

APPENDIX II – 4



SCHOOL NAME: Mansfeld Magnet MS

MAGNET THEME(S): STEM

[illegible][illegible]



Magnet 2018-19 – School Level Final 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	240	3	Interoffice mailing of STEM Night “Save the Date” fliers to Borton, Carrillo, Lineweaver, and Hughes.
Quarter 2	0	4	Responses from previous mailings
Quarter 3/4	350	42 families	Family Information Night attendance.
Totals	590	49	

Activity: Recruitment Related Phone Calls

Range	#	# ParentLink (recruitment)	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	11	0	9 calls were requests for tours/shadows. 3 were neighborhood transfers
Quarter 2	31	0	Several tour/shadow requests. Towards the end of the quarter, several requests for neighborhood families wanting to transfer back to Mansfeld after starting at another school.
Quarter 3/4	36	0	*as of 3/26/19
Totals	78	0	

Activity: Retention Related Phone Calls

Range	#	# ParentLink (retention)	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	31	5580	Calls primarily relating to busses or scheduling Parent Link relating to Open House, BOOST, 9/11 STEM Fair, and Conferences
Quarter 2	1	8298	Calls: parents are now more familiar with who to best contact for help Parent Link: 6 calls



Magnet 2018-19 – School Level Final Report

INTEGRATION

Quarter 3/4	1	4103	Calls: parents are now more familiar with who to best contact for help Parent Link: 3 calls (as of 3/26)
Totals	111	17,981	*Q3 number is low as testing and promotion Parent Links have not gone out.

Activity: Recruitment - Electronic Communication

Range	Outgoing e-mails	Incoming e-mails	Social media (ie: # posts)	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	~29	29	32	Several requests for tours and requests to attend middle school nights at district elementary schools. 21 FB, 11 Instagram
Quarter 2	~51	~69	338	Emails largely tours/shadow requests 47 FB posts/event, 277 Mail Chimp mailings, 4 Twitter 10 Instagram
Quarter 3/4	~81	~68	89	31 FB posts/events 30 Mail Chimp mailings, 17 Twitter, 11 Instagram (as of 3/26), Starting to get 4 th grade inquiries of parents interested in the 2020-21 school year.
Totals	161	166	459	

Activity: Retention - Electronic Communication

Range	Outgoing e-mails	Incoming e-mails	Social media (ie: # posts)	Notes/reflections if applicable. Be specific.
Quarter 1	~22	22	32	Mainly issues related to BOOST program or scheduling 21 FB, 11 Instagram
Quarter 2	~7	~7	338	Emails: parents are now more familiar with who o best contact for help 47 FB posts/event, 277 Mail Chimp mailings, 4 Twitter 10 Instagram
Quarter 3/4	~17	17	1058	56 FB posts/events, 974 MailChimp mailings, 17 Twitter, 11 Instagram (as of 3/26)
Totals	46	46	1428	



Magnet 2018-19 – School Level Final 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	STEM Night (9/27)	3 families	From Borton & Lineweaver
Quarter 2	STEM Night (11/8)	4 families	From Borton, Fructhender, and Lineweaver (3 new families)
Quarter 3/4	Magnet Info Night (2/26)	42 families	Neighborhood and Magnet Families
	STEM Night (2/28)	62 families	Neighborhood and Magnet Families
	Course Selection Night (4/17)	TBD	TBD
	Course Selection Night (4/18)	TBD	TBD
	STEM Night (5/14)	TBD	TBD
Totals	7		

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	9/8 Parent University	5	5	Many families looking to transfer mid year, referred to Fickett
	9/20 Carrillo Literacy Night	0	1	Worked with 38 students
Quarter 2	10/16 Borton MS Night	9	9	Families confirming interest in pipeline
	10/18 Carrillo MS Night	13	13	Cafecito style. Lots of interest
	10/23 Hughes MS Night	11	8	Table presentation, high traffic
	11/19 Carrillo Math Night	?	?	Sign-in misplaced. Counselor taught a math-magic trick
	11/19 Lineweaver MS Night	14	14	Presentation and table. High traffic.
	11/27 Mission View MS Night	25	25	Living room style. Casual and intimate, many families had never heard of us.
	11/28 Tully MS Night	13	13	Counselor attended. Families contact after for tour sign up.
	12/7 STEM Lesson @ Hughes	0	50	Students expressed excitement in attending next year.



Magnet 2018-19 – School Level Final Report

INTEGRATION

Quarter 3/4	2/11 Reader @ Robison	0	n/a	Read to 3 rd graders talked about Mansfeld and middle schools
Totals	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	6 tours = 3 Davis, 1 Borton, 1 Hughes, 1 Out of State
Quarter 2	46	26 tours = 6 Lineweaver, 5 Borton, 5 Davis, 3 Carrillo, 3 Hughes, and 4 out of district/charter. 16 shadows = 8 Lineweaver, 4 Hughes, 4 other
Quarter 3/4	40	21 tours = TBD 19 shadows = TBD
Totals	92	



Magnet 2018-19 – School Level Final Report

INTEGRATION

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

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	2	6	3	1	3	5	156	180	336
	5.7%	7.4%	4.5%	3.9%	33.9%	38.7%	0.6%	1.8%	0.9%	0.3%	0.9%	1.5%	46.4%	53.6%	
07	36	35	19	20	116	116	4	9	6	2	4	7	185	189	374
	9.6%	9.4%	5.1%	5.3%	31.0%	31.0%	1.1%	2.4%	1.6%	0.5%	1.1%	1.9%	49.5%	50.5%	
08	16	22	14	13	121	105	4	6	1	0	6	4	162	150	312
	5.1%	7.1%	4.5%	4.2%	38.8%	33.7%	1.3%	1.9%	0.3%	0.0%	1.9%	1.3%	51.9%	48.1%	
Total	71	82	48	46	351	351	10	21	10	3	13	16	503	519	1022
	6.9%	8.0%	4.7%	4.5%	34.3%	34.3%	1.0%	2.1%	1.0%	0.3%	1.3%	1.6%	49.2%	50.8%	
	153		94		702		31		13		29		1022		
	15.0%		9.2%		68.7%		3.0%		1.3%		2.8%		100.0%		

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
06	18	24	16	14	112	128	1	6	2	1	2	5	151	178	329
	5.5%	7.3%	4.9%	4.3%	34.0%	38.9%	0.3%	1.8%	0.6%	0.3%	0.6%	1.5%	45.9%	54.1%	
07	34	31	20	20	115	112	3	12	6	1	4	7	182	183	365
	9.3%	8.5%	5.5%	5.5%	31.5%	30.7%	0.8%	3.3%	1.6%	0.3%	1.1%	1.9%	49.9%	50.1%	
08	18	23	12	12	119	101	5	6	1	0	7	4	162	146	308
	5.8%	7.5%	3.9%	3.9%	38.6%	32.8%	1.6%	1.9%	0.3%	0.0%	2.3%	1.3%	52.6%	47.4%	
Total	70	78	48	46	346	341	9	24	9	2	13	16	495	507	1002
	7.0%	7.8%	4.8%	4.6%	34.5%	34.0%	0.9%	2.4%	0.9%	0.2%	1.3%	1.6%	49.4%	50.6%	
	148		94		687		33		11		29		1002		
	14.8%		9.4%		68.6%		3.3%		1.1%		2.9%		100.0%		

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	104	4	8	5	2	4	5	164	170	334
	10.2%	10.5%	4.5%	4.8%	30.5%	31.1%	1.2%	2.4%	1.5%	0.6%	1.2%	1.5%	49.1%	50.9%	
07	16	20	13	18	107	101	5	6	2	0	5	3	148	148	296
	5.4%	6.8%	4.4%	6.1%	36.1%	34.1%	1.7%	2.0%	0.7%	0.0%	1.7%	1.0%	50.0%	50.0%	
08	14	18	16	9	128	114	8	7	6	5	3	4	175	157	332
	4.2%	5.4%	4.8%	2.7%	38.6%	34.3%	2.4%	2.1%	1.8%	1.5%	0.9%	1.2%	52.7%	47.3%	
Total	64	73	44	43	337	319	17	21	13	7	12	12	487	475	962
	6.7%	7.6%	4.6%	4.5%	35.0%	33.2%	1.8%	2.2%	1.4%	0.7%	1.2%	1.2%	50.6%	49.4%	
	137		87		656		38		20		24		962		
	14.2%		9.0%		68.2%		4.0%		2.1%		2.5%		100.0%		

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	110	4	8	4	2	4	5	167	176	343
	9.9%	10.2%	4.7%	4.7%	30.6%	32.1%	1.2%	2.3%	1.2%	0.6%	1.2%	1.5%	48.7%	51.3%	
07	17	20	13	16	115	102	4	6	2	0	6	3	157	147	304
	5.6%	6.6%	4.3%	5.3%	37.8%	33.6%	1.3%	2.0%	0.7%	0.0%	2.0%	1.0%	51.6%	48.4%	
08	13	20	16	11	127	113	8	10	5	5	3	4	172	163	335
	3.9%	6.0%	4.8%	3.3%	37.9%	33.7%	2.4%	3.0%	1.5%	1.5%	0.9%	1.2%	51.3%	48.7%	
Total	64	75	45	43	347	325	16	24	11	7	13	12	496	486	982
	6.5%	7.6%	4.6%	4.4%	35.3%	33.1%	1.6%	2.4%	1.1%	0.7%	1.3%	1.2%	50.5%	49.5%	
	139		88		672		40		18		25		982		
	14.2%		9.0%		68.4%		4.1%		1.8%		2.5%		100.0%		

STUDENT RETENTION

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

Reflection: Q1: While the 6th and 8th grade class size is about the same as they were last year, there are approximately 80 more students in 7th grade than last year. From a cohort perspective, the 6th grade class of 2017-18 gained forty students. That has pushed class sizes over-cap for all 7th grade core classes. This has made RTI practices difficult to manage. With projections for 2019-20 being very high, we are concerned about the number of magnet seats will be physically be able to offer and about our integration as a result.

Q2/Q3: We have had some student attrition quarter 2, which has helped ease the overcrowding; however, we have lost a disproportionate number of Anglo students making us less integrated. The reason parents give for leaving is primarily overcrowding.



Magnet 2018-19 – School Level Final Report

INTEGRATION

Theme Visibility: Theme Visibility is not an emphasis area for SY 2018-19; 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 2019/20
Current magnet theme is evident on exterior of building/grounds.				*add A+ logo to exterior
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	Mansfeld has no specialized areas of campus due to its age/historic status. Teachers can utilize the cafeteria/library as needed, but there are no specialized STEM spaces for use outside the classroom.			
Magnet theme is incorporated into the school's mission/vision statement.				
Evidence of family/community engagement/partnerships.				



Magnet 2018-19 – School Level Final 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. The Mansfeld “passer-rate” was, on average, 14 percentage points above the district average; with students getting, on average, 2 more questions correct. Our ELA department met in their PLC and will be working to help students master the unmastered standards as they are not satisfied with a 50% mastery rate.










ELA – Q1 Benchmark Data

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

1819.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	86.9%	12.4	41.4% 	55:43	1212	40.6% 	58:58	1770	59.4% 	53:29
MANSFELD MIDDLE SCHOOL	305	90.8%	14.4	47.9% 	89:20	169	55.4% 	86:46	136	44.6% 	92:32
Grade 6	305	9.0%	14.4	47.9% 	89:20	169	55.4% 	86:46	136	44.6% 	92:32

1819.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	2977	87.3%	16.1	53.8% 	45:35	942	31.6% 	47:22	2035	68.4% 	44:45
MANSFELD MIDDLE SCHOOL	355	93.7%	18.2	60.7% 	72:30	162	45.6% 	68:10	193	54.4% 	76:09
Grade 7	355	10.6%	18.2	60.7% 	72:30	162	45.6% 	68:10	193	54.4% 	76:09

1819.TUSD.ELA.08.Q1Benchmark



Magnet 2018-19 – School Level Final 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	2964	89.1%	13.3	44.5%	52:16	1225	41.3%	53:37	1739	58.7%	51:19
MANSFELD MIDDLE SCHOOL	300	96.5%	15	50.1%	87:28	164	54.7%	85:25	136	45.3%	89:56
Grade 8	300	9.1%	15	50.1%	87:28	164	54.7%	85:25	136	45.3%	89:56

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 scored above the district in all three grade levels. We had the highest 6th grade ELA scores in TUSD and the 2nd highest scores in grades 7 and 8. The Mansfeld “passer-rate” was, on average, 14 percentage points above the district average again with students getting, on average, 2 more questions correct. Our ELA department met in their PLC and will be working to help students master the unmastered standards as they are not satisfied with a 50% mastery rate. They have also identified students for targeted Tier 2 interventions as a 6/5 class (Tier 1) during Advisory time (Tier 2) and small group tutoring (Tier 3).

ELA – Q2 Benchmark Data

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

1819.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	2974	87.7%	12.7	42.2%	52:55	1179	39.6%	52:29	1795	60.4%	53:12
MANSFELD MIDDLE SCHOOL	309	93.4%	14.3	47.8%	72:49	161	52.1%	69:46	148	47.9%	76:08
Grade 6	309	93.4%	14.3	47.8%	72:49	161	52.1%	69:46	148	47.9%	76:08

1819.TUSD.ELA.07.Q2Benchmark



Magnet 2018-19 – School Level Final 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	2921	87.0%	14.4	47.9%	49:39	1236	42.3%	51:43	1685	57.7%	48:08
MANSFELD MIDDLE SCHOOL	358	96.2%	15.9	53.1%	72:03	198	55.3%	72:00	160	44.7%	72:07
Grade 7	358	96.2%	15.9	53.1%	72:03	198	55.3%	72:00	160	44.7%	72:07

1819.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	2916	88.1%	13.7	45.6%	57:45	1286	44.1%	59:34	1630	55.9%	56:18
MANSFELD MIDDLE SCHOOL	297	95.8%	15.3	51.1%	81:46	180	60.6%	80:19	117	39.4%	84:00
Grade 8	297	95.8%	15.3	51.1%	81:46	180	60.6%	80:19	117	39.4%	84:00

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 scored above the district in all three grade levels and had the 2nd highest scores in grades in all grades. The Mansfeld “passer-rate” was, on average, 14.8 percentage points above the district average again with students getting, on average, 2 more questions correct. Our ELA department continues to meet in their PLC and will be working to help students master the unmastered standards as the school goal is 80% mastery rate. They continue to provide select students students with targeted Tier 2 interventions as a 6/5 class (Tier 1) during Advisory time (Tier 2) and small group tutoring (Tier 3).

ELA – Q3 Benchmark Data

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

1819.TUSD.ELA.06.Q3Benchmark



Magnet 2018-19 – School Level Final 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	2913	88.2%	14.7	49%	54:39	976	33.5%	54:33	1937	66.5%	54:42
MANSFELD MIDDLE SCHOOL	300	92.9%	16.5	55.1%	73:38	131	43.7%	71:18	169	56.3%	75:26
Grade 6	300	92.9%	16.5	55.1%	73:38	131	43.7%	71:18	169	56.3%	75:26

1819.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	2864	84.8%	13.8	46%	56:16	1262	44.1%	57:43	1602	55.9%	55:07
MANSFELD MIDDLE SCHOOL	340	94.2%	15.5	51.6%	81:00	203	59.7%	80:50	137	40.3%	81:15
Grade 7	340	94.4%	15.5	51.6%	81:00	203	59.7%	80:50	137	40.3%	81:15

1819.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	2871	86.0%	18	59.9%	49:29	1235	43%	50:11	1636	57%	48:56
MANSFELD MIDDLE SCHOOL	290	94.5%	20.4	68.1%	72:11	187	64.5%	69:26	103	35.5%	77:11
Grade 8	290	94.8%	20.4	68.1%	72:11	187	64.5%	69:26	103	35.5%	77:11

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 scored above the district in all four grade assessments. Mansfeld's "passer-rate" was, on average, 20 percentage points above the district average in 6th and 7th grade, and an average of 47 percentage points above the district in 8th grade (including Algebra). Incredibly, 83% of 8th graders and 96.6% of Algebra students passed the benchmark. The math PLC met to look at Q2 standards and has identified highly leveraged standards to focus upon for Q3. Some of our teachers in grade 7 were unaware of the change in sequence for math standards this year, so they will be following curriculum 5.0 more closely this upcoming quarter.

MATH – Q1 Benchmark Data

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

1819.TUSD.Math.06.Q1Benchmark



Magnet 2018-19 – School Level Final 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	3193	93.4%	12.8	42.7%	59:12	1276	40%	66:12	1917	60%	54:33
MANSFELD MIDDLE SCHOOL	325	97.3%	15.7	52.3%	92:32	192	59.1%	94:03	133	40.9%	90:20
Grade 6	325	9.6%	15.7	52.3%	92:32	192	59.1%	94:03	133	40.9%	90:20
1819.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	3031	88.9%	9.8	32.6%	68:11	1253	41.3%	78:19	1778	58.7%	61:02
MANSFELD MIDDLE SCHOOL	366	97.1%	12.6	42.1%	107:13	228	62.3%	111:23	138	37.7%	100:20
Grade 7	366	10.9%	12.6	42.1%	107:13	228	62.3%	111:23	138	37.7%	100:20
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	2741	81.2%	10.7	35.6%	56:19	1085	39.6%	69:21	1656	60.4%	47:46
MANSFELD MIDDLE SCHOOL	247	79.4%	17.8	59.5%	84:29	205	83%	83:42	42	17%	88:20
Grade 8	247	7.5%	17.8	59.5%	84:29	205	83%	83:42	42	17%	88:20
1819.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	3540	17.1%	12.6	46.5%	43:03	1626	45.9%	46:27	1914	54.1%	40:11
MANSFELD MIDDLE SCHOOL	58	8.4%	21.2	78.6%	72:16	56	96.6%	72:01	2	3.4%	78:55
Grade 8	58	1.8%	21.2	78.6%	72:16	56	96.6%	72:01	2	3.4%	78:55



Magnet 2018-19 – School Level Final 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: Mansfeld again scored above the district in all four grade assessments. We had the highest Algebra score in the district second highest scores in the district for grades 6, 7, and 8. Our Algebra and the Mansfeld's "passer-rate" was, on average, 15 percentage points above the district average in 6th and 7th grade, and an average of 35 percentage points above the district in 8th grade (including Algebra) Incredibly, 91.4% of Algebra students passed the benchmark. The math PLC met to look at Q2 standards and has identified highly leveraged standards to focus upon for Q3. They have also identified students for targeted Tier 2 interventions as a 6/5 class (Tier 1) during Advisory time (Tier 2) and small group tutoring (Tier 3).

MATH – Q2 Benchmark Data

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

1819.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	3130	92.3%	13.9	46.3%	61:15	1231	39.3%	62:45	1899	60.7%	60:17
MANSFELD MIDDLE SCHOOL	322	97.3%	16.6	55.3%	80:07	182	56.5%	79:07	140	43.5%	81:26
Grade 6	322	97.3%	16.6	55.3%	80:07	182	56.5%	79:07	140	43.5%	81:26

1819.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	2993	89.1%	10.4	34.8%	78:31	1169	39.1%	88:25	1824	60.9%	72:10
MANSFELD MIDDLE SCHOOL	364	97.8%	12.5	41.6%	110:45	191	52.5%	114:07	173	47.5%	107:02
Grade 7	364	97.8%	12.5	41.6%	110:45	191	52.5%	114:07	173	47.5%	107:02

1819.TUSD.Math.08.Q2Benchmark



Magnet 2018-19 – School Level Final 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	2641	78.3%	9.3	30.9%	68:09	1025	38.8%	80:34	1616	61.2%	60:16
MANSFELD MIDDLE SCHOOL	243	78.1%	11.7	38.9%	102:27	143	58.8%	107:16	100	41.2%	95:34
Grade 8	243	78.4%	11.7	38.9%	102:27	143	58.8%	107:16	100	41.2%	95:34

1819.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	3322	16.4%	11.3	41.8%	42:32	1399	42.1%	48:46	1923	57.9%	37:59
MANSFELD MIDDLE SCHOOL	58	8.5%	19.8	73.3%	81:47	53	91.4%	82:08	5	8.6%	77:56
Grade 8	58	18.7%	19.8	73.3%	81:47	53	91.4%	82:08	5	8.6%	77:56

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 again scored above the district in all four grade assessments. We had the highest 8th grade score in the district second highest scores in the district for grades 6, 7, and Algebra. On average, our students scored 17.6% higher than the district average, getting about 3 more questions correct per exam. Incredibly, 96.4% of Algebra students passed the benchmark. The math PLC continues to meet to look at Q3 standards and has identified highly leveraged standards to focus upon in preparation for AZMerit. They continue to work with identified students for targeted Tier 2 interventions as a 6/5 class (Tier 1) during Advisory time (Tier 2) and small group tutoring (Tier 3).

MATH – Q3 Benchmark Data

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

1819.TUSD.Math.06.Q3Benchmark



Magnet 2018-19 – School Level Final 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	3108	93.8%	14.3	47.6%	62.04	1282	41.2%	64:35	1826	58.8%	60:19
MANSFELD MIDDLE SCHOOL	321	99.4%	16.6	55.4%	86.07	177	55.1%	84:34	144	44.9%	88:01
Grade 6	321	99.4%	16.6	55.4%	86.07	177	55.1%	84:34	144	44.9%	88:01

1819.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	2959	87.1%	12.4	41.2%	75:27	908	30.7%	83:38	2051	69.3%	71:49
MANSFELD MIDDLE SCHOOL	352	97.5%	14.7	48.8%	104:32	162	46%	105:11	190	54%	103:59
Grade 7	352	97.8%	14.7	48.8%	104:32	162	46%	105:11	190	54%	103:59


1819.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	2580	75.9%	12.5	41.7%	65:56	835	32.4%	74:22	1745	67.6%	61:54
MANSFELD MIDDLE SCHOOL	244	79.5%	15.8	52.7%	101:10	144	59%	101:57	100	41%	100:01
Grade 8	244	79.7%	15.8	52.7%	101:10	144	59%	101:57	100	41%	100:01

1819.TUSD.Algebra.HS.Q3Benchmark

By Grade ▲	# Tested ⚡	Participation Rate ⚡	Avg. RS ⚡	Avg. % Correct ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡	Proficient			Not Proficient		
						# ⚡	% ⚡	Avg. TS ⚡	# ⚡	% ⚡	Avg. TS
Tucson Unified School District	3173	15.9%	11.3	41.7%	44:43	1346	42.4%	52:40	1827	57.6%	38:52
MANSFELD MIDDLE SCHOOL	55	8.3%	18.8	69.6%	88:10	53	96.4%	88:27	2	3.6%	80:45
Grade 8	55	18.0%	18.8	69.6%	88:10	53	96.4%	88:27	2	3.6%	80:45

**Magnet 2018-19 – School Level Final 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: All Mansfeld subgroups outperformed the district average. This is evidence that while a gap exists, Mansfeld is making progress increasing academic achievement for all students in English Language Arts. We are happy to report that the gap is decreasing over the three years for hispanic students (dropping from 2.4% percent fewer passing than average in 6th grade to 0.9% fewer passing in 8th grade.) For African American students, the gap appears to widen over time. This data will be shared with teams in an effort to identify what is helping to close the achievement gap for Hispanic students and utilize similar strategies for African American students. (Gap: Gr 6 18.2% Gr 7 13.3% Gr 8 15.3%)

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

1819.TUSD.ELA.06.Q1Benchmark

USP focus groups	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	287	100%	14.3	47.8%	157	54.7%	130	45.3%
Hispanic	229	79.8%	13.6	45.4%	113	49.3%	116	50.7%
White	38	13.2%	19.1	63.6%	34	89.5%	4	10.5%
African American	20	7%	13.8	45.8%	10	50%	10	50%

1819.TUSD.ELA.07.Q1Benchmark

USP focus groups	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	326	100%	18.3	61%	151	46.3%	175	53.7%
Hispanic	224	68.7%	17.8	59.2%	92	41.1%	132	58.9%
White	68	20.9%	20.8	69.5%	46	67.6%	22	32.4%
African American	34	10.4%	16.9	56.2%	13	38.2%	21	61.8%



Magnet 2018-19 – School Level Final Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

1819.TUSD.ELA.08.Q1Benchmark

USP focus groups	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	281	100%	15.1	50.3%	156	55.5%	125	44.5%
Hispanic	223	79.4%	14.8	49.4%	118	52.9%	105	47.1%
White	35	12.5%	18.1	60.2%	27	77.1%	8	22.9%
African American	23	8.2%	13.5	44.9%	11	47.8%	12	52.2%

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: All Mansfeld subgroups continue outperformed the district average. African American students at Mansfeld scored 20.7% above district peers and 12.6% above the district average. Hispanic students at Mansfeld scored 11.8% above district peers and 12.6% above the district average. This is continued evidence that while a gap exists, Mansfeld is making progress increasing academic achievement for all students in English Language Arts. Students on the cusp will be receiving additional Tier 1 Interventions during a special additional ELA intervention class, Tier 2 interventions during Advisory period with ELA teachers, or Tier 3 Interventions during school day tutoring in an effort to further reduce the achievement gap.

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

1819.TUSD.ELA.06.Q2Benchmark



Magnet 2018-19 – School Level Final Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Ethnicity Subgroups ▲	Students Tested		Avg. RS ▲	Avg. Percent Correct ▲	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	# ▼	% ▲			# ▲	% ▲	# ▲	% ▲
All Test Takers	309	100%	14.3	47.8%	161	52.1%	148	47.9%
Hispanic	237	76.7%	13.5	45%	109	46%	128	54%
White	38	12.3%	19.2	64%	32	84.2%	6	15.8%
African American	15	4.9%	14.9	49.5%	11	73.3%	4	26.7%
Multi Racial	8	2.6%	15.9	52.9%	4	50%	4	50%
Native American	8	2.6%	11.6	38.8%	2	25%	6	75%
Asian Pacific American	3	1%	19.7	65.5%	3	100%	0	0%



Magnet 2018-19 – School Level Final Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

1819.TUSD.ELA.07.Q2Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups ▲	Students Tested		Avg. RS ◆	Avg. Percent Correct ◆	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	# ▼	% ◆			# ◆	% ◆	# ◆	% ◆
All Test Takers	358	100%	15.9	53.1%	198	55.3%	160	44.7%
Hispanic	236	65.9%	15.2	50.8%	118	50%	118	50%
White	67	18.7%	19.7	65.7%	56	83.6%	11	16.4%
African American	22	6.1%	14.5	48.3%	11	50%	11	50%
Multi Racial	14	3.9%	16.9	56.4%	9	64.3%	5	35.7%
Native American	14	3.9%	11.4	38.1%	2	14.3%	12	85.7%
Asian Pacific American	5	1.4%	15	50%	2	40%	3	60%

1819.TUSD.ELA.08.Q2Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups ▲	Students Tested		Avg. RS ◆	Avg. Percent Correct ◆	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	# ▼	% ◆			# ◆	% ◆	# ◆	% ◆
All Test Takers	297	100%	15.3	51.1%	179	60.3%	118	39.7%
Hispanic	226	76.1%	15	50%	132	58.4%	94	41.6%
White	38	12.8%	18.9	63.2%	31	81.6%	7	18.4%
African American	17	5.7%	12.9	43.1%	8	47.1%	9	52.9%
Native American	9	3%	12.4	41.5%	4	44.4%	5	55.6%
Multi Racial	6	2%	13.3	44.4%	3	50%	3	50%
Asian Pacific American	1	0.3%	26	86.7%	1	100%	0	0%



Magnet 2018-19 – School Level Final 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: All Mansfeld subgroups continue outperformed the district average. African American students at Mansfeld scored 16.8% above district peers and 9.7% above the district average. Hispanic students at Mansfeld scored 14.4% above district peers and 11.3% above the district average. This is continued evidence that while a gap exists, Mansfeld is making progress increasing academic achievement for all students in English Language Arts. Of note, when accelerated classes are separated from general classes, the gap decreases from 25% in 6th grade to 10% in 8th grade with all ethnic groups scoring above 90% proficiency in 8th grade. There are pockets in the general strands that we are looking at: in 6th Hispanic students scored quite low and 8th grade our African American students scored quite low. Teams are working to identify the root cause to address it. Students on the cusp will continue to receive additional Tier 1 Interventions during a special additional ELA intervention class, Tier 2 interventions during Advisory period with ELA teachers, or Tier 3 Interventions during school day tutoring in an effort to further reduce the achievement gap.

**** Note:** Using Benchmark data - There is minimal achievement gap between subgroups in 8th grade advanced ELA.

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

1819.TUSD.ELA.06.Q3Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups ▲	Students Tested		Avg. RS ⬆	Avg. Percent Correct ⬆	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	# ▼	% ⬆			# ⬆	% ⬆	# ⬆	% ⬆
All Test Takers	300	100%	16.5	55.1%	131	43.7%	169	56.3%
Hispanic	230	76.7%	15.7	52.4%	86	37.4%	144	62.6%
White	36	12%	21.6	72.1%	29	80.6%	7	19.4%
African American	14	4.7%	17.9	59.8%	10	71.4%	4	28.6%
Multi Racial	9	3%	16.6	55.2%	4	44.4%	5	55.6%
Native American	8	2.7%	13.8	45.9%	0	0%	8	100%
Asian Pacific American	3	1%	19.3	64.5%	2	66.7%	1	33.3%

1819.TUSD.ELA.07.Q3Benchmark



Magnet 2018-19 – School Level Final Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Ethnicity Subgroups ▲	Students Tested		Avg. RS ⬆	Avg. Percent Correct ⬆	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	# ▼	% ⬆			# ⬆	% ⬆	# ⬆	% ⬆
All Test Takers	340	100%	15.5	51.6%	203	59.7%	137	40.3%
Hispanic	226	66.5%	14.8	49.4%	125	55.3%	101	44.7%
White	62	18.2%	18.8	62.7%	52	83.9%	10	16.1%
African American	19	5.6%	14.7	49.1%	11	57.9%	8	42.1%
Native American	15	4.4%	10.7	35.5%	3	20%	12	80%
Multi Racial	14	4.1%	16.9	56.4%	9	64.3%	5	35.7%
Asian Pacific American	4	1.2%	17.5	58.3%	3	75%	1	25%

1819.TUSD.ELA.08.Q3Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups ▲	Students Tested		Avg. RS ⬆	Avg. Percent Correct ⬆	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	# ▼	% ⬆			# ⬆	% ⬆	# ⬆	% ⬆
All Test Takers	290	100%	20.4	68.1%	187	64.5%	103	35.5%
Hispanic	222	76.6%	20.2	67.2%	139	62.6%	83	37.4%
White	38	13.1%	22.4	74.7%	33	86.8%	5	13.2%
African American	15	5.2%	20.3	67.8%	7	46.7%	8	53.3%
Native American	9	3.1%	19.6	65.2%	4	44.4%	5	55.6%
Multi Racial	5	1.7%	19.4	64.7%	3	60%	2	40%
Asian Pacific American	1	0.3%	23	76.7%	1	100%	0	0%

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: All Mansfeld subgroups outperformed the district average. This is evidence that while a gap exists, Mansfeld is making progress increasing academic achievement for all students in Math. For Hispanic students, this gap increases slightly between 6th and 7th grade, and decreases in 8th grade. For African American students the same pattern exists. This data will be shared with teams in an effort to identify what is helping to close the achievement gap for in certain grades, and attempt to replicate those strategies across the school. (Gap: Gr 6 22.7% Gr 7 33.9% Gr 8 30.5%)

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

1819.TUSD.MATH.06.Q1Benchmark



Magnet 2018-19 – School Level Final Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

USP focus groups	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	307	100%	15.6	52.1%	180	58.6%	127	41.4%
Hispanic	239	77.9%	15.2	50.6%	135	56.5%	104	43.5%
White	42	13.7%	19.8	66%	32	76.2%	10	23.8%
African American	26	8.5%	13	43.3%	13	50%	13	50%



Magnet 2018-19 – School Level Final Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

1819.TUSD.MATH.07.Q1Benchmark

USP focus groups	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	334	100%	12.8	42.8%	211	63.2%	123	36.8%
Hispanic	225	67.4%	12	40%	137	60.9%	88	39.1%
White	70	21%	16.8	56%	56	80%	14	20%
African American	39	11.7%	10.6	35.2%	18	46.2%	21	53.8%

1819.TUSD.MATH.08.Q1Benchmark

USP focus groups	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	230	100%	17.8	59.3%	191	83%	39	17%
Hispanic	188	81.7%	17.8	59.2%	157	83.5%	31	16.5%
White	22	9.6%	20.7	68.9%	21	95.5%	1	4.5%
African American	20	8.7%	15.1	50.3%	13	65%	7	35%

1819.TUSD.Algebra.HS.Q1Benchmark

USP focus groups	Students Tested		Avg. RS	Avg. Percent Correct	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	#	%			#	%	#	%
All Test Takers	55	100%	21.3	78.9%	53	96.4%	2	3.6%
Hispanic	35	63.6%	21.5	79.6%	34	97.1%	1	2.9%
White	15	27.3%	21.7	80.5%	15	100%	0	0%
African American	5	9.1%	18.6	68.9%	4	80%	1	20%



Magnet 2018-19 – School Level Final Report

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: All Mansfeld subgroups continue outperformed the district average. African American students at Mansfeld scored 17.6% above district peers and 3.9% above the district average. Hispanic students at Mansfeld scored 18.2% above district peers and 16.2% above the district average. Interestingly, Algebra, the only advanced class to be reported separately, the top achieving group are our African American students. This is continued evidence that while a gap exists, Mansfeld is making progress increasing academic achievement for all students in Math. Students on the cusp will be receiving additional Tier 2 Interventions during a special additional Math intervention class, Tier 2 interventions during Advisory period with Math teachers, or Tier 3 Interventions during school day tutoring in an effort to further reduce the achievement gap.

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

1819.TUSD.MATH.06.Q2Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups ▲	Students Tested		Avg. RS ◆	Avg. Percent Correct ◆	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	# ▼	% ◆			# ◆	% ◆	# ◆	% ◆
All Test Takers	322	100%	16.6	55.3%	182	56.5%	140	43.5%
Hispanic	240	74.5%	16.1	53.7%	132	55%	108	45%
White	41	12.7%	20.7	68.9%	30	73.2%	11	26.8%
African American	21	6.5%	14.4	47.9%	10	47.6%	11	52.4%
Multi Racial	9	2.8%	15.8	52.6%	4	44.4%	5	55.6%
Native American	8	2.5%	14.6	48.8%	3	37.5%	5	62.5%
Asian Pacific American	3	0.9%	23.3	77.8%	3	100%	0	0%

1819.TUSD.MATH.07.Q2Benchmark



Magnet 2018-19 – School Level Final Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Ethnicity Subgroups ▲	Students Tested		Avg. RS ▲	Avg. Percent Correct ▲	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	# ▼	% ▲			# ▲	% ▲	# ▲	% ▲
All Test Takers	364	100%	12.5	41.6%	191	52.5%	173	47.5%
Hispanic	237	65.1%	11.9	39.7%	121	51.1%	116	48.9%
White	67	18.4%	16.9	56.3%	48	71.6%	19	28.4%
African American	26	7.1%	8.8	29.2%	7	26.9%	19	73.1%
Multi Racial	14	3.8%	12.9	42.9%	8	57.1%	6	42.9%
Native American	14	3.8%	8.5	28.3%	3	21.4%	11	78.6%
Asian Pacific American	6	1.6%	10.7	35.6%	4	66.7%	2	33.3%
1819.TUSD.MATH.08.Q2Benchmark								
Ethnicity Subgroups ▲	Students Tested		Avg. RS ▲	Avg. Percent Correct ▲	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	# ▼	% ▲			# ▲	% ▲	# ▲	% ▲
All Test Takers	243	100%	11.7	38.9%	143	58.8%	100	41.2%
Hispanic	191	78.6%	11.5	38.5%	112	58.6%	79	41.4%
White	22	9.1%	12.4	41.4%	15	68.2%	7	31.8%
African American	15	6.2%	11.5	38.2%	8	53.3%	7	46.7%
Native American	10	4.1%	13.9	46.3%	7	70%	3	30%
Multi Racial	5	2.1%	9.6	32%	1	20%	4	80%
1819.TUSD.Algebra.HS.Q3Benchmark								



Magnet 2018-19 – School Level Final Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Ethnicity Subgroups ▲	Students Tested		Avg. RS ◆	Avg. Percent Correct ◆	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	# ▼	% ◆			# ◆	% ◆	# ◆	% ◆
All Test Takers	59	100%	19.6	72.8%	53	89.8%	6	10.2%
Hispanic	40	67.8%	19.9	73.7%	36	90%	4	10%
White	15	25.4%	18.4	68.2%	13	86.7%	2	13.3%
African American	2	3.4%	23	85.2%	2	100%	0	0%
Asian Pacific American	1	1.7%	17	63%	1	100%	0	0%
Multi Racial	1	1.7%	24	88.9%	1	100%	0	0%

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:

All Mansfeld subgroups continue outperformed the district average. African American students at Mansfeld scored 17.7% above district peers and 8.4% above the district average. Hispanic students at Mansfeld scored 15.7% above district peers and 14.3% above the district average. Interestingly, Algebra, the only advanced class to be reported separately, the top achieving groups are our African American and Anglo students (100% mastery). This is continued evidence that while a gap exists, Mansfeld is making progress increasing academic achievement for all students in Math. Of note, when accelerated classes are separated from general courses, the gap decreases from 21% in 6th grade to 12% in 8th grade and 5% in Algebra with all major subgroups achieving 80% mastery in 8th grade. There is a pocket in the general strands that we are looking at: in 7th grade, our African American students scored quite low. Teams are working to identify the root cause to address it. Students on the cusp will continue to receive additional Tier 2 Interventions during a special additional Math intervention class, Tier 2 interventions during Advisory period with Math teachers, or Tier 3 Interventions during school day tutoring in an effort to further reduce the achievement gap.

**** Note:** Using Benchmark data - In Algebra, there is no achievement gap between AA students and other subgroups by 3rd quarter. There is also minimal achievement gap between subgroups in 8th grade advanced Math.

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

1819.TUSD.MATH.06.Q3Benchmark



Magnet 2018-19 – School Level Final Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Ethnicity Subgroups ▲	Students Tested		Avg. RS ⬆	Avg. Percent Correct ⬆	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	# ▼	% ⬆			# ⬆	% ⬆	# ⬆	% ⬆
All Test Takers	321	100%	16.6	55.4%	177	55.1%	144	44.9%
Hispanic	242	75.4%	15.7	52.4%	120	49.6%	122	50.4%
White	39	12.1%	22.2	73.8%	33	84.6%	6	15.4%
African American	21	6.5%	15.1	50.5%	11	52.4%	10	47.6%
Multi Racial	8	2.5%	19.1	63.7%	5	62.5%	3	37.5%
Native American	8	2.5%	15.5	51.7%	5	62.5%	3	37.5%
Asian Pacific American	3	0.9%	23	76.7%	3	100%	0	0%

1819.TUSD.MATH.07.Q3Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups ▲	Students Tested		Avg. RS ⬆	Avg. Percent Correct ⬆	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	# ▼	% ⬆			# ⬆	% ⬆	# ⬆	% ⬆
All Test Takers	352	100%	14.7	48.8%	162	46%	190	54%
Hispanic	228	64.8%	14	46.5%	95	41.7%	133	58.3%
White	63	17.9%	19.6	65.3%	48	76.2%	15	23.8%
African American	25	7.1%	11.6	38.7%	7	28%	18	72%
Native American	15	4.3%	9.5	31.8%	2	13.3%	13	86.7%
Multi Racial	14	4%	15.8	52.6%	7	50%	7	50%
Asian Pacific American	7	2%	12.1	40.5%	3	42.9%	4	57.1%

1819.TUSD.MATH.08.Q3Benchmark

Ethnicity Subgroups ▲	Students Tested		Avg. RS ⬆	Avg. Percent Correct ⬆	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	# ▼	% ⬆			# ⬆	% ⬆	# ⬆	% ⬆
All Test Takers	244	100%	15.8	52.7%	144	59%	100	41%
Hispanic	188	77%	15.6	51.8%	103	54.8%	85	45.2%
White	27	11.1%	17.7	58.9%	23	85.2%	4	14.8%
African American	15	6.1%	15.4	51.3%	9	60%	6	40%
Native American	9	3.7%	17.4	58.2%	7	77.8%	2	22.2%
Multi Racial	5	2%	13.2	44%	2	40%	3	60%

1819.TUSD.Algebra.HS.Q3Benchmark



Magnet 2018-19 – School Level Final Report

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Ethnicity Subgroups ▲	Students Tested		Avg. RS ⬆	Avg. Percent Correct ⬆	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	# ▼	% ⬆			# ⬆	% ⬆	# ⬆	% ⬆
All Test Takers	55	100%	18.8	69.6%	53	96.4%	2	3.6%
Hispanic	38	69.1%	18.7	69.2%	36	94.7%	2	5.3%
White	13	23.6%	18.8	69.5%	13	100%	0	0%
African American	2	3.6%	22.5	83.4%	2	100%	0	0%
Asian Pacific American	1	1.8%	14	51.9%	1	100%	0	0%
Multi Racial	1	1.8%	20	74.1%	1	100%	0	0%



Magnet 2018-19 – School Level Final Report

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.
Homework Help	Homework Help	Teacher/parent recommendation	33
6 th Grade Homework Help	Tutoring/Homework Help	Teacher/parent recommendation	15
7 th Grade Homework Help	Tutoring/Homework Help	Teacher/parent recommendation	11
8 th Grade Homework Help	Tutoring/Homework Help	Teacher/parent recommendation	7
ExEd Homework Help	Tutoring/Homework Help	Teacher/parent recommendation	3
Total enrollment for above classes			69
Grand Total of ALL intervention classes			69

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	30
Computer Science Club	Computers	Self selection	10
GEMS Club	Science/Engineering (girls)	Self selection	16
Math Exploration Club	Math	Self selection	6
Robotics	Robotics	Self selection	14
Total enrollment for above classes			76
Grand Total of ALL enrichment classes (High Schools: Only include MAGNET themed enrichment classes)			201



Magnet – School Level Final Report

2018-19

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	2	2	2	3	2.4
2	Learning = 1 Literal = 2 Refined = 3 Internalized = 4		3	2	2	2.5	4	2.7
3	Learning = 1 Literal = 2 Refined = 3 Internalized = 4		3	3	2.5	2	4	2.9



Magnet – School Level Final Report

2018-19

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	2	2	3	2.6
2	Learning = 1 Literal = 2 Refined = 3 Internalized = 4		3	3	3	2	3	2.8
3	Learning = 1 Literal = 2 Refined = 3 Internalized = 4		3	3	3	2	3	2.8



Magnet – School Level Final Report

2018-19

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



Magnet – School Level Final Report

2018-19

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		2	2	2	2	3	2.2
2	Learning = 1 Literal = 2 Refined = 3 Internalized = 4		2	3	2	2	3	2.4
3	Learning = 1 Literal = 2 Refined = 3 Internalized = 4		2	3	2	2	4	2.6



Magnet – School Level Final Report

2018-19

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		2	2	2	2	4	2.4
2	Learning = 1 Literal = 2 Refined = 3 Internalized = 4		2	3	2	2	4	2.6
3	Learning = 1 Literal = 2 Refined = 3 Internalized = 4		2	3	2	2	4	2.6



Magnet – School Level Final Report

2018-19

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	2.4	2.7	2.9
Guaranteed Curriculum	2.6	2.8	2.8
Common Assessment	2.0	2.0	2.0
Ensuring Learning	2.2	2.4	2.6
Enriching Learning	2.4	2.6	2.6

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: Training/Time to create CFAs on SchoolCity/O365**
- 2. Assessment: Training/Time on analyzing student scores**
- 3. Differentiated Assessment: Tier 2 interventions**

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	PLCs established new norms and collective commitments. They have also determined high leverage standards for their own department their next step is scaffolding those key concepts across the grade bands.
Quarter 2	Teachers will meet after the holiday break to review District benchmark data using Mastery and Item Analysis Reports. Summary findings from these reports will be used in the creation/refinement of CFAS during Q3. *Reflection point: We have been evaluating our cross-grade level department PLCs that meet on Wednesdays. It was pointed out that due to the nature of the standards, it is difficult to engage in the “Inquiry Cycle” in a meaningful way across grade bands.
Quarter 3/4	Department PLC Teams have had limited time together this quarter so there has not been time to improve collaboration.
For 2019/20	Next year we will use ELA and Math paired content teams to get a better measure of content PLCs that can engage in the Inquiry Cycle in a meaningful way. This will provide a better measure of PLCs as content teams at the individual grade levels are significantly more collaborative and meet more often.



Magnet – School Level Final Report

2018-19

PARTNERSHIPS

Directions: Each school is allocated 11 opportunities for Site Focus PD for the 2018-19 school year. If additional opportunities for PD have been offered (such as Saturday PD), please add additional rows.

SITE SPECIFIC PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

<u>Date</u>	<u>Title of PD</u>	<u>Focus of PD</u>	<u>Rationale</u>
8/8	Back to School Information	Setting of norms policies and procedures for 2018-19 school year.	All staff will have common expectations.
8/15	Loose vs Tight Systems	What systems and expectations are in place? Which are tight? Which are loose?	To inform new principal/staff about school climate and culture.
9/5	Q1 STEM Challenge	Paper Helicopter Challenge	To give teachers first hand experience with the challenge so they can better support their advisory groups.
9/15	STEM Academy: Math Practices	What are the math practices? How can we embed the math practices in our teaching?	This will allow new staff to become familiar with the magnet theme and how to ensure they are teaching with the theme in mind.
9/26	Department PLCs	Focus Standards Leading to Benchmark	Departments will review Highly Leveraged ELA/Math standards and select the standard that can be best supported in non ELA/Math classes. ELA/Math will develop strategies to improve Tier 1 instruction for Highly Leveraged standards.
9/29	STEM Academy: Science Practices	What are the science practices? How can we embed the science practices in our teaching?	This will allow new staff to become familiar with the magnet theme and how to ensure they are teaching with the theme in mind.
10/3	Celebration of Success	To celebrate Mansfeld's "B" letter grade and identify factors that contributed to success	To build climate and culture and to identify factors that contributed to success so we can replicate that success.
10/17	Department PLCs	SMART Goals from Q2 Benchmark Data	Departments will review Q1 Benchmark results and set Q2 SMART Goals.
10/20	STEM Academy: Engineering Practices	What are the engineering practices? How can we embed the engineering practices in our teaching?	This will allow new staff to become familiar with the magnet theme and how to ensure they are teaching with the theme in mind.
10/31	Q2 STEM Challenge	Simple Paper Bridge	To give teachers first hand experience with the challenge



Magnet – School Level Final Report

2018-19

PARTNERSHIPS

			so they can better support their advisory groups.
11/7	Department PLCs	Focus Standards Leading to Benchmarks	Departments will review Highly Leveraged ELA/Math standards and select the standard that can be best supported in non ELA/Math classes. ELA/Math will develop strategies to improve Tier 1 instruction for Highly Leveraged standards.
11/17	STEM Academy: Technology Practices	What are the technology practices? How can we embed the technology practices in our teaching?	This will allow new staff to become familiar with the magnet theme and how to ensure they are teaching with the theme in mind.
11/28	Trauma Training	Teaching Students with Trauma	How to identify students with trauma (ACE score). Effects of a high ACE score. Trauma vs ADHD. Best practices for support students with high ACE scores.
12/12	Independent Work	Independent Work: End of Semester Tasks	Teachers will finalize EQuIP Rubrics, STEM Unit Uploads, and grading of Q2 STEM projects. (necessary due to large number of classes overcap).
12/19	Celebrations and Victories	Climate and Culture	
1/9	Grading Writing Prompts		Teachers score writing prompts according to state rubric in order to give staff members information on writing strengths and areas for improvement
1/16	Q3 STEM Challenge	Wind Racers	To give teachers first hand experience with the challenge so they can better support their advisory groups.
1/23	Epi Pen Training	Nurse Presentation	Update staff skill in signs symptoms of sever allergic reactions and how to administer EpiPens.
4/3	Q4 STEM Challenge	Door Challenge	To give teachers first hand experience with the challenge so they can better support their advisory groups.

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 2019/20.

Professional development during Quarter 1 has focused on setting the stage for success this year. We have worked to develop new common language and expectations regarding policies and produced as well as STEM practices. With the number of retirements and teachers who moved, we have also provided STEM training meant to bring our new teachers up to speed.



Magnet – School Level Final Report

2018-19

PARTNERSHIPS

FAMILY/COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT				
	Q1	Q2	Q3/Q4	Total
# Family/community events	13	11	20	44
# Participants in family/community events	1,178	1,692	881 + ~2200	~5951
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 exit 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: We offered a variety of opportunities for parents to connect with the school. Our strengths lie in the areas of Communicating, Volunteering, Learning at Home, and Decision Making.				
Q1 Events included: STEM Night (173 people), Band/Orchestra Concert (~400 people) Open House (347 families), Parent Teacher Conferences (133 families), ELD Open House (10 families), Site Council x3 (30 total families), PTSO x3 (55 total families), and Traveling Bulldog Information Session (30 families)				
Q2 Events included: STEM Night (152), Band/Orchestra Concerts x2 (700+) Choir x3 (550), Honor Roll Ceremony (300+) Site Council x2 (10 total families), PTSO x2 (30 total families), Promotion (TBD)...TBDs estimated at ~2200				



Magnet – School Level Final Report

2018-19

PARTNERSHIPS

Q3 Events included: STEM Night (153) Band/Orchestra Concert (300) Lip Sync Battle (100) Site Councilx3 (30), PTSOx3 (30), Spring Parent Teacher Conferences (68 families)

Q4 Events still to come: 3/28 Guitar and Beginning Choir Concert (200), STEM Night (TBD), Sky School Meeting (20 families), Disney Meeting (TBD), Washington DC Meeting (TBD), Course Selection Nightx2 (TBD), Band Concertsx2 (TBD), Orchestra Concertsx2 (TBD) Advanced Chorus (TBD) Frog and Toad performance x2 (TBD)

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.

**Magnet – School Level Final Report****2018-19****PARTNERSHIPS**

10.	Math/Word Cats/Project SOAR	Established	Yes	Provides Tier 2 interventions during the school day to “at-risk” students.
11.	Americorps	New	In process	Americorps hosted a Saturday 9/11 STEM brining several UofA groups to Mansfeld to conduct mini STEM investigations.



Magnet – School Level Final Report

2018-19

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"> • Mansfeld maintains its B status. • Engineering teacher, Trish Vogel recognized a Raytheon Teacher-Leader of the Year. • Student, Ruthie Wnek, received the Davies Student Humanitarian award from EEF • Teacher, Beverly Sutton, award a \$1100 grant from Burlington Coat Factory via DonorsChoose. • Teacher, Ms. Trowbridge, had a \$500 literacy project funded through DonorsChoose. • Ms. Palaszak had a \$725 literacy project funded through DonorsChoose • The Mansfeld 8th Grade GATE Science class was selected to participate in the Letters to a Pre-Scientist pilot program. • 8th Grade science department was selected to host the BioDiversity program this year. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mansfeld continues to be seriously oversubscribed. • Teacher morale is low because of the continued overcrowding. • It has been reported to us that Robbins families have heard about the overcrowding and no longer considering Mansfeld a viable option for middle school. Families report looking at Sacred Heart (private school) and Flowing Wells School District. This will be a loss to the school as these are high achieving families that positively contribute to the integration of the school. • Our office manager reports that families who are unhappy with the changes to the Roskrige dual language program have been asking about Mansfeld. We are the neighborhood school for many of those students. Should they peruse enrollment, this will exacerbate our overcrowding situation, likely pushing more teachers into “over cap” payments. • We have not heard any definitive information regarding the start date of “overlapping boundary”, “change of address”, or “false address” policy changes that were discussed with Mr. Sanchez and Mr. Nodine.
<p>Q1 Reflection: We are extremely concerned about teacher burnout due to overcrowding. Many teachers have openly stated they are looking at leaving TUSD next year unless something is done to stabilize enrollment numbers at the design capacity level (300 per grade level according to Mr. Nodine’s numbers). We have seen a sharp decline in interest in Mansfeld from Robbins (no tours/show requests). Last year 17% of our Q1</p>	



Magnet – School Level Final Report

2018-19

CELEBRATIONS AND CHALLENGES

tours were from Robins. This data backs up the information reported to one of our teachers from the Robins community. Due to the class sizes Robins families are planning to leave TUSD to enroll in private schools and Flowing Wells middle schools next year. This is especially disheartening as Mansfeld submitted a proposal to shrink it's neighborhood which would have kept Robins families in TUSD and increased the enrollment of other undersubscribed schools while allowing Mansfeld to return to 2016-17 magnet seat numbers.

Quarter 2

- | | |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engineering teacher, Trish Vogel received a \$5,000 grant from Fiesta Bowl Charities • Art teacher, Lisa Bradford received a \$450 grant from Assistance League of Tucson • Ms. Schilling had a \$150 Origami Math Project funded through DonorsChoose. • Ms. Smith, 7th Grade GATE Science Teacher, was nominated by a Parent for the 2019 Presidential Award for Excellence in Math and Science Teaching. • Mansfeld selected to receive 1:1 iPad initiative through Verizon/Digital Promise next year! | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mansfeld continues to be seriously oversubscribed. • Despite the 8th grade cohort being integrated last year, the influx of students moving into the neighborhood has resulted in a loss of integration. • Concern about lack of timeliness of curriculum documents |
|--|--|

Q2 Reflection: We have had a lot of teachers taking the initiative to improve classroom libraries with high interest books for struggling readers. This is a testament to the dedication of our teachers! We are also thrilled about the 1:1 iPad initiative next year. Teachers are looking forward to utilizing future STEM time to design online interactive notebooks and assessments now that all students will have meaningful access to digital technology.

Curriculum Needs: Teachers have expressed a desire to be a quarter ahead in their planning so in March we will begin planning our integrated STEM Units for Q1 of 2019-20. However, the curriculum maps for Social Studies and Science do not exist yet. There is also concern about changes to ELA and Math. It is vitally important to our Magnet Theme/Curriculum that we have those curriculum maps during Q4 for all core subject areas.

Overcrowding continues to affect staff morale negatively. We have lost some students (18) making class sizes marginally better, however, this loss of students has contributed to net decrease in integration. While Anglo student account for only 14.6% of our population, they accounted for 33.3% of our lost demographics. Hispanics students account for 68.8% of our population, but account for only 61% of our lost population. The number one reason parents gave for leaving was class size. The only avenue we have to control class size is limiting entry-grade magnet seats, which goes against our integration goals.



Magnet – School Level Final Report

2018-19

CELEBRATIONS AND CHALLENGES

Quarter 3/4

- | | |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ms. Canahui had a \$700 literacy project funded through Donor's Choose. • \$1200 raided by the Mansfeld Community for a Kawame Alexander visit to talk to targeted students about reading. • Mansfeld earns Magnet School of America School of Excellence Award (2nd consecutive year) • Several teachers have applied for EEF Grants, we will know in late April who was awarded a grant. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The volume of students has caused some issues with testing. Classes that are extremely large are being forced to relocate due to limits of the wireless routers. This will be an issue again next year. • Testing has made STEM PLC time difficult in April. |
|--|---|

Q3 Reflection:

Teachers and students came back from the winter break rested and ready to work. Students performed well on benchmarks and STEM PLC time was productive. THE school has been largely focused on the upcoming AZMerit testing and ensuring that students are well prepared.

Annual Summary

•

•

Annual Reflection:

With new leadership at Mansfeld, there was initial apprehension about the impact on the magnet program. Mansfeld has continued to perform well and the culture continues to be positive. The focus remains firmly on ensuring that STEM remains in the forefront of teacher lessons and units and there is continued focus on academic excellence and teacher collaboration.

Teachers are looking forward to the 1-to-1 iPad initiative taking place next year. Mansfeld has hired a technology coach who will work with the CSP and Magnet Coordinator to ensure that rigor and relevance are a part of the STEM curriculum and that teachers have the support and skill to embed technology into the lessons to improve student engagement and achievement.