



2017-18 Combined WBWF Summary and Achievement and Integration Progress Report

District or Charter Name: Zumbrota-Mazeppa Public Schools ISD #2805

Grades Served: P-12

WBWF Contact: Michael Harvey
Title: Superintendent of Schools
Phone: 507-732-1400
Email: mikeh@zmsch.k12.mn.us

A and I Contact: Rebecca Sjolander
Title: Achievement & Integration Coordinator
Phone: 507-732-1400
Email: rebeccas@zmsch.k12.mn.us

New this year! This is MDE's first attempt at asking districts/charters to submit one combined report to address two needs: the Annual WBWF Summary Report and the Annual Achievement and Integration (A&I) Progress Report. Hopefully this will help districts build connections between the work in both of these areas and simplify the reporting process with this integrated report.

This report has two parts:

Part A: Required for all districts/charters

Part B: Required for districts in the A&I program

All districts/charters must submit this completed template between **October 15 and December 15, 2018**, to MDE.WorlBestWorkForce@state.mn.us.

If you have questions while completing the WBWF portion of the summary, please feel free to email MDE.WorlBestWorkForce@state.mn.us or contact [Susan Burris](mailto:susan.burris@state.mn.us), (susan.burris@state.mn.us).program manager for District Support.

If you have any questions regarding the A&I portion of this report, please email MDE.Integration@state.mn.us.

Part A: Required for All Districts

Annual Report

WBWF Requirement: 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.

A & I Requirement: Districts must post a copy of their A & I plan, a preliminary analysis on goal progress, and related data on student achievement on their website 30 days prior to the annual public meeting.

- *Provide the direct website link to the district's WBWF annual report. If a link is not available, describe how the district disseminates the report to stakeholders. www.zmschools.us (Under District Info>District Documents)*

- *Provide the direct website link to the A & I materials. www.zmschools.us (Under District Info>District Documents)*

Annual Public Meeting

WBWF Requirement: 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.

A&I Requirement: The public meeting for A & I is to be held at the same time as the WBWF annual public meeting.

- *Provide the date of the school board annual public meeting to review progress on the WBWF plan (and A&I plan for participating districts) for the 2017-18 school year. **November 26, 2018***

District Advisory Committee

WBWF Requirement: 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.

Complete the list of your district advisory committee members for the 2017-18 school year. Expand the table to include all committee members. Ensure roles are clear (teachers, parents, support staff, students, and other community residents).

District Advisory/World's Best Workforce Committee Meetings:

March 26, 2018

August 20, 2018

November 5, 2018

District Advisory Committee Members	Role in District	Are they part of the Achievement and Integration leadership team? (Mark X if Yes)
Michael Harvey	Superintendent	X
Dave Anderson	7-12 Principal	X
Quinn Rasmussen	Pre-K-6 Principal	X
Wendy Ahern	Ass't Principal/SPED Coordinator	X
Jen Burfeind	Community Ed Director	
Rebecca Sjolander	Achievement/Integration Coordinator	X
Laura Skogen	Staff Development Coordinator	X
Beth Arendt	Middle/High School Parent	
Kelsey Bradley	Middle/High School Teacher	
Angela Hunstad	Middle/High School Parents	
Tony Brown	Primary School Parents	
Kari Gunhus	Middle/High School Parents	
Pamla Langley	Elementary Teachers	
Jamie Quam	Elementary Teachers	
Brittney Thomforde	Elementary Parent	
Kristi Moore	Student	
Kristi Moore	Student	
Mary Graves	Community	
Jeanette Richardson	Community	
Jean Roth	School Board	
Angie Bredehoft	School Board	

Equitable Access to Excellent Teachers

WBWF Requirement: WBWF requires districts to have a process in place to ensure low-income students, students of color, and American Indian students are not taught at disproportionate rates by ineffective, inexperienced, and out-of-field teachers. The legislation also requires that districts have strategies to increase equitable access to effective and diverse teachers.

While districts may have their own local definitions, please note the definitions developed by Minnesota stakeholders during the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) state plan development process:

- An **ineffective teacher** is defined as a teacher who is not meeting professional teaching standards as defined in local teacher development and evaluation (TDE) systems.
- An **inexperienced teacher** is defined as a licensed teacher who has been employed for three or less years.
- An **out-of-field teacher** is defined as a licensed teacher who is providing instruction in an area which he or she is not licensed.

- Equitable Access to Experienced, Effective, and In-Field Teachers
 - Who is included in the conversations to review equitable access data and when do these occur?
 - What gaps, if any, has the district found related to equitable access for low-income students, students of color or American Indian students? What data did the district use?
 - What are the root causes contributing to your gaps?
 - What strategies has the district put in place to improve access for low-income students, students of color, and American Indian students to experienced, effective, and in-field teachers?
- Access to Diverse Teachers
 - What has the district discovered related to student access to teachers who reflect the diversity of enrolled students in the district?
 - What efforts are in place to increase the diversity of the teachers in the district?

Zumbrota-Mazeppa’s administrative team, along with the District Advisory Committee, reviewed equitable access to excellent teacher data. For the 2017-18 school year:

- 100% of ZM’s teachers were licensed in Minnesota,
- 100% of ZM’s teachers were labeled as effective teachers,
- 14.5% were defined as licensed teachers with less than three years of employment,
- 4.5% of teachers were a licensed teacher but teaching classes out of field.

ZM School operates three sites: primary, elementary, and middle/high school. Sections per grade range from four to five depending on the student population at that grade. ZM’s administrative team annually reviews equitable access data in the spring and summer prior to student-teacher assignment postings. ZM strives for equitable distribution of diverse student groups across sections at each grade level and teacher experience. No gaps are identified in equitable access for low income students, students of color, or American Indian students. Based on demographic data and MDE’s website, current ZM student population reflects limited diversity as well as in the employed staff. ZM uses a variety of information to assure classes/sections are balanced. This includes the use of academic data, information from previous teachers, and student support personnel, as well as information about student needs and learning styles provided by parents. ZM has equal employment opportunity policies in place. ZM’s recruitment and employment does not unlawfully discriminate based on race, color, creed, religion, national origin, sex, gender, marital status, status regarding public assistance, disability, sexual orientation, age, family care leave status, or veteran status.

Local Reporting of Teacher Equity Data

Please check the box below to confirm that you have publicly reported your data as described below.

Districts are required to publicly report data on an annual basis related to equitable teacher distribution, including data on access for low-income students, students of color, and American Indian students to effective, experienced, and in-field teachers. Beginning with the December 2019 WBWF summary report submission, districts will be required to provide an assurance that this data is being publicly reported.

For this 2017-18 WBWF summary report submission, please check the box if your district publicly reported this data.

District/charter publicly reports data on an annual basis related to equitable teacher distribution, including data on access for low-income students, students of color, and American Indian students to effective, experienced, and in-field teachers.

All Students Ready for School

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> WBWF Goal Only <input type="checkbox"/> WBWF /A & I Goal	Result	Goal Status
<p><i>All Students Ready for Kindergarten</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All students in the ZM School District will be offered screening between their third and fourth birthday. All students entering kindergarten in the fall of 2017 will score at 9 or better on the letter naming fluency as measured by FASTbridge benchmark testing. 	<p>All students were offered and participated in screening.</p> <p>99/104 students scored 9 or better on letter naming fluency as measured by FASTbridge.</p>	<p>One-Year Goal</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Goal Met <input type="checkbox"/> Goal Not Met</p> <p>One-Year Goal</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Goal Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Goal Not Met</p>

Bulleted narrative is appreciated. 200-word limit.

- *What data have you used to identify needs in this goal area? How is this data disaggregated by student groups?*
- *What strategies are in place to support this goal area?*
- *How well are you implementing your strategies?*
- *How do you know whether it is or is not helping you make progress toward your goal?*

Data to Identify Needs:

- General screening
- FASTbridge data

Disaggregated by Subgroups:

- By grade level
- Most subgroups too small
- Free/reduced price lunch data
- Special Education data was disaggregated

Strategies to Support Goal:

- Interventions, data meetings
- Flexible groups
- Outreach to district families to communicate readiness expectations through open houses, early childhood kickoff night, and Family Night
- Continuous education to families on screening/registration/round up
- Community Education and ECFE classes

Implementing Progress to Goal:

- All strategies were implemented reasonably well, participation in ECFE, Community Ed classes, and early childhood events was up from previous year.
- Preschool teachers formed their own PLC team during the 2017-18 school year and increased communication and collaboration with kindergarten teachers. Data was reviewed at team meetings.

All Students in Third Grade Achieving Grade-Level Literacy

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> WBWF Goal Only <input type="checkbox"/> WBWF /A & I Goal	Result	Goal Status
<p><i>Provide the established SMART goal for the 2017-18 school year.</i></p> <p>During the 2017-18 school year, the three-year average of 3rd grade MCA reading scores will increase by 2 percentage points</p> <p>Average 71.6% Goal 2018 – 73.6%</p>	<p><i>Provide the result for the 2017-18 school year that directly ties back to the established goal.</i></p> <p>Proficiency rate for 3rd grade dropped in 2018 to 67.4% from 71.6% in 2017.</p> <p>Three-year average in 2018 – 66.2 Goal – 73.6%</p>	<p>One-Year Goal</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Goal Met</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Goal Not Met</p>

Bulleted narrative is appreciated. 200 word limit.

- *What data have you used to identify needs in this goal area? How is this data disaggregated by student groups?*
- *What strategies are in place to support this goal area?*
- *How well are you implementing your strategies?*
- *How do you know whether it is or is not helping you make progress toward your goal?*

Data Used: MCA data for past three years, plus FASTbridge assessment data in grades K-3. Due to limited students in most subgroups only FRP lunch subgroup has enough students for data analysis. Needs are also identified through monthly PLC team meetings where each team review grade level data.

Strategies to Support Goal: Through monthly PLC team meetings and quarterly data meetings, teachers review FASTbridge assessment data, MCA data, classroom formative and summative assessments data to identify student needs for TIER I, II and III support, plus ADSIS, Title I and Special education for identified struggling students. These strategies are implemented reasonably well, with all P-3 grade teachers participating in team meetings and data days. ADSIS teachers, the Title I lead teacher, and Title I paras work closely with classroom teachers to implement and monitor reading strategies.

Monitor Progress on Goal: FASTbridge data is reviewed three times throughout the school year with some teachers progress monitoring weekly. Through quarterly data meetings, teachers review student data and identify changing student needs for support services.

Close the Achievement Gap(s) Between Student Groups

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> WBWF Goal Only <input type="checkbox"/> WBWF /A & I Goal	Result	Goal Status																																																																																
<p><i>Provide the established SMART goal for the 2017-18 school year.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> During the 2017-18 school year, ZM's MCA proficiency in math, reading, and science will increase to at least 13 percentage points above the state averages. 2018 MCA proficiency in reading and math for all subgroups, which include ZM student representation, will be at least 13 percentage points above the state average. 	<p><i>Provide the result for the 2017-18 school year that directly ties back to the established goal.</i></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="511 495 1266 1113"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="4">Reading</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Subgroup</th> <th># of Students</th> <th>Reading Prof</th> <th>State Average</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>White, No Hispanic Origin</td> <td>2017: 420/583 2018: 396/657</td> <td>2017: 72.0% 2018: 69.8%</td> <td>2017: 68.8% 2018: 68.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Asian Pacific Islander</td> <td>2017: NA 2018: NA</td> <td>2017: NA 2018: NA</td> <td>2017: NA 2018: NA</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hispanic</td> <td>2017: 9/19 2018: 9/20</td> <td>2017: 47.4% 2018: 45%</td> <td>2017: 37.9% 2018: 38.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Black, Not Hispanic Origin</td> <td>2017: NA 2018: NA</td> <td>2017: NA 2018: NA</td> <td>2017: NA 2018: NA</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SPED</td> <td>2017: 15/68 2018: 24/85</td> <td>2017: 22.1% 2018: 28.2%</td> <td>2017: 26.2% 2018: 26.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Free/Reduced Price Lunch</td> <td>2017: 77/144 2018: 77/147</td> <td>2017: 53.5% 2018: 52.4%</td> <td>2017: 40.2% 2018: 40.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Limited English Prof</td> <td colspan="3">Not enough students for subgroup</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Science</td> <td>FRP ZM-48.3% SPED ZM 48.7%</td> <td>State: 32.5% State 28.5%</td> <td>29/60 19/39</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1" data-bbox="511 1144 1266 1753"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="4">Math</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Subgroup</th> <th># of Students</th> <th>Math Prof</th> <th>State Average</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>White, No Hispanic Origin</td> <td>2017:395/540 2018: 409/572</td> <td>2017: 73.15% 2018: 71.5%</td> <td>2017: 67.6% 2018: 66.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Asian Pacific Islander</td> <td>2017: NA</td> <td>2017: NA</td> <td>2017: NA</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hispanic</td> <td>2017: 10/18 2018: 6/19</td> <td>2017: 55.6% 2018: 31.6%</td> <td>2017: 35.2% 2018: 43.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Black, Not Hispanic Origin</td> <td>2017: NA 2018: NA</td> <td>2017: NA 2018: NA</td> <td>2017: NA 2018: NA</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SPED</td> <td>2017: 16/67 2018: 24/81</td> <td>2017: 23.9% 2018: 29.6%</td> <td>2017: 22.1% 2018: 24.9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Free/Reduced Price Lunch</td> <td>2017: 72/130 2018: 71/148</td> <td>2017: 55.4% 2018: 48%</td> <td>2017: 37.9% 2018: 36.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Limited English Prof</td> <td colspan="3">N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Science</td> <td>FRP ZM-47.4% SPED ZM 47.5%</td> <td>State: 23.6% State: 31.5%</td> <td>28/59 18/38</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Reading				Subgroup	# of Students	Reading Prof	State Average	White, No Hispanic Origin	2017: 420/583 2018: 396/657	2017: 72.0% 2018: 69.8%	2017: 68.8% 2018: 68.7%	Asian Pacific Islander	2017: NA 2018: NA	2017: NA 2018: NA	2017: NA 2018: NA	Hispanic	2017: 9/19 2018: 9/20	2017: 47.4% 2018: 45%	2017: 37.9% 2018: 38.8%	Black, Not Hispanic Origin	2017: NA 2018: NA	2017: NA 2018: NA	2017: NA 2018: NA	SPED	2017: 15/68 2018: 24/85	2017: 22.1% 2018: 28.2%	2017: 26.2% 2018: 26.2%	Free/Reduced Price Lunch	2017: 77/144 2018: 77/147	2017: 53.5% 2018: 52.4%	2017: 40.2% 2018: 40.8%	Limited English Prof	Not enough students for subgroup			Science	FRP ZM-48.3% SPED ZM 48.7%	State: 32.5% State 28.5%	29/60 19/39	Math				Subgroup	# of Students	Math Prof	State Average	White, No Hispanic Origin	2017:395/540 2018: 409/572	2017: 73.15% 2018: 71.5%	2017: 67.6% 2018: 66.7%	Asian Pacific Islander	2017: NA	2017: NA	2017: NA	Hispanic	2017: 10/18 2018: 6/19	2017: 55.6% 2018: 31.6%	2017: 35.2% 2018: 43.3%	Black, Not Hispanic Origin	2017: NA 2018: NA	2017: NA 2018: NA	2017: NA 2018: NA	SPED	2017: 16/67 2018: 24/81	2017: 23.9% 2018: 29.6%	2017: 22.1% 2018: 24.9%	Free/Reduced Price Lunch	2017: 72/130 2018: 71/148	2017: 55.4% 2018: 48%	2017: 37.9% 2018: 36.6%	Limited English Prof	N/A			Science	FRP ZM-47.4% SPED ZM 47.5%	State: 23.6% State: 31.5%	28/59 18/38	<p>One-Year Goal</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Goal Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Goal Not Met</p> <p>One-Year Goal</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Goal Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Goal Not Met</p>
Reading																																																																																		
Subgroup	# of Students	Reading Prof	State Average																																																																															
White, No Hispanic Origin	2017: 420/583 2018: 396/657	2017: 72.0% 2018: 69.8%	2017: 68.8% 2018: 68.7%																																																																															
Asian Pacific Islander	2017: NA 2018: NA	2017: NA 2018: NA	2017: NA 2018: NA																																																																															
Hispanic	2017: 9/19 2018: 9/20	2017: 47.4% 2018: 45%	2017: 37.9% 2018: 38.8%																																																																															
Black, Not Hispanic Origin	2017: NA 2018: NA	2017: NA 2018: NA	2017: NA 2018: NA																																																																															
SPED	2017: 15/68 2018: 24/85	2017: 22.1% 2018: 28.2%	2017: 26.2% 2018: 26.2%																																																																															
Free/Reduced Price Lunch	2017: 77/144 2018: 77/147	2017: 53.5% 2018: 52.4%	2017: 40.2% 2018: 40.8%																																																																															
Limited English Prof	Not enough students for subgroup																																																																																	
Science	FRP ZM-48.3% SPED ZM 48.7%	State: 32.5% State 28.5%	29/60 19/39																																																																															
Math																																																																																		
Subgroup	# of Students	Math Prof	State Average																																																																															
White, No Hispanic Origin	2017:395/540 2018: 409/572	2017: 73.15% 2018: 71.5%	2017: 67.6% 2018: 66.7%																																																																															
Asian Pacific Islander	2017: NA	2017: NA	2017: NA																																																																															
Hispanic	2017: 10/18 2018: 6/19	2017: 55.6% 2018: 31.6%	2017: 35.2% 2018: 43.3%																																																																															
Black, Not Hispanic Origin	2017: NA 2018: NA	2017: NA 2018: NA	2017: NA 2018: NA																																																																															
SPED	2017: 16/67 2018: 24/81	2017: 23.9% 2018: 29.6%	2017: 22.1% 2018: 24.9%																																																																															
Free/Reduced Price Lunch	2017: 72/130 2018: 71/148	2017: 55.4% 2018: 48%	2017: 37.9% 2018: 36.6%																																																																															
Limited English Prof	N/A																																																																																	
Science	FRP ZM-47.4% SPED ZM 47.5%	State: 23.6% State: 31.5%	28/59 18/38																																																																															

Bulleterd narrative is appreciated. 200-word limit.

- *What data have you used to identify needs in this goal area? How is this data disaggregated by student groups?*
- *What strategies are in place to support this goal area?*
- *How well are you implementing your strategies?*
- *How do you know whether it is or is not helping you make progress toward your goal?*

Data to Identify Need:

- Historical MCA data from past three years from MDE site
- Each of subgroups are checked for data, ZM has limited enrollment in many of the subgroups.

Strategies to Support Goal:

- Title I, SPED, ADSIS, and ELL services are offered to students who qualify,
- MTSS and SST committee reviews student referrals,
- Develop intervention plans
- Teacher implemented alternative delivery and flexible learning options,
- A and I teacher support students through co-teaching and pullout program
- PLC team meetings and quarterly data meetings review student data with students identified for further interventions,
- TIER II and III interventions were implemented for identified students.

Implementation of Strategies and Progress Towards Goal:

- Monthly PLC team meetings and quarterly data meeting reviews student data for increased student learning,
- ELL teacher met with 7-12 teachers explaining program and needs of ELL students in classrooms and answered teacher questions and concerns.
- Internal data indicated some learning growth of students in free/reduced lunch and special education, but that progress wasn't evident in district MCA data.

All Students Career- and College-Ready by Graduation

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> WBWF Goal Only <input type="checkbox"/> WBWF /A & I Goal	Result	Goal Status
<p><i>Provide the established SMART goal for the 2017-18 school year.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All students will develop a MCIS (individual graduation plan) portfolio in grade 10 or 11. During the 2017-18 school year, ZM will expand the opportunity for high school students to gain college credit during high school. 	<p><i>Provide the result for the 2017-18 school year that directly ties back to the established goal.</i></p> <p>By second semester (January 2018), all ZM sophomores and juniors had a MCIS.</p> <p>For the 2017-18 school year, three courses were added: college statistics, CLEP marketing, and CLEP American Politics</p> <p>ZM students started enrolling in MN Online college in high school to gain college credit opportunities.</p>	<p>One-Year Goal</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Goal Met <input type="checkbox"/> Goal Not Met</p> <p>One-Year Goal</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Goal Met <input type="checkbox"/> Goal Not Met</p>

Bulleted narrative is appreciated. 200 word limit.

- What data have you used to identify needs in this goal area? How is this data disaggregated by student groups?*
- What strategies are in place to support this goal area?*
- How well are you implementing your strategies?*
- How do you know whether it is or is not helping you make progress toward your goal?*

Data used to identify needs:

- Student interest and requests indicated a want for more college credit options.
- Course requests were noted for a variety of student sub groups.

Strategies in place to support goal:

- All ZM students completed a required careers class by the end of their junior year.
- ZM maintains an advisory program for all students grade 7-12.
- Career exploration and skills training is offered through classes such as construction, Ag, FACS, industrial tech, and computers.
- Students in health take a personality test that ties career/interest possibilities to match careers to student personality traits.
- All strategies identified in the WBWF plan were implemented.

Making progress towards the goal:

- All new courses offered were filled through student selection at registration.

All Students Graduate

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> WBWF Goal Only <input type="checkbox"/> WBWF/A & I Goal	Result	Goal Status
<p><i>Provide the established SMART goal for the 2017-18 school year.</i></p> <p>ZM's graduation rate will exceed 93% in 2017, 97% in 2018, and 100% in 2019.</p> <p>Results: 2015: 85.6% 2016: 88.2% 2017: 93.3%</p>	<p><i>Provide the result for the 2017-18 school year that directly ties back to the established goal.</i></p> <p>2018: Data not available from MDE</p>	<p><i>Check one of the following:</i></p> <p>Multi-Year Goal:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> On Track <input type="checkbox"/> Not On Track</p> <p>One-Year Goal</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Goal Met <input type="checkbox"/> Goal Not Met</p>

Bulleted narrative is appreciated. 200-word limit.

- *What data have you used to identify needs in this goal area? How is this data disaggregated by student groups?*
- *What strategies are in place to support this goal area?*
- *How well are you implementing your strategies?*
- *How do you know whether it is or is not helping you make progress toward your goal?*

Data used to identify needs:

- Graduation rates are reviewed by site leadership team as well as rates for subgroups.

Strategies to support goal:

- Students are part of an advisory team with the same advisor for four years. This advisory program supports students to stay on track to meet graduation requirements.
- Targeted services and an alternative learning program (ALP) are options for student intervention to maintain or recover credits.
- Students can choose dual-credit, CLEP and/or hybrid courses.

Implementation of strategies and progress toward goal:

- All strategies listed on WBWF plan were implemented.
- Counselors, social worker, and student advisors track students and support students to make sure students follow their individual graduation plan to complete credits for graduation.

Part B: Achievement and Integration Progress Report

This portion is only required for districts participating in the A&I program.

If one of your A&I goals is the same as your WBWF goals, please note that in the box below and do not feel a need to repeat the information already provided for that goal area.

Achievement and Integration Goal 1

Goal Statement	Achievement or Integration Goal?	Baseline	Year 1 (2017-18) Actual	On Track?
During the 2017-18 school year the achievement gap will be reduced to 10% or less for all identified groups.	<i>Check one of the following:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Achievement Goal</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Integration Goal</i>	2017 Reading MCA Proficiency Results: District: 70.8% FRP: 53.5% Hispanic: 47.4% SPED: 22.1% 2017 Math MCA Proficiency Results: District: 71.4% FRP: 55.4% Hispanic: 55.6% SPED: 23.9%	2018 Reading MCA Proficiency Results: District: 68.7% FRP: 52.4% Hispanic: 45% SPED: 28.2% 2018 Math MCA Proficiency Results: District: 68.7% FRP: 48% Hispanic: 31.6% SPED: 29.6%	<i>Check one of the following:</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>On Track</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Not on Track</i>

Bulleted narrative is appreciated. 200-word limit.

- *What data have you used to identify needs in this goal area? How is this data disaggregated by student groups?*
- *What strategies are in place to support this goal area?*
- *How well are you implementing your strategies?*
- *How do you know whether it is or is not helping you make progress toward your goal?*

- MCA data taken from the Minnesota Department of Education’s website (Baseline 2017, Actual 2018). The Zumbrota-Mazeppa District has only three subgroups large enough to identify students: Free and Reduced-Price Lunch, Hispanic, and Special Education.
- Strategies in place to support goal success:
 - WIN (What I Need) time in grades K-6, Title I Services in K-4, ADSIS in K-2 and 5-6 grades
 - Data Days – teachers collaborate to define and redefine students’ needs for intervention and personalization

- MTSS and SST committees' functioning
- PLC Collaborative groups are focusing on researched based teaching strategies, test item analysis, and/or tracking standard proficiency
- Teacher utilize best practice techniques during core instruction
- ZM has appropriate structures in place to provide students with the supports they need to be successful; however, work on follow through procedures are needed to make sure students are benefitting from the interventions are taking place.
- ZM uses goal setting, progress monitoring, and benchmark testing to ensure students are making progress toward goals. They have also integrated standards-based report cards in K-6.

Achievement and Integration Goal 2

Goal Statement	Achievement or Integration Goal?	Baseline	Year 1 (2017-18) Actual	On Track?
The Rochester Area Achievement and Integration collaborative districts will partner annually on at least one culturally relevant instructional staff development experience. Each partner district will establish a leadership team and monitor equity work in the district. Each partnering district will send a team of student leaders to one student school board meeting each year.	<input type="checkbox"/> Achievement Goal <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Integration Goal	Prior to 2017, there was not a representative of Achievement and Integration on the leadership team. Students did not attend any meetings in Rochester.	This goal was met. ZM established an Achievement and Integration coordinator and now has representation on the leadership team. The coordinator took eight students to the March Rochester student school board meeting.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> On Track <input type="checkbox"/> Not on Track

- ZM used in-house district data to identify equity needs. An Equity Walk was done prior to initiating this plan. As a result, an Achievement and Integration coordinator position was created.
- The A & I coordinator attended equity and cultural competency training and provided staff trainings and information. An Equity Leadership Team was established and meets a minimum of four times per year. ZMHS sent a group of leaders to attend a Rochester student school board meeting.
- All strategies were implemented with fidelity.
- Our goal was met, and plans are already in place to meet this year's goal, as well.

Integration

Please summarize the impact of the integration strategies you implemented with the A&I districts you partnered with during the 2017-18 school year. Also consider ways that your A&I plan strategies have increased integration within your district.

The ZM Schools' achievement and integration coordinator attended two trainings put on by the KINECT Education group on equity and cultural awareness. The coordinator provided one staff development training during the 2017-18 school year and equity information at five PLC meetings. The achievement and integration coordinator works directly with students through small group instruction and team teaching to support academic and social growth striving to close the achievement gap.

[2017-18 Staff Development Report Link](#)

Q Comp Annual Report

Core Component: Career Advancement Options

Implementation

Are the teacher leader positions that were implemented this year the same as those outlined in the approved plan (approval letter and subsequent plan change approval letters)?

YES

If no, please explain what changes have occurred and why?

Impact

How did the work of teacher leaders through coaching, observing, mentoring, facilitating learning teams and performing other responsibilities impact classroom instruction?

TEACHER LEADERS OF ALL POSITIONS GUIDED ON-THE-JOB PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR TEACHERS THROUGHOUT THE YEAR. THE PD WAS TARGETED TO ADDRESS OBSERVED NEEDS AND REPORTED WANTS OF TEACHERS, BUILDING SITES, AND THE DISTRICT AS A WHOLE. THE PD WAS ALSO TARGETED AT IMPROVING INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES, WITH THE GOAL OF IMPROVING STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT. THROUGH THE PD TEACHERS WERE ABLE TO DEVELOP, IMPLEMENT, AND REFLECT ON NEW INSTRUCTIONAL METHODS, AS WELL AS IMPROVE THOSE METHODS ALREADY BEING USED.

How did the work of teacher leaders impact student achievement?

THROUGH THE WORK OF TEACHER LEADERS STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT REMAINED HIGH THROUGHOUT THE DISTRICT. MOST INDIVIDUAL TEACHER GOALS, BASED ON STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT, WERE MET. TWO OUT OF THREE SITE GOALS, ALSO BASED ON STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT, WERE MET.

Review Findings

How did the training teacher leaders received impact their ability to fulfill the responsibilities of the position and meet the needs of the licensed staff members?

THIS IS THE AREA THAT COULD USE IMPROVEMENT AS A WHOLE. TRAINING, WHEN PROVIDED/OFFERED WAS UTILIZED WELL BY TEACHER LEADERS IN GUIDING TEACHER AND STUDENT GROWTH. MORE SUBSECTIONS OF TEACHER LEADERS COULD USE HIGHER LEVELS OF TRAINING, INCLUDING PLC FACILITATORS AND PEER COACHES.

What did the results of the evaluations of the teacher leaders in their leadership roles demonstrate about the impact they had on the effectiveness of the licensed staff members?

STAFF MEMBERS FOUND THE TEACHER LEADERS EFFECTIVE IN TERMS OF FULFILLING SPECIFIC JOB REQUIREMENTS. STAFF ALSO FOUND TEACHER LEADERS EFFECTIVE IN PROVIDING USEFUL AND EFFECTIVE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OVERALL.

Recommendations

How will the district use the review findings to improve the effectiveness of teacher leadership?

THE DISTRICT WILL INVEST MORE IN TRAINING OPPORTUNITIES FOR TEACHER LEADERS. THE DISTRICT WILL ALSO WORK TO MORE ACCURATELY AND SPECIFICALLY ASSESS STRENGTHS AND AREAS FOR GROWTH AMONG TEACHER LEADERS.

Core Component: Job-embedded Professional Development

Implementation

Are learning teams configured and meeting as outlined in the approved plan (approval letter and subsequent plan change approval letters)?

NOT ALWAYS

If no, please explain the changes that have occurred and why?

TEACHERS ARE MEETING ONCE A MONTH IN PLCS FOR 2 HOURS. THEY ARE NOT NECESSARILY MEETING TWICE PER MONTH FOR 30-45 MINUTES AT INDIVIDUALLY SELECTED PLC TIMES. INSTEAD, TEACHERS ARE MEETING IN GRADE LEVEL TEAMS, USING STUDENT DATA TO IDENTIFY SPECIFIC NEEDS AND INTERVENTIONS. AT THE K-6 LEVEL THIS CAN STILL BE CONSIDERED A PLC SINCE THEY ARE IN GRADE-LEVEL GROUPS FOR PLCS. AT THE MS/HS LEVEL THIS IS A DIFFERENT GROUPING OF TEACHERS, WHICH COULD BE CONSIDERED A SEPARATE PLC, BUT IS NOT DEFINED AS SUCH IN OUR PLAN.

Impact

How did teacher learning from learning teams and other job-embedded professional development activities impact classroom instruction?

TEACHERS IMPLEMENTED NEW TECHNOLOGY, INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNIQUES, AND BEHAVIOR MANAGEMENT TECHNIQUES AS A RESULT OF THE JOB-EMBEDDED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES. THESE IMPLEMENTATIONS CAME AS A DIRECT RESULT OF PLC WORK AND THE PD PROVIDED BY MENTORS, PEER COACHES, AND OTHER TEACHER LEADERS.

How did teacher learning from learning teams and other job-embedded professional development impact student achievement?

TEACHER LEADERS OF ALL POSITIONS GUIDED ON-THE-JOB PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR TEACHERS THROUGHOUT THE YEAR. THE PD WAS TARGETED TO ADDRESS OBSERVED NEEDS AND REPORTED WANTS OF TEACHERS, BUILDING SITES, AND THE DISTRICT AS A WHOLE. THE PD WAS ALSO TARGETED AT IMPROVING INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES, WITH THE GOAL OF IMPROVING STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT. THROUGH THE PD TEACHERS WERE ABLE TO DEVELOP, IMPLEMENT, AND REFLECT ON NEW INSTRUCTIONAL METHODS, AS WELL AS IMPROVE THOSE METHODS ALREADY BEING USED.

Review Findings

How did the sites or learning teams identify needs and instructional strategies to increase student achievement?

SITES AND TEAMS UTILIZED STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA FROM MULTIPLE SOURCES. THEY ALSO ANALYZED STUDENT BEHAVIOR AND ATTENDANCE. THIRDLY, THEY ANALYZED STUDENT ENGAGEMENT. FROM THESE ANALYSIS TEAMS WERE ABLE TO IDENTIFY TARGETED TEACHER PD NEEDS FOCUSED ON STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT.

How did learning teams use data and implement the selected instructional strategies and follow-up on implementation?

DATA USE IS MENTIONED ABOVE. IMPLEMENTATION WAS AIDED BY PEER COACHING AND PLC TEAMS. FOLLOW-UP ON USE OF INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES WAS ALSO DONE VIA PEER COACHING AND PLC TEAMS. SOME TEACHERS EVEN BROUGHT THEIR NEW LEARNING TO OTHERS BY PROVIDING INSTRUCTION TO OTHER TEACHERS.

Recommendations

How will the district use the review findings to improve the effectiveness of job-embedded professional development?

THE ANALYSIS OF STUDENT DATA WILL CONTINUE, AS STUDENTS WHO ARE IDENTIFIED ARE IMPROVING THEIR ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE DUE TO INTERVENTIONS DETERMINED AT THOSE MEETINGS. PEER COACHES AND PLC TEAMS COULD TAKE ON A MORE ACTIVE ROLE IN DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERVENTION, DESIGN/DECISIONS. THE DISTRICT WILL WORK TO TARGET JOB-EMBEDDED PD TOWARDS DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERVENTION STRATEGIES, AS CARRIED OUT THROUGH PLCs, PEER COACHES, AND SITE TEAMS.

Core Component: Teacher Evaluation

Implementation

Are licensed staff members observed/evaluated as outlined in the approved plan (approval letter and subsequent plan change approval letters)?

YES

If no, please explain the changes that have occurred and why?

Impact

What impact did the observation/evaluation process, including coaching, have on classroom instruction?

TEACHERS RECEIVED FEEDBACK FROM THE PRINCIPAL AND PEER COACHES REGARDING CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION, CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT, AND PLANNING. THAT DIRECT FEEDBACK WAS UTILIZED BY TEACHERS, WHO REFLECTED ON IT AND WORKED TO IMPLEMENT CHANGES THAT WOULD IMPROVE THEIR OWN INSTRUCTION, CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT, AND PLANNING.

What impact did the observation/evaluation process, including coaching, have on student achievement?

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT REMAINS HIGH DUE IN PART TO THE OBSERVATION/EVALUATION AND COACHING PROCESSES UTILIZED. MCA SCORES AND OTHER STANDARDIZED TESTS UTILIZED BY THE DISTRICT SHOW HIGH LEVELS OF STUDENT PERFORMANCE.

Review Findings

How did the feedback teachers received from each observation/evaluation assist in self-reflection and improved instructional practice?

TEACHERS WERE GIVEN FEEDBACK DIRECTLY RELATED TO THE DANIELSON FRAMEWORK FOR TEACHING. THEY WERE THEN ASKED TO REFLECT ON THEIR TEACHING AND STUDENT LEARNING. THAT SELF-REFLECTION HAS LED TO CHANGES IN INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICE AT THE INDIVIDUAL, TEAM, AND SITE LEVELS. MOST, IF NOT ALL, OF THOSE CHANGES HAVE BEEN A BIG STEP FORWARD FOR INSTRUCTION HERE AT ZM.

How did the training observers/evaluators received throughout the year impact inter-rater reliability and their ability to provide constructive and meaningful feedback to all licensed staff members?

PEER COACHES AND PRINCIPALS RECEIVED VERY LITTLE TRAINING OUTSIDE OF PEER OBSERVATIONS OF COACHES IN OTHER DISTRICTS AND CONTACT WITH PRINCIPALS IN OTHER DISTRICTS. THIS CAUSED LOW LEVELS OF INTER-RATER RELIABILITY TO EXIST WITHIN THE SYSTEM. PRINCIPALS AND PEER COACHES ALSO DID NOT MEET TO DISCUSS AND WORK ON IMPROVING INTER-RATER RELIABILITY.

Recommendations

How will the district use the review findings to improve the effectiveness of teacher evaluation?

THE DISTRICT WILL INVEST IN PEER COACH TRAINING BY OPENING UP FUNDS AND BY ALLOWING TIME FOR COACHES TO RECEIVE TRAINING. COACHES WILL ALSO USE COMMON TIME TO PRACTICE UTILIZATION OF THE DANIELSON FRAMEWORK FOR TEACHING TO BUILD STRONGER INTER-RATER RELIABILITY.

Core Component: Performance Pay and Alternative Salary Schedule

Implementation

Are the performance pay amounts and standards the same as outlined in the approved plan (approval letter and subsequent plan change approval letters)?

YES

If no, please explain the changes that have occurred and why?

Is salary schedule movement or base salary increase based on the same measure of performance as outlined in the approved plan (approval letter and subsequent plan change approval letters)?

YES

If no, please explain the changes that have occurred and why?

Impact

What percentage of all licensed staff met the standard to earn performance pay for the measures of student achievement? %

98%

What percentage of all licensed staff met the standard to earn performance pay for observation/evaluation results? %

100%

What percentage of tenured licensed staff met the standard to earn performance pay for observation/evaluation results? %

100%

What percentage of probationary licensed staff met the standard to earn performance pay for observation/evaluation results? %

100%

Is performance pay awarded for another area (besides schoolwide goals, measures of student achievement and observation/evaluation results)?

NO

If yes, what percentage of all licensed staff members met the standard to earn performance pay for this other area? %

What percentage of all licensed staff met the standard to earn movement on the salary schedule or an increase in base salary? %
100%

What percentage of tenured licensed staff met the standard to earn movement on the salary schedule or an increase in base salary? %
100%

What percentage of probationary licensed staff met the standard to earn movement on the salary schedule or an increase in base salary? %
100%

Recommendations

How will the district use the data to improve the effectiveness of this core component?

THE DISTRICT WILL CONTINUE TO MONITOR THIS COMPONENT THROUGH PRINCIPAL AND PEER COACH REPORTING. TEACHERS WILL ALSO BE SURVEYED TO ASSESS THE DEGREE TO WHICH THE STIPENDS PROMOTE THEIR ACTIVE PARTICIPATION IN THE PROGRAM AND PERSONAL GROWTH.

General Program Impact and Recommendations

What overall impact on instruction has the district or charter school seen as a result of implementing the Q Comp program?

TEACHERS ARE MORE COGNIZANT OF INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES BEING USED AND HAVE INCREASED THEIR EFFORT IN LOOKING FOR NEW, EFFECTIVE STRATEGIES. COOPERATIVE LEARNING HAS ALSO INCREASED. MORE TEACHERS ARE ENGAGING IN PEER OBSERVATIONS, RESOURCE SHARING, AND IDEA GENERATION. INSTRUCTION BETWEEN TEACHERS HAS BECOME MORE ALIGNED, VERTICALLY AND HORIZONTALLY, AS TEACHER COLLABORATION HAS INCREASED. TEACHERS ARE ALSO MORE WILLING TO ATTEMPT NEW PROCESSES AND USE NEW RESOURCES AS THE Q-COMP PROGRAM HAS PROMOTED THAT FORM OF 'RISK' TAKING.

What overall impact on student achievement has the district or charter school seen as a result of implementing the Q Comp program?

THE BIGGEST IMPACT ON STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT HAS COME IN THE WAY WE AS A DISTRICT MEASURE IT. WE ARE MOVING THE CONVERSATION OF GRADING FOR LEARNING AND GRADING OF LEARNING INTO A REALM THAT IS MORE FOCUSED ON IMPROVING STUDENT GROWTH THAN ON SIMPLY ASSESSING STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT. WE ARE TYING ACHIEVEMENT TO STANDARDS, RATHER THAN SIMPLY POINTS-BASED

GRADES. THIS NEW METHOD OF MEASUREMENT MORE ACCURATELY SHOWS WHAT STUDENTS KNOW AND HAVE MASTERED. THE INCREASE IN ACCURACY ALSO ALLOWS TEACHERS TO TARGET INSTRUCTION IN A MORE EFFECTIVE AND EFFICIENT MANNER.

How will the district use the review findings to improve the overall effectiveness of the program?

THE DISTRICT WILL CONTINUE ALONG THE Q-COMP JOURNEY, MAKING CHANGES WHEN PORTIONS OF THE PROGRAM LACK POSITIVE EFFECT. THE DISTRICT WILL ALSO CONTINUE TO GATHER FEEDBACK FROM TEACHERS REGARDING THE PERCEIVED AND ACTUAL USEFULNESS OF THE VARYING COMPONENTS OF THE PROGRAM IN AN EFFORT TO ENHANCE THE UTILITY AND EFFECTIVENESS OF THE PROGRAM.