

## 2015-2016 World's Best Workforce Report Summary

District or Charter Name: Medford

Grades Served: PK-12

Contact Person Name and Position: Rich Dahman, Superintendent

In accordance with Minnesota Statutes, section 120B.11, a school board, at a public meeting, shall adopt a comprehensive, long-term strategic plan to support and improve teaching and learning that is aligned with creating the world's best workforce. The school board must publish an annual report on the previous year's plan and hold an annual public meeting to review goals, outcomes and strategies. An electronic *summary* of the annual report must be sent to the Commissioner of Education each fall.

This document serves as the required template for submission of the 2015-2016 report summary.

Districts must submit this completed template by **December 15, 2016**, to:

[MDE.WorldsBestWorkForce@state.mn.us](mailto:MDE.WorldsBestWorkForce@state.mn.us).

### 1. Stakeholder Engagement

#### 1a. Annual Report

➤ Add link to school website before sending to MDE

#### 1b. Annual Public Meeting

➤ October 24, 2016

#### 1c. District Advisory Committee 2015-16

Carrie Heiderscheidt	Parent, Chair	Amanda Lannoye	Teacher
Mary Cronin	Parent	Angie Finholdt	Parent
Allison Janke	Board Member, Parent	Carolyn Kanne	Parent
Jennifer Jones	Board Member, Parent	Diane Larson	Staff, Parent
Rich Dahman	Superintendent	Marie Sexton	Community
Mark Ristau	Principal	Alyssa Butterfield	Student
Chris Ovrebo	Principal	Jesse Deering	Student
Kim Goblirsch	Teacher	Wyatt Volkmann	Student
Jeannie Ness	Teacher		

## 2. Goals and Results

### 2a. All Students Ready for Kindergarten

Goal	Result	Goal Status
1) 20% of all kindergarten students will be proficient on the ESGI Kindergarten Assessment in fall 2015.	1) 33% of all kindergarten students will be proficient on the ESGI Kindergarten Assessment in fall 2015.	1) Goal Met
2) 90% of all kindergarten students will be proficient on the ESGI Kindergarten Assessment in spring 2016.	2) 95% of all kindergarten students will be proficient on the ESGI Kindergarten Assessment in spring 2016.	2) Goal Met
3) 100% of the day care providers in the community will be identified and provided with kindergarten entrance expectations/standards by February 2016.	3) 100% of the day care providers in the community will be identified and provided with kindergarten entrance expectations/standards by February 2016.	3) Goal Met

### 2b. All Students in Third Grade Achieving Grade-Level Literacy

Goal	Result	Goal Status
1) Increase the percent of Grade 3 students tested who are proficient to 68%, as measured by the Reading MCA III in May 2016.	1) The percent of Grade 3 students tested who are proficient was 52%, as measured by the Reading MCA III in May 2016.	1) Goal Not Met
2) Increase the average Grade 2 NWEA Reading RIT Score to 190 as measured in spring 2016.	2) The average Grade 2 NWEA Reading RIT Score was 192 as measured in spring 2016.	2) Goal Met

**2c. Close the Achievement Gap(s) Among All Groups**

<b>Goal</b>	<b>Result</b>	<b>Goal Status</b>
<p>1) Increase the percent of FRP students tested who are proficient as measured by the MCA III Reading and Math Assessments in May 2016 to 45%.</p> <p>2) Increase the percent of Special Education students tested who are proficient as measured by the MCA III Reading and Math Assessments in May 2016 to 30%.</p> <p>3) Increase the percent of LEP students tested who are proficient as measured by the MCA III Reading and Math Assessments in May 2016 to 30%.</p>	<p>1) The percent of FRP students tested who were proficient as measured by the MCA III in May 2016 was 46% Reading and 40% Math.</p> <p>2) The percent of Special Education students tested who were proficient as measured by the MCA III in May 2016 was 19% Reading and 13% Math.</p> <p>3) The percent of LEP students tested who were proficient as measured by the MCA III in May 2016 was 19% Reading and 24% Math.</p>	<p>1) Math Goal Met Reading Goal Not Met</p> <p>2) Math Goal Not Met Reading Goal Not Met</p> <p>3) Math Goal Not Met Reading Goal Not Met</p>

**2d. All Students Career- and College-Ready by Graduation**

<b>Goal</b>	<b>Result</b>	<b>Goal Status</b>
<p>1) The four-year graduation rate will be over 90% for all student groups, as measured annually by MDE.</p> <p>2) Over 90% of all students in each grade (9-12) will have the credits required to be on track for graduation at the end of every semester.</p>	<p>1) The four-year graduation rate, as measured annually by MDE, was 93% overall, with all student groups except FRP (83%) above 90%.</p> <p>2) Over 93% of all students in each grade (9-12) had the credits required to be on track for graduation at the end of every semester.</p>	<p>1) Goal Not Met</p> <p>2) Goal Met</p>

**2e. All Students Graduate**

<b>Goal</b>	<b>Result</b>	<b>Goal Status</b>
<p>1) Individual Post-Secondary Plans are completed by 100% of the students in grades 7-12 by November 1, 2015.</p> <p>2) On the 8th Grade Math MCA III, over 53% of the students tested are proficient, in May 2016.</p>	<p>1) Individual Post-Secondary Plans were completed by 100% of the students in grades 7-12 by November 1, 2015.</p> <p>2) On the 8th Grade Math MCA III, 41% of the students tested were proficient in May 2016.</p>	<p>1) Goal Met</p> <p>2) Goal Not Met</p>

### 3. Identified Needs Based on Data

Entering the 2015-16 school year, we had seen a slight decrease in the overall Math and Reading results from the previous year, both as a percent proficient and in comparison to the MN averages (Reading = 55.4% and Math 54.6% proficient on MCA in spring 2015).

When analyzing these results and breaking it down into student group and grade-level data, we identified areas of focus for 2015-16, with Special Education and LEP student groups scoring below the state average in Math and Reading. The grade-levels that were below the state average coming into 2015-16 included Grades K-3 and 7-10 (Reading), Grades 7-11 (Math), and Grades 8-11 (Science).

MCA scores are an important snapshot of student learning, but are not the only indicator. In addition to MCA data, we also look at many other data sources, including ACT, NWEA, classroom assessments, graduation and attendance rates, and demographic data. Through the analysis of this data, we identified that our biggest needs were in boosting the Math and Reading scores of students in Grades 7, 8 and high school, as well as those of our Special Education and LEP students.

### 4. Systems, Strategies and Support Category

#### 4a. Students

Staff members regularly assessed students' progress toward state/local standards. Classroom teachers utilized summative classroom assessments, aligned to the standards. Students in grades 1-8 were given the AIMS-WEB throughout the year, with the Rtl process and Child Study Teams used to inform instruction and determine necessary interventions for individual students and student groups (LEP, Special Ed, Hispanic). Students in grade levels that don't have MCA/OLPA testing took NWEA tests, with teachers analyzing growth data. The OLPA was given in Math (twice) and Reading (once), with student data compared to individual expected growth. Classroom teachers regularly used formative classroom assessments to monitor student progress toward standards.

On Data Days, teachers utilized Viewpoint and the MDE website to analyze data, both for individual students and student groups. This data was then used to determine placement in Math/Reading intervention groups, with flexible grouping utilized as students demonstrate mastery of the standards.

Specific tiered interventions included:

- \* Summer programming for Special Education/LEP students, offered at school/neighborhoods
- \* Bilingual paraprofessional (English/Spanish) to assist with instruction and parent communication
- \* Additional Math/Reading time for middle-level students, as identified through our Rtl process
- \* Individual plans for graduation for all students in Grades 7-12 (Ramp Up to Readiness).

#### **4b. Teachers and Principals**

Our teacher development & evaluation process includes Individual Growth Plans for all teachers, PLCs, Job-Embedded Professional Development, and a Mentoring Program. Every teacher works with their principal and Peer Coach to set individual goals, reflecting on progress during multiple contacts throughout the year. We utilize the Danielson Framework for Effective Teaching, with all teachers receiving training on developing growth plans. Progress is measured using detailed rubrics that define effective instruction, with formative feedback provided throughout the year and summative evaluation at the end of the year. Our Peer Coach and principals also received training on using reflective questions to promote growth.

Our principal evaluation model incorporates seven core competencies for school leaders, which emphasize improved teaching and learning. Principals develop individual goals, then work with the superintendent throughout the year to achieve these goals. Monthly meetings are held to look at evidence of progress toward goal achievement and to reflect on the process, in an effort to improve instructional leadership

In our comprehensive curriculum review process, school stakeholders examine best practice, student achievement data, and state standards to evaluate the effectiveness of our curriculum and instruction. Professional Development is provided to ensure alignment between the standards, curriculum, instruction, and assessment.

#### **4c. District**

With our K-12 students and our district office all in one building, there is regular, ongoing integration between our district staff and our schools. We utilize a continuous improvement model, with the belief that all work should be regularly evaluated to identify areas to improve. District-wide staff, who work with all teachers, include a Peer Coach, Technology Integration Specialist, and Math and Reading Interventionists.

District initiatives that began or continued during the 2015-16 school year included PLCs, Data Days, Teacher and Principal Development and Evaluation, and a 1-to-1 iPad Initiative. Each of these initiatives are used with every teacher at every grade level.

All teachers meet in PLCs at least twice monthly, with tasks including identifying target standards, analyzing student data, and implementing systematic interventions. Teachers have received training on working together collaboratively, in an effort to make effective use of our PLC efforts.

Our Site Leadership teams utilize the district goals and school data to develop building goals. They also review instructional and curriculum effectiveness, and determine professional development needs. With our continuous improvement model, there is consistent monitoring of our district, building, and grade-level goals, for all students and for our student groups and individual students.

## 5. Equitable Access to Excellent Teachers

Ensuring that every student has access to an effective teacher is vital to our school's success. Starting in preschool, we incorporated both formative and summative assessment data to determine whether every student is meeting their grade-level benchmarks, and provide support for students who are not meeting the standards. Staff regularly looked at STAR 360 and MCA data, at both grade-level and by classroom, to determine which teachers are meeting expected student growth targets for their class.

Our Principals and Peer Coach worked directly with teachers who are inexperienced or less effective, using the Charlotte Danielson Framework for Effective Teaching as a model, to improve Tier 1 instruction. Our Math and Reading Specialists provided additional student support, both in the classroom and through small group or individual work for struggling students.