.7%	74:19
MANSFELD MIDDLE SCHOOL	311	89.9%	17.6	58.7%	125:17	167	53.7%	117:04	144	46.3%	134:49
Grade 8	311	9.1%	17.6	58.7%	125:17	167	53.7%	117:04	144	46.3%	134:49



Magnet 2017-18 – School Level Quarterly 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: There is a large gap between Anglo and African American students at 6th grade (34.7%), however, by 7th grade that gap shinks to 23.8%. This indicates that interventions are working over a 2 year period. At 8th grade the gap widens, in part due to the number of refugee students. The gap their is 42.7%. There is a similar pattern with the Anglo-Hispanic Gap. The gap is 37.6% at 6th grade and shinks to 8.6% at 7th grade. Again in 8th grade the gap rises to 14%. We will continue tutoring students in the lowest quartile to decrease the achievement gap. We will share gap data with the ELA department so they can see if there are other strategies that can be employed to decrease the achievement gap.

1718.TUSD.ELA.06.Q1Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		NonProficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	313	100%	17.4	57.9%	147	47%	166	53%
Hispanic	202	64.5%	16.5	55.1%	81	40.1%	121	59.9%
White	67	21.4%	20.7	69.1%	52	77.6%	15	22.4%
African American	14	4.5%	16.5	55%	6	42.9%	8	57.1%
Multi Racial	14	4.5%	19.1	63.6%	6	42.9%	8	57.1%
Native American	11	3.5%	11.2	37.3%	1	9.1%	10	90.9%
Asian Pacific American	5	1.6%	16.4	54.7%	1	20%	4	80%



Magnet 2017-18 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

1718.TUSD.ELA.07.Q1Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		NonProficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	282	100%	16.3	54.5%	137	48.6%	145	51.4%
Hispanic	211	74.8%	16.1	53.7%	101	47.9%	110	52.1%
White	34	12.1%	18.7	62.3%	23	67.6%	11	32.4%
African American	16	5.7%	16.1	53.5%	7	43.8%	9	56.3%
Native American	12	4.3%	14.5	48.3%	3	25%	9	75%
Multi Racial	7	2.5%	15.1	50.5%	2	28.6%	5	71.4%
Asian Pacific American	2	.7%	18.5	61.7%	1	50%	1	50%

1718.TUSD.ELA.08.Q1Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		NonProficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	302	100%	13.2	44.1%	117	38.7%	185	61.3%
Hispanic	228	75.5%	13.4	44.5%	94	41.2%	134	58.8%
White	29	9.6%	15.7	52.4%	16	55.2%	13	44.8%
African American	16	5.3%	10.5	35%	2	12.5%	14	87.5%
Native American	14	4.6%	9.1	30.2%	1	7.1%	13	92.9%
Asian Pacific American	8	2.6%	13.9	46.3%	2	25%	6	75%
Multi Racial	7	2.3%	12.9	42.9%	2	28.6%	5	71.4%



Magnet 2017-18 – School Level Quarterly Report

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: There is gap between Anglo and African American students at 6th grade drops from 34.7% Q1 to 25.7% Q2. The 7th grade gap drops from 23.8% Q1 to 22.4% Q2. The 8th grade gap also drops from 42.7% Q1 to 31.4% Q2.

There is a different pattern with the Anglo-Hispanic Gap. The 6th grade gap drops from 37.6% Q1 to 22.4% Q2 at 6th grade. However the 7th grade gap increases from 8.6% Q1 to 31.9% Q2. Again in 8th grade the gap increase from 14% Q1 to 17.8% Q2. We will continue tutoring students in the lowest quartile to decrease the achievement gap. Again we do see, that when we compare our major subgroups average to the districts overall passer average, our students outperform the district (except for 7th grade African American students). So while we have continued work to do in decreasing the achievement gap for our Hispanic students, our students utperform tehri ethnic peers and the distuict as a whole, providing them greater oppourtunities than they would have at other schools.

1718.TUSD.ELA.06.Q2Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		NonProficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	316	100%	16.8	45.3%	203	64.2%	113	35.8%
Hispanic	207	65.5%	16.1	43.5%	125	60.4%	82	39.6%
White	64	20.3%	20	54.1%	53	82.8%	11	17.2%
African American	14	4.4%	16.2	43.8%	8	57.1%	6	42.9%
Multi Racial	14	4.4%	18.2	49.2%	11	78.6%	3	21.4%
Native American	12	3.8%	10.8	29.3%	3	25%	9	75%
Asian Pacific American	5	1.6%	15.6	42.2%	3	60%	2	40%



Magnet 2017-18 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

1718.TUSD.ELA.07.Q2Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		NonProficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	280	100%	17.2	57.3%	139	49.6%	141	50.4%
Hispanic	213	76.1%	17	56.5%	100	46.9%	113	53.1%
White	33	11.8%	20.2	67.2%	26	78.8%	7	21.2%
African American	14	5%	15.5	51.7%	4	28.6%	10	71.4%
Native American	11	3.9%	15.6	52.1%	5	45.5%	6	54.5%
Multi Racial	7	2.5%	16.9	56.2%	4	57.1%	3	42.9%
Asian Pacific American	2	.7%	14.5	48.3%	0	0%	2	100%

1718.TUSD.ELA.08.Q2Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		NonProficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	311	100%	14.4	46.6%	152	48.9%	159	51.1%
Hispanic	233	74.9%	14.5	46.8%	114	48.9%	119	51.1%
White	30	9.6%	16.4	52.8%	20	66.7%	10	33.3%
African American	17	5.5%	12.5	40.2%	6	35.3%	11	64.7%
Native American	15	4.8%	11.3	36.3%	3	20%	12	80%
Multi Racial	9	2.9%	16.2	52.3%	6	66.7%	3	33.3%
Asian Pacific American	7	2.3%	13.7	44.3%	3	42.9%	4	57.1%



Magnet 2017-18 – 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: There is still a gap between Anglo and African American students. At 6th grade the gap is 31% (up 5.3% from last quarter but down 3.7% from the beginning of the year). The 7th grade gap is 44.5%. (up 20.7% from Q1 and up 22.1% from Q2) The gap in 8th grade is 10%. (down 32.7% fom Q1 and down 21.4% from Q2). Although there is a gap increase in 7th grade, there is an overall decrease in the achievement gap between 6th and 8th grade.

There is a also still a gap between the Anglo and Hispanic students. The 6th grade gap is 27.8% (down 9.8% from Q1, but up 5.4% from Q2). The gap is 29.2% in 7th grade. (up 20.6% from Q1 but down 2,7% from Q2). The 8th grade gap is 4.8% (9.2% from Q1 and down 13% from Q2). Although there is a gap increase in 7th grade, there is an overall decrease in the achievement gap between 6th and 8th grade.

We will continue tutoring students in the lowest quartile to decrease the achievement gap. Again we do see, that when we compare our major subgroups average to the disttricts overall passer average, our students outperform the district (except for 7th grade African American students). So while we have continued work to do in decreasing the achivement gap for our Hispanic students, our students utperform their ethnic peers and the distuict as a whole, providing them greater oppourtunities than they would have at other schools.



Magnet 2017-18 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

1718.TUSD.ELA.06.Q3Benchmark								
Ethnicity Subgroups	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	351	100%	16.5	55.2%	167	47.6%	184	52.4%
Hispanic	238	67.2%	15.7	52.5%	102	43.2%	134	56.8%
White	69	19.7%	20.1	67%	49	71%	20	29%
African American	15	4.3%	15.6	52%	6	40%	9	60%
Multi Racial	15	4.3%	18.1	60.4%	8	53.3%	7	46.7%
Native American	10	2.8%	10.3	34.3%	0	0%	10	100%
Asian Pacific American	6	1.7%	16	53.4%	2	33.3%	4	66.7%

Magnet Students	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	351	100%	16.5	55.2%	167	47.6%	184	52.4%
Magnet - No	255	72.6%	15.9	53.1%	111	43.5%	144	56.5%
Magnet - Yes	96	27.4%	18.2	60.6%	56	58.3%	40	41.7%



Magnet 2017-18 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

1718.TUSD.ELA.07.Q3Benchmark								
Ethnicity Subgroups	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	297	100%	14.7	49.1%	118	39.7%	179	60.3%
Hispanic	232	78.1%	14.4	48.1%	89	38.4%	143	61.6%
White	34	11.4%	18	59.9%	23	67.6%	11	32.4%
African American	13	4.4%	13.6	45.4%	3	23.1%	10	76.9%
Native American	10	3.4%	10.8	36%	0	0%	10	100%
Multi Racial	6	2%	15.5	51.7%	2	33.3%	4	66.7%
Asian Pacific American	2	.7%	17.5	58.3%	1	50%	1	50%

Magnet Students	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	297	100%	14.7	49.1%	118	39.7%	179	60.3%
Magnet - No	207	69.7%	14	46.5%	68	32.9%	139	67.1%
Magnet - Yes	90	30.3%	16.5	55%	50	55.6%	40	44.4%



Magnet 2017-18 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

1718.TUSD.ELA.08.Q3Benchmark								
Ethnicity Subgroups	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	311	100%	17.6	58.7%	167	53.7%	144	46.3%
Hispanic	230	74%	17.8	59.2%	127	55.2%	103	44.8%
White	30	9.6%	18.8	62.7%	18	60%	12	40%
Native American	18	5.8%	13.8	46.1%	4	22.2%	14	77.8%
African American	16	5.1%	16.3	54.4%	8	50%	8	50%
Multi Racial	9	2.9%	19.9	66.3%	7	77.8%	2	22.2%
Asian Pacific American	8	2.6%	17.5	58.3%	3	37.5%	5	62.5%

Magnet Students	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	311	100%	17.6	58.7%	167	53.7%	144	46.3%
Magnet - No	220	70.7%	16.9	56.3%	107	48.6%	113	51.4%
Magnet - Yes	91	29.3%	19.4	64.5%	60	65.9%	31	34.1%



Magnet 2017-18 – School Level Quarterly Report

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: There is a large gap between Anglo and African American students at 6th grade (47%), the gap rises slightly in 7th grade to 51.3% but shrinks to 30% in 8th grade. This indicates that interventions are working over a 3 year period. There is a similar pattern with the Anglo-Hispanic Gap. The gap is 22.8% at 6th grade, rises to 23.4% at 7th grade rises again to 30% at 8th grade. While this rise is disturbing, it is of note that when comparing Mansfield subgroups to the district averages, our Hispanic students outscore the district at all 3 grade levels and by increasing percentages. (14.9% in 6th grade, 23.5% in 7th grade and 30.6% in 8th grade). This pattern is replicated with our African American students. They start below the district average, but are above by 8th grade. (-9.3% in 6th grade, -4.4% in 7th grade, and +5.7% in 8th grade). We continue to offer tutoring services to our lowest achieving students and their gains show.

1718.TUSD.MATH.06.Q1Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		NonProficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	323	100%	17.5	58.3%	209	64.7%	114	35.3%
Hispanic	205	63.5%	16.9	56.2%	125	61%	80	39%
White	68	21.1%	20.5	68.3%	57	83.8%	11	16.2%
African American	19	5.9%	14.8	49.3%	7	36.8%	12	63.2%
Multi Racial	14	4.3%	19.4	64.8%	12	85.7%	2	14.3%
Native American	10	3.1%	12.5	41.7%	3	30%	7	70%
Asian Pacific American	7	2.2%	17	56.7%	5	71.4%	2	28.6%



Magnet 2017-18 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

1718.TUSD.MATH.07.Q1Benchmark								
Ethnicity Subgroups	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		NonProficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	267	100%	16.2	50.6%	159	59.6%	108	40.4%
Hispanic	195	73%	16.2	50.5%	116	59.5%	79	40.5%
White	35	13.1%	19.8	61.9%	29	82.9%	6	17.1%
African American	19	7.1%	11.8	37%	6	31.6%	13	68.4%
Native American	10	3.7%	13.3	41.6%	5	50%	5	50%
Multi Racial	7	2.6%	15.4	48.2%	3	42.9%	4	57.1%
Asian Pacific American	1	.4%	9	28.1%	0	0%	1	100%

1718.TUSD.MATH.08.Q1Benchmark								
Ethnicity Subgroups	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		NonProficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	256	100%	15.4	51.4%	161	62.9%	95	37.1%
Hispanic	191	74.6%	15.6	52%	124	64.9%	67	35.1%
African American	20	7.8%	13.2	44%	8	40%	12	60%
White	20	7.8%	17	56.5%	14	70%	6	30%
Native American	12	4.7%	13.3	44.2%	5	41.7%	7	58.3%
Asian Pacific American	7	2.7%	15.7	52.4%	5	71.4%	2	28.6%
Multi Racial	6	2.3%	17	56.7%	5	83.3%	1	16.7%



Magnet 2017-18 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

1718.TUSD.Algebra.HS.Q1Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		NonProficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	52	100%	15.8	51.1%	43	82.7%	9	17.3%
Hispanic	37	71.2%	15.3	49.4%	31	83.8%	6	16.2%
White	11	21.2%	16.7	54%	8	72.7%	3	27.3%
Asian Pacific American	2	3.8%	17.5	56.5%	2	100%	0	0%
Multi Racial	1	1.9%	19	61.3%	1	100%	0	0%
Native American	1	1.9%	19	61.3%	1	100%	0	0%

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 gap between Anglo and African American students at 6th grade shrinks from 47% in Q1 to 31.6% in Q2. The 7th Grade gap also shrinks from 51.3% in Q1 to 40% in Q2. However, it rises in 8th grade from 30% to 47.4%. In the Algebra class there is effectively no gap. This indicates that interventions are working over a 3 year period. There is a similar pattern with the Anglo-Hispanic Gap. The gap is 27.3% at 6th grade (up 4.5%) , rises to 32.8% (up 9.4%) at 7th grade, and shrinks to 9.1% (down)20.9%at 8th grade. Again over 3 years we see a reduction in the gap. A large percentage of Magnet students attend Mansfeld to take advanced courses. Algebra is the only advanced course whose benchmark results are reported seperately. It is interesting to note that group shows about ½ Magnet and ½ Neighborhood, and no achievement gap. I’m interested to see if the gap reduces when classes are controlled for ALE status. What is most exciting for our students is when compared across the district, with the exception of 6th grade African American students, every major ethnic subgroup outscores the district average. This tells us that students here are doing better then their peers at other schools and that they will have greater opportunites as a result of their education here.

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



Magnet 2017-18 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

1718.TUSD.MATH.06.Q2Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		NonProficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	331	100%	17.3	54.1%	182	55%	149	45%
Hispanic	215	65%	16.3	51%	110	51.2%	105	48.8%
White	65	19.6%	22	68.6%	51	78.5%	14	21.5%
African American	19	5.7%	14.1	44.1%	6	31.6%	13	68.4%
Multi Racial	14	4.2%	19.9	62.1%	10	71.4%	4	28.6%
Native American	12	3.6%	12.9	40.4%	3	25%	9	75%
Asian Pacific American	6	1.8%	15	46.9%	2	33.3%	4	66.7%

Magnet Students	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		NonProficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	331	100%	17.3	54.1%	182	55%	149	45%
Magnet - No	235	71%	16.4	51.1%	116	49.4%	119	50.6%
Magnet - Yes	96	29%	19.6	61.3%	66	68.8%	30	31.3%



Magnet 2017-18 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

1718.TUSD.MATH.07.Q2Benchmark									
Ethnicity Subgroups	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		NonProficient		
	#	%			#	%	#	%	
All Test Takers	292	100%	14	43.8%	160	54.8%	132	45.2%	
Hispanic	217	74.3%	13.7	42.7%	114	52.5%	103	47.5%	
White	34	11.6%	19.2	60%	29	85.3%	5	14.7%	
African American	20	6.8%	10.7	33.3%	8	40%	12	60%	
Native American	11	3.8%	11.3	35.2%	4	36.4%	7	63.6%	
Multi Racial	8	2.7%	12.3	38.3%	3	37.5%	5	62.5%	
Asian Pacific American	2	.7%	17.5	54.7%	2	100%	0	0%	

Magnet Students	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		NonProficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	292	100%	14	43.8%	160	54.8%	132	45.2%
Magnet - No	201	68.8%	12.9	40.2%	97	48.3%	104	51.7%
Magnet - Yes	91	31.2%	16.5	51.5%	63	69.2%	28	30.8%



Magnet 2017-18 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

1718.TUSD.MATH.08.Q2Benchmark									
Ethnicity Subgroups	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		NonProficient		
	#	%			#	%	#	%	
All Test Takers	262	100%	13.9	46.4%	178	67.9%	84	32.1%	
Hispanic	192	73.3%	14	46.7%	131	68.2%	61	31.8%	
White	22	8.4%	16	53.3%	17	77.3%	5	22.7%	
African American	19	7.3%	11	36.7%	9	47.4%	10	52.6%	
Native American	14	5.3%	13	43.3%	10	71.4%	4	28.6%	
Multi Racial	8	3.1%	16	53.3%	7	87.5%	1	12.5%	
Asian Pacific American	7	2.7%	12.7	42.4%	4	57.1%	3	42.9%	

Magnet Students	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		NonProficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	262	100%	13.9	46.4%	178	67.9%	84	32.1%
Magnet - No	197	75.2%	13.4	44.7%	127	64.5%	70	35.5%
Magnet - Yes	65	24.8%	15.5	51.7%	51	78.5%	14	21.5%



Magnet 2017-18 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

1718.TUSD.Algebra.HS.Q3Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		NonProficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	56	100%	17.5	54.8%	54	96.4%	2	3.6%
Hispanic	41	73.2%	17	53.3%	40	97.6%	1	2.4%
White	8	14.3%	19.1	59.8%	7	87.5%	1	12.5%
African American	2	3.6%	22	68.8%	2	100%	0	0%
Asian Pacific American	2	3.6%	16	50%	2	100%	0	0%
Multi Racial	2	3.6%	19	59.4%	2	100%	0	0%
Native American	1	1.8%	15	46.9%	1	100%	0	0%

Magnet Students	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		NonProficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	56	100%	17.5	54.8%	54	96.4%	2	3.6%
Magnet - No	30	53.6%	16.6	51.8%	29	96.7%	1	3.3%
Magnet - Yes	26	46.4%	18.6	58.2%	25	96.2%	1	3.8%

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: There is a gap between African American and Anglo students. At 6th grade that gap is 38%. (Down 9% from Q1 but up 6.4% from Q2). In 7th grade the gap is 36.5%. (Down 14.8% from Q1 and 3.5% from Q2). At 8th grade the gap is 14%. (Down 16% from Q1 and down 33.4% from Q2). In the Algebra class there is no gap. Overall the gap continues to diminish over time. This indicates that interventions are working over a 3 year period.

There is also still a gap between Hispanic and Anglo students. At 6th grade the gap is 25.7%. (Up 2.9% from Q1 but down 1.6% from Q2). The 7th grade gap is 19.6%. (Down 3.8% from Q1 and down 13.2% from Q2). The 8th grade there is essentially no gap (technically it is 1.6%. Down 3.5%



Magnet 2017-18 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

from Q1 ad down 7.5% from Q2). Algebra also has no real achivement gap. The difference, 2.5% is the difference of less that 1 question.) Again, overall the gap diminishes over time. This indicates that interventions are working over a 3 year period.

What is most exciting for our students is when compared across the district, with the exception of 6th grade African American students, every major ethnic subgroup outscores the district average. This tells us that students here are doing better then their peers at other schools and that they will have greater oppportunites as a result of their education here.

1718.TUSD.MATH.06.Q3Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	364	100%	16.1	53.7%	213	58.5%	151	41.5%
Hispanic	239	65.7%	15.3	50.9%	129	54%	110	46%
White	69	19%	20.1	67%	55	79.7%	14	20.3%
African American	24	6.6%	13.4	44.7%	10	41.7%	14	58.3%
Multi Racial	15	4.1%	18.6	62%	11	73.3%	4	26.7%
Native American	10	2.7%	12.7	42.3%	4	40%	6	60%
Asian Pacific American	7	1.9%	14.9	49.5%	4	57.1%	3	42.9%

Magnet Students	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	364	100%	16.1	53.7%	213	58.5%	151	41.5%
Magnet - No	266	73.1%	15.5	51.6%	144	54.1%	122	45.9%
Magnet - Yes	98	26.9%	17.8	59.4%	69	70.4%	29	29.6%



Magnet 2017-18 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

1718.TUSD.MATH.07.Q3Benchmark								
Ethnicity Subgroups	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	308	100%	15.6	48.9%	189	61.4%	119	38.6%
Hispanic	236	76.6%	15.3	47.9%	144	61%	92	39%
White	36	11.7%	19.5	61%	29	80.6%	7	19.4%
African American	17	5.5%	14.1	44.1%	8	47.1%	9	52.9%
Native American	10	3.2%	12.4	38.8%	3	30%	7	70%
Multi Racial	7	2.3%	15.1	47.3%	4	57.1%	3	42.9%
Asian Pacific American	2	.6%	14.5	45.4%	1	50%	1	50%

Magnet Students	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	308	100%	15.6	48.9%	189	61.4%	119	38.6%
Magnet - No	216	70.1%	14.5	45.2%	118	54.6%	98	45.4%
Magnet - Yes	92	29.9%	18.4	57.5%	71	77.2%	21	22.8%



Magnet 2017-18 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

1718.TUSD.MATH.08.Q3Benchmark									
Ethnicity Subgroups	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		Not Proficient		
	#	%			#	%	#	%	
All Test Takers	266	100%	15.1	50.4%	182	68.4%	84	31.6%	
Hispanic	194	72.9%	15.3	51.2%	132	68%	62	32%	
White	23	8.6%	15.9	53%	16	69.6%	7	30.4%	
African American	18	6.8%	12.7	42.2%	10	55.6%	8	44.4%	
Native American	17	6.4%	13.8	45.9%	13	76.5%	4	23.5%	
Asian Pacific American	7	2.6%	15.9	52.9%	6	85.7%	1	14.3%	
Multi Racial	7	2.6%	15.1	50.5%	5	71.4%	2	28.6%	
Magnet Students	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		Not Proficient		
	#	%			#	%	#	%	
All Test Takers	266	100%	15.1	50.4%	182	68.4%	84	31.6%	
Magnet - No	203	76.3%	14.5	48.2%	130	64%	73	36%	
Magnet - Yes	63	23.7%	17.2	57.4%	52	82.5%	11	17.5%	



Magnet 2017-18 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

1718.TUSD.Algebra.HS.Q3Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	57	100%	20.3	67.5%	56	98.2%	1	1.8%
Hispanic	40	70.2%	20.2	67.3%	39	97.5%	1	2.5%
White	9	15.8%	19.1	63.7%	9	100%	0	0%
Asian Pacific American	3	5.3%	21	70%	3	100%	0	0%
African American	2	3.5%	20.5	68.3%	2	100%	0	0%
Multi Racial	2	3.5%	25	83.3%	2	100%	0	0%
Native American	1	1.8%	21	70%	1	100%	0	0%

Magnet Students	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	57	100%	20.3	67.5%	56	98.2%	1	1.8%
Magnet - No	30	52.6%	19.4	64.6%	29	96.7%	1	3.3%
Magnet - Yes	27	47.4%	21.3	70.9%	27	100%	0	0%



Magnet 2017-18 – School Level Quarterly Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

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

Before/afterschool 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.
General Homework Help	T, H am	Parent/Self-select	4
6 th Grade Homework Help	W am M, T pm	Parent/Self-select	37
8 th Grade Homework Help	T, H pm	Parent/Self-select	10
7 th Grade Homework Help	T H pm	Parent/Self-select	21
ExEd Homework Help	T H pm	Parent/Self-select	7
Total enrollment for above classes			79
Grand Total of ALL intervention classes			79

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.
Science Olympiad	Science and Engineering	Parent/Self-select	20
Robotics	Engineering	Parent/Self-select	17
GEMS	Math and Science	Parent/Self-select	12
Student Council/Yearbook	Leadership	Parent/Self-select	
Debate Club	Speech	Parent/Self-select	19
Total enrollment for above classes			68
Grand Total of ALL enrichment classes (High Schools: Only include MAGNET themed enrichment classes)			154



Magnet – School Level Quarterly Report

2017-18

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	3	3	4	3			3.25
2	Learning = 1 Literal = 2 Refined = 3 Internalized = 4	3	3	4	3			3.25
3	Learning = 1 Literal = 2 Refined = 3 Internalized = 4	4	3	4	3			3.5



Magnet – School Level Quarterly Report

2017-18

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	4	3	4	3			3.5
2	Learning = 1 Literal = 2 Refined = 3 Internalized = 4	4	3	4	3			3.5
3	Learning = 1 Literal = 2 Refined = 3 Internalized = 4	4	3	4	3			3.5



Magnet – School Level Quarterly Report

2017-18

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	4	3	4	2			3.25
2	Learning = 1 Literal = 2 Refined = 3 Internalized = 4	4	3	4	3			3.5
3	Learning = 1 Literal = 2 Refined = 3 Internalized = 4	4	3	4	3			3.5



Magnet – School Level Quarterly Report

2017-18

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			2.5
2	Learning = 1 Literal = 2 Refined = 3 Internalized = 4	4	3	4	3			3.5
3	Learning = 1 Literal = 2 Refined = 3 Internalized = 4	4	3	4	3			3.5



Magnet – School Level Quarterly Report

2017-18

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			2.5
2	Learning = 1 Literal = 2 Refined = 3 Internalized = 4	4	3	3	3			3.25
3	Learning = 1 Literal = 2 Refined = 3 Internalized = 4	4	3	4	3			3.5



Magnet – School Level Quarterly Report

2017-18

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	3.25	3.25	3.5
Guaranteed Curriculum	3.5	3.5	3.5
Common Assessment	3.25	3.5	3.5
Ensuring Learning	2.5	3.5	3.5
Enriching Learning	2.5	3.25	3.5
PLC – Needs Analysis			
<p><i>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)</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Dedicated time on grade level agenda for pre-planning interventions based on past difficulties</i> <i>Dedicated time on grade level agenda for planning grade level enrichment</i> <i>Dedicated time on grade level agenda for planning grade level reteaching</i> 			
PLC – Planning Next Steps			
<p><i>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.</i></p>			
Quarter 1	Departments and content teams create CFAs based upon essential learning and reflect upon process/outcomes. Content teams utilize regular teach/enrich opportunities. Next Steps: streamline the process for ELA/Math sharing of integrated support in other classes.		
Quarter 2	Using Office 365 to increase collaboration. This is still a work in progress. Teams continue to use and analyze CFAs for use in instructional planning, Tier 2 interventions, Reteach/Enrich opportunities. Next Steps: Develop confidence in using 365 to increase collaboration		
Quarter 3	Mansfield PLCs showed growth in “Collaborative Culture” and “Enriching Learning”		
2018-19 SY	Now that teachers are more familiar with using Office 365, we can refocus on using 365 in enhance collaboration, curriculum and assessment design, and reteach and enrich opportunities.		



Magnet – School Level Quarterly Report

2017-18

PARTNERSHIPS

FAMILY/COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT				
	Q1	Q2	Q3/Q4	Total
# Family/community events	12	13	7	32
# Participants in family/community events	1571	1847	737	4155
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	Home Visits	The Community Liaison conducts home visits with families on an as needed basis.		
Type 2: Communicating	Quarterly Newsletter	Newsletters sent home with report cards to inform parents about events from previous quarter and important dates for the next quarter.		
Type 3: Volunteering	Booster Clubs	Parent booster clubs exist for the Vocal Music Classes and the Traveling Bulldog Club. These parent groups support the programs by fundraising.		
Type 4: Learning at Home	Family STEM Night	Quarterly family night with a keynote speaker and choice of breakout sessions for families to attend. Each year there is a specific theme.		
Type 5: Decision Making	PTSO/Site Council	Site Council meets the first Tuesday of every month from 4:30 – 5:30. PTSO, which continues to grow, meets the first Tuesday of every month from 6:00 – 7:00 pm.		
Type 6: Collaborating with Community	Focus on Vision and Payless Shoe Party	The Community Liaison takes select students for glasses and shoes through the support of our community partners.		
Reflection: Parenting and Collaborating with the Community are areas we can strengthen as the year progresses. Decision Making, Learning at Home, and Communication are strengths for our campus. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q1 Activities include (STEM Night, Band/Orchestra, Choir, Open House, Parent-Teacher Conferences, New Student Orientations, Site Council and PTSO) • Q2 Activities include (STEM Night (192), Magnet Open House(~45), 2 Site Council (~10 each), 2 PTSO (~25 total), Honor Roll Ceremony (~600), November Music Festival(~300), Winter Music Festival(~600), Caroling at the Airport (~20), 3 Community Concerts (~145) • Q3 Activities include Honor Roll Ceremony (~300) STEM Night (~130), Honor Band (1), Honor Orchestra (16), Peter Pan Performances (140), Guitar/Choir Concert (150) 				



Magnet – School Level Quarterly Report

2017-18

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.	AZ Trail Association	Established	In process	Provides field research and outdoor learning experiences for select 7 th Grade and ELD students.
2.	W.I.S.E.	Established	Yes	The director serves on our Magnet Committee and the organization helps facilitate breakout sessions for STEM Nights and coordinates volunteers in classes/clubs
3.	STEMAZing Project	Established	In process	The director serves on our Magnet Committee and the organization helps facilitate breakout sessions for STEM Nights and has provided Professional Develop to staff.
4.	Palo Verde HS	Established	In process	Supports Family STEM Night workshops
5.	Tucson HS	Established	Yes	Supports Family STEM Night workshops
6.	Borton ES	Established	Yes	Informs families of STEM Program at Mansfeld and fosters pipeline.
7.	Carrillo ES	Established	In process	Informs families of STEM Program at Mansfeld and fosters community between schools.
8.	UofA Sky School	Established		Provides mentoring for students on an annual overnight research trip.
9.	UofA Garden Project	Established	Yes	Coordinates mentoring for 6 th grade science work with Project LEO and 7 th grade social studies cloning project.
10.	Math/Word Cats/Project SOAR	Established	Yes	Provides Tier 2 interventions during the school day to “at-risk” students.
11.	U of A	In Process	No	Working with Carrillo on developing a partnership with the UofA to share information with faculty @ nearby Magnet Programs



Magnet – School Level Quarterly Report

2017-18

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.

SITE LEVEL CELEBRATIONS	SITE LEVEL CHALLENGES
Quarter 1	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Received PBIS Bronze Level Award Ms. Ryan received a Tucson Appreciates Teachers Recognition for September Selected as an Office 365 site 1 teacher received an EEF Grant Received Fuel up to Play 60 Grant Ms. Lozano selected as STEMAZing teacher Leader Ms. Vogel and Ms. Lozano are in their 2nd year as Notre Dame Trustey STEM fellows Only middle school in TUSD to go up a level under the new letter grade system. Earned a letter grade of B (only 11 points from an A) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The increased number of PDs, while generally good, means a lot more time working on recruiting after hours. Inaccurate projections have put us well above capacity at all three grade levels. We suspect there are families using fictitious addresses to circumvent the lottery process as we have many returned report cards with “forwarding time expired” notices on the front.
<p>Q1 Reflection: Mansfeld has a lot to celebrate! The staff is concerend about the incresed student enrollment above the 27:1 goal.</p>	
Quarter 2	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> GEMS Club awarded the “Intel: She Will Connect; Technolochicas Lift Initiative Grant” Mansfeld wins Metrognome Store credit for most gnomes at GnomeFest Lisa Bradford received a grant from Assisteens for a project entitled “Imaginative Landscapes.” Beverly Sutton’s 8th grade Science Class had a Donor’s Choose 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shared boundaries with K-8s have increased out numbers and we are now over consensus in several classes. We are concerned that if our neighborhood is not reduced that we will have to take fewer magnet students to keep our class sizes reasonable. Presently we have 10 feeder schools, and three of those are K-8. If Mansfeld had even two fewer feeders then we can continue to increase our magnet seats as we have in the



Magnet – School Level Quarterly Report

2017-18

CELEBRATIONS AND CHALLENGES

<p>project funded.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ms. Shu’s ELD class applied for received visits from two teaching artists from the UofA poetry Center to work the students for 10 weeks. • Applied for Magnet School of America School Award • Applied for Magnet Principal of the Year Award • In process of applying for A+ School Award 	<p>past. Several nearby K-8 and middle schools are under-subscribed, so changing feeder patterns would benefit both schools.</p>
<p>Q2 Reflection: Teachers are extremely upset about the increased class size and slowness of district response to addressing boundaries. Teachers are concerned about the safety of students as well as their access to education with classes at and over capacity. This concerns me for the sustainability of our STEM program. Parents touring are concerned about class size as well and are debating between TUSD or charters which can offer smaller classes. Teachers have so far maintained high quality instruction for students, but they are concerned about how long they can continue if the increase is not stemmed.</p>	
<p>Quarters 3/4</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applied for A+ Award • Mansfeld made it past round one of the A+ Award process! • Mansfeld Selected as MSA School of Excellence • Richard Sanchez selected as MSA Principal of the Year for Region 8 • Kirstin Bittel selected as TUSD Certified Campus Support Employee of the Year • Trish Vogel received an EEF Grant 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We need to look at feeder patterns again. I have spoken with several families that are attending other schools that plan to return to Mansfeld next year due to our academic success and positive climate and culture. Families that did not gain entry into Mansfeld via the lottery have told me they are just planning to move into the neighborhood to gain entry.
<p>Q3/Q4 Reflection: Mansfeld has received a lot of accolades this year due to the hard work of the entire campus. That comes with the cost of increased enrollment and overcrowding. Sadly, we also had to reduce Magnet seats this year despite a large number of applications to ensure that class sizes fall between 30 and 33.</p>	
<p>Annual Summary</p>	
<p>Annual Reflection: The entire staff is very proud of the work done on campus this year. We have seen Mansfeld score in the top three middle schools on each benchmark test, often at number 1. The students, as well, take pride in attending one of the top schools in TUSD. We are thrilled to have our hard work recognized by MSA again this year!</p>	



Magnet – School Level Quarterly Report

2017-18

CELEBRATIONS AND CHALLENGES

The USP specifies a dual lottery for neighborhood and magnet, we really need to either pursue this, or divert some of Mansfeld’s feeders to nearby undersubscribed middle schools. Redrawing the boundaries will help strengthen other schools who are at risk due to low enrollment and will ensure that overcrowding does not drive families away from Mansfeld and TUSD again. If some feeder schools are reassigned to under-enrolled middle and K-8 schools, then Mansfeld can increase the number of Magnet seats it can offer. Given that there were 400 applications on the table last year, we feel we can support becoming a zero boundary Magnet school.

We have put five years of hard work into recruiting and program improvements. Right now 978 student attend an integrated school. If class sizes remain overcrowded, we fear the families we have recruited to make the campus integrated will leave the district and then 900 more students will again be attending a racial concentrated school.