

2014-2015 World's Best Workforce Report Summary

District or Charter Name Worthington School District 518

Contact Person Name and Position Dr. Katie Clarke, Director of Teaching and Learning

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 2014-2015 report summary. Districts must submit this completed template by **December 1, 2015** to MDE.WorldsBestWorkForce@state.mn.us.

Stakeholder Engagement

Report

[Note: For each school year, the school board must publish a report in the local newspaper, by mail or by electronic means on the district website.]

Web Page: www.isd518.net

The link will appear on the left side of the page.

Annual Public Meeting

[Note: School boards are to hold an annual public meeting to communicate plans for the upcoming school year based on a review of goals, outcomes and strategies from the previous year. Stakeholders should be meaningfully involved, and this meeting is to occur separately from a regularly scheduled school board meeting. The author's intent was to have a separate meeting just for this reason.]

An annual public meeting was held on November 17, 2015 to review progress made in the 2014-2015 school year.

District Advisory Committee

[Note: The district advisory committee must reflect the diversity of the district and its school sites. It must include teachers, parents, support staff, students, and other community residents. Parents and other community residents are to comprise at least two-thirds of advisory committee members, when possible. The district advisory committee makes recommendations to the school board.]

The District Advisory Committee is composed of community/school board members, parents, teaching and non-teaching staff, and administrators.

Members included:

- Dr. Katie Clarke, Director of School Improvement
- Mr. Jeff Luke, Principal
- Mr. Reed Sather, Assistant Principal
- Mrs. Heidi Meyer, Assistant Principal
- Ms. Sam Becker, Teacher
- Mr. John Singler, Teacher
- Mrs. Casey Morfitt, Teacher
- Mrs. Kris Besel, Teacher
- Mrs. Janet Haren, Teacher
- Mrs. Julie Linder, Teacher
- Mrs. Jodi Hansen, Teacher
- Mr. Mark Prunty, Teacher
- Mrs. Gail Holinka, Teacher
- Mrs. Joan Philips, Teacher
- Mrs. Krista VanNote, Teacher
- Mr. Barry Fischer, Parent
- Mr. Tom Ahlberg, Support Staff; Technology
- Mrs. Lori Dudley, Community Member/School Board
- Mr. Linden Olson, Community Member/School Board
- Miss Quinn Bents, Student

Goals and Results

[Note: Goals should be linked to needs and written in SMART-goal format. SMART goals are: specific and strategic, measurable, attainable (yet rigorous), results-based and time-based. Results should tie directly back to the established goal so it is clear whether the goal was met. Districts may choose to use the data profiles provided by MDE in reporting goals and results.]

| SMART Goal | 2014-2015 Goals | 2014-2015 Goal Results |
|---|---|--|
| All Students Ready for Kindergarten | 80% of identified PK-4 children will have an early childhood experience, as measured by enrollment in a pre-school program within the community or school district. | 78% of PK-4 children identified by the school district had an early childhood experience in a community pre-school program or school district program. |
| All Students in Third Grade Achieving Grade-Level Literacy | 55% of Third and Fourth Grade students will be proficient in Reading as measured by the 2014-2015 MCA Reading Assessments. | There were 47% of all Third and Fourth Grade students who were proficient as measured by the 2014-2015 MCA Reading Assessment. |

| SMART Goal | 2014-2015 Goals | 2014-2015 Goal Results |
|---|---|--|
| Close the Achievement Gap(s) Among All Groups | The achievement gap between the EL student group and non-EL student group will be reduced by 5% as measured by the change in proficiency gap using MCA data from the 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 school year. | The achievement gap between EL learners and non-EL learners went from 43.9% in 2013-2014 school year to 43.4% in the 2014-2015 school year, as measured by the change in proficiency gap using MCA data from the 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 school year. The gap was reduced by 0.5%. |
| All Students Career- and College-Ready by Graduation | The percentage of students at Worthington High School and Alternative Learning Center who have a personal learning plan will increase from 25% to 50%, as measured by having career goals in a written format and completing a career assessment. | There are 50% of students at Worthington High School and Alternative Learning Center who developed a personal learning plan, as evidenced by having career goals in a written format and completing a career assessment. |
| All Students Graduate | The Worthington High School will have a 90% graduation rate (4-year) as measured by the Annual Yearly Progress report. | The Worthington High School had a 74.6% graduation rate for 2014 (4-year) for all students, as measured by the Annual Yearly Progress report. |

Identified Needs Based on Data

[Note: Data that was reviewed to determine needs may include state-level accountability tests, such as Minnesota Comprehensive Assessments (MCAs) and/or local-level data, such as local assessments, attendance, graduation, mobility, remedial course-taking rates, child poverty, etc.]

At the start of the 2014-2015 school year, leadership committees including teachers, school board members, and administrators reviewed the Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment (MCA) data by grade level, building level, and district level. In addition, ACCESS data was reviewed to determine needs for EL students. The data revealed that the largest achievement gap was between the EL student group and non-EL students at all grade levels.

Based on the data, the district moved forward with implementing strategies identified in the District Improvement Plan. Strategies included:

- Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) training was provided for all new staff, Middle School staff, and HS/ALC staff. Classroom teachers were trained on this framework

which focused on making content comprehensible for English Learner (EL) students in the mainstream classroom. Elementary staff had previously received training on SIOP.

- Accountable Talk, an instructional practice, was introduced to elementary staff and accountability measures were implemented to ensure student voice was included within each elementary designed lesson. The rationale for this practice was based on the district's attempt to increase English speaking abilities of EL students. Measurement of EL speaking for English Learner students was measured on the ACCESS test.

Systems, Strategies and Support Category

Students

During the 2014-2015 school year, all teachers participated in Professional Learning Communities. Following DuFour's model of PLC implementation, teachers collaborated about students' needs and determined re-grouping and interventions, based on formative assessment data. Interventions were arranged and offered at all grade levels. Examples included

- Additional individual instruction
- After school program
- Credit recovery program
- Homework help
- Intervention classes
- Small group work

Several assessments were administered to determine student progress towards meeting state and local academic standards and were a factor in determining additional support (listed above) for students. Assessments included: MCA, STAR, DIBELS, OLPA, ACCESS, and Common Formative Assessments.

Additionally, teachers worked in PLCs to disaggregate the data from the assessments listed above.

The District also disaggregated the summative MCA assessment and ACCESS score data and provided to teachers for interpretation and evidence in lesson planning.

The District was aware of the assessments and data discussions of student progress, by reviewing the PLC meeting minutes from each week.

Teachers and Principals

There was a curriculum review cycle and framework was implemented in all curricular areas. Curriculum was reviewed by teacher leaders in each content area, from grades K-12. The model for review included representatives from each school building meeting quarterly to review the vertical alignment. Additional meetings and work in identifying gaps and overlaps in curriculum occurred on a weekly basis within grade level and department professional learning communities.

The School District implemented the district approved teacher evaluation process that was established for the 2013-2014 school year. The review system included the following:

- Each teacher in the third year of their professional growth cycle had a formal evaluation by district licensed administrator.

- Each teacher within their first three years of teaching had three formal evaluations by a district licensed administrator.
- All continuing contract teachers who were not in the third year of their professional growth cycle and did not have a formal evaluation, participated in peer coaching which included a pre-observation, observation, and post observation.
- All principals were evaluated based on the criteria and legislative requirements for principal evaluation. Principals wrote SMART goals, sent surveys to stakeholders for professional growth feedback, and monitored their building academic progress.

District

District level support was provided for teachers in the following areas:

- Professional Learning Communities (PLCs)– all teachers participated in PLCs on a weekly basis during contracted work hours.
- Technology Integration – All teachers and students had district-owned tablets. A district-wide Digital Learning Coordinator provided group and individualized training to provide high-quality instruction and rigorous curriculum through the use of the tablets.
- English Learner Support – The district employed an English Learner (EL) Coordinator. This position supported EL teachers with data disaggregation in the EL area, best practice instructional strategies, and curriculum review.
- Flexible Learning Year (FLY) – The district was a member of the Southwest MN FLY Consortium. As a member, all teachers and administrators attended presentations by nationally known speakers including Todd Whitaker, and Cassandra Erkens.

Progress indicators of evidence included: all staff attended the national speaker training, Tech lead teachers were developed at each school and established goals with the Digital Learning Coordinator. Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) was implemented in all schools during the 2014-2015 school year. This training and implementation supported teacher instruction for EL learners in the classroom. The EL Coordinator routinely met with EL teachers and teacher leaders from each school.

The supports listed above aligned with the district improvement plan goals which included: establishing and implementing high functioning PLCs and innovative lesson design and delivery strategies.

Equitable Access to Excellent Teachers

[Note: Review the information below. **Districts do not need to report information in this section at this time.**]

Section 1111(b)(8)(C) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) requires that each state take steps to ensure that poor and minority children are not taught at higher rates than other children by inexperienced, unqualified or out-of-field teachers. On June 1, 2015, MDE submitted a plan to the U.S. Department of Education that required all states to address long-term needs for improving equitable access of all students to great educators. The plan was developed with significant stakeholder input and can be found on the [MDE website](#).

From MDE's data review, the following statewide equity gaps surfaced:

- Schools in the highest poverty quartile are more likely to have inexperienced, unqualified and out-of-field teachers than schools in the lowest poverty quartile.

- Schools in the highest minority quartile are more likely to have inexperienced, unqualified and out-of-field teachers than schools in the lowest minority quartile.
- Priority and Focus schools are more likely to have inexperienced, unqualified and out-of-field teachers than Reward schools.
- Charter schools are more likely to have inexperienced, unqualified and out-of-field teachers than non-charter schools.

To reach the goals of the WBWF, it is important to ensure that all students, particularly students from low-income families and students of color, have equitable access to teachers and principals who can help them reach their potential. Beginning with the next WBWF summary, to be submitted in fall 2016, MDE will request information about the district process to examine the distribution of experienced and qualified teachers across the district and within school sites using data.