



2016-17 World's Best Workforce Report Summary

District or Charter Name: Metro Schools Charter 4131

Grades Served: Grades 5-12

Contact Person Name and Position: Mr. Ahmed Elmi

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 year.

This document serves as the required template for submission of the 2016-17 report summary. Districts must submit this completed template by **December 15, 2017**, to MDE.WorldsBestWorkForce@state.mn.us.

If you have questions while completing this summary, please feel free to email MDE.WorldsBestWorkforce@state.mn.us or contact [Susan Burris](mailto:susan.burris@state.mn.us) (susan.burris@state.mn.us), Program Manager for District Support.

1. Stakeholder Engagement

1a. Annual 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.]

- 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.

1b. 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.]

- Provide the date of the school board annual public meeting to review progress from the 2016-17 school year.

1c. 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.]

- Complete the list of your District Advisory Committee members for the 2016-17 school year. Expand the table to include all committee members. Ensure roles are clear (teachers, parents, support staff, students, and other community residents).

Metro Schools provides translation/interpretation for members of the district advisory committee needing such translation/interpretation.

| Advisory Member | ROLE | CONTACT INFORMATION |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Ahmed Elmi | Executive Director | ahelmi@metroschoolsmn.org |
| Katia Colon-Holmers | High school administrator | kcolon-holmers@metroschoolsmn.org |
| Laura Ruuska | ESL/teacher | lruuska@metroschoolsmn.org |
| Amina Mohamed | Middle School administrator | amohamed@metroschoolsmn.org |
| Trudy Suleiman | Academic Counselor | tsuleiman@metroschoolsmn.org |
| Micah Merritt | Teacher | mmerritt@metroschoolsmn.org |
| Adam Hansen | Teacher | ahansen@metroschoolsmn.org |
| Aila O'Loughlin | Teacher | aoloughlin@metroschoolsmn.org |
| Osman Ali | Teacher | olai@metroschoolsmn.org |
| Mohamed Musa | Support staff | mmusa@metroschools.org |
| Hamdi Ali | Parent | x |
| Deeqo Mohamed | Student | x |
| Mohamed Omar | Community member | x |

2. Goals and Results

[Note: SMART goals are: specific and strategic, measurable, attainable (yet rigorous), results-based and time-based. Goals should be linked to needs and written in SMART-goal format. 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 or other locally-determined measures. Be sure to check the box with the most appropriate goal status.]

2a. All Students Ready for School

| Goal | Result | Goal Status |
|--|--|--|
| <i>Provide the established SMART goal for the 2016-2017 school year.</i> | <i>Provide the result for the 2016-2017 school year that directly ties back to the established goal.</i> | <i>Check one of the following:</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Goal Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Goal Not Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Goal in Progress</i> <i>(only for multi-year goals)</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>District/charter does not enroll students in Kindergarten</i> |

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

| Goal | Result | Goal Status |
|---|---|--|
| <p><i>Provide the established SMART goal for the 2016-2017 school year.</i></p> | <p><i>Provide the result for the 2016-2017 school year that directly ties back to the established goal.</i></p> | <p><i>Check one of the following:</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>Goal Met</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>Goal Not Met</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>Goal in Progress (only for multi-year goals)</i></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>District/charter does not enroll students in grade 3</i></p> |

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

| Goal | Result | Goal Status |
|--|---|---|
| <p>Math Growth: FY16 to FY18, the school will earn at least 60.0% of possible NWEA growth index points*.</p> <p>Reading Growth: FY16 to FY18, the school will earn at least 60.0% of possible NWEA growth index points*.</p> | <p>FY17: When growth index points were calculated by the same method, Metro Schools earned 52.1% of possible points; Metro Schools is approaching this standard, with at least 50% of possible points earned. See Appendix 1 for details.</p> <p>FY17: When growth index points were calculated by the same method, Metro Schools earned 52.6% of possible points; Metro Schools is approaching this standard, with at least 50% of possible points earned. See Appendix 1 for details.</p> | <p><i>Check one of the following:</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>Goal Met</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>Goal Not Met</i></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Goal in Progress (only for multi-year goals)</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>Goal Met</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>Goal Not Met</i></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Goal in Progress (only for multi-year goals)</i></p> |

- The Northwest Evaluation Association does not provide for conversion of Measures of Academic

Progress (MAP) test scores to grade level equivalents. To group students in terms of whether they were below, at or above grade level, NWEA’s Student Status Norms were used. Students were defined as at least a year behind, if their fall RIT score was at or below the mean RIT score for students the previous grade. For instance, the mean-average beginning-of-year Reading RIT score for 6th graders is 211.0. Thus, a 7th grader whose fall score was 211 or lower would be defined as at least a year below grade level. If a student’s fall RIT score was at least as high as the average beginning-of-year score for the next-highest grade, they were defined as a year or more above grade level. Grade 11 norms were used as a proxy for seniors, as the MAP tests are not normed for grade 12. When students were grouped this way, 2016-17 MAP test results showed 75% of Metro Schools students with both fall and spring scores were a year or more below grade level (171 of 229 students); 6% were on grade level or less than a year behind; and 19% were a year or more above grade level.

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

| Goal | Result | Goal Status |
|---|---|---|
| <p>FY16 to FY17, the aggregate percentage of graduating students continuously enrolled for at least three years who earn at least one college credit prior to graduation will be at least 25.0%.</p> <p>From FY16 to FY17, the aggregate percentage of graduates that are accepted into at least one post secondary institution prior to graduation will be at least 60.0%.</p> | <p>FY17: Only one of 50 students took PSEO; Metro Schools is not meeting this target.</p> <p>FY17: Metro Schools’ Academic Advisor reported in the spring, 100% of graduating students had been accepted into post-secondary institutions. Metro Schools continues to exceed this target.</p> | <p><i>Check one of the following:</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>Goal Met</i></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Goal Not Met</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>Goal in Progress (only for multi-year goals)</i></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Goal Met</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>Goal Not Met</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>Goal in Progress (only for multi-year goals)</i></p> |

2e. All Students Graduate

| Goal | Result | Goal Status |
|---|---|---|
| <p>From FY15 to FY17, the school's aggregate 4-year graduation rate will be at least 45.0%. Note: reported data on this measure lags a year; 2016-17 grad rate data is not expected until early 2018.</p> <p>In FY17, the school's 6-year graduation rate will be at least 60.0%.</p> | <p>FY16: 37.5% (Note: reported data on this measure lags a year; 2016-17 grad rate data is not expected until early 2018.)</p> <p>FY16: 56.0% (Note: reported data on this measure lags a year; 2016-17 grad rate data is not expected until early 2018.)</p> | <p><i>Check one of the following:</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Goal Met</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Goal Not Met</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Goal in Progress <i>(only for multi-year goals)</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Goal Met</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Goal Not Met</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Goal in Progress <i>(only for multi-year goals)</i></p> |

3. 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.]

- *List and describe the district's needs that were identified at the start of the 2016-2017 school year and the data the needs were based upon.*
- *Include only the key data used to determine identified needs and limit response to 300 words.*
- *Bulleted points are welcome and appreciate.*

The leadership team did a preliminary examination of enrollment data and possible changes in our student body. We anticipated as high as 60% of EL students. The leadership team also did a preliminary examination of the MCA data in all categories. We did experience a disappointing drop in our % of students reaching proficiency in math. The reading data was more consistent the previous year. Further examination showed that our EL students dropped significantly in math and some in reading.

On the NWEA assessment, we noticed that our below grade level students made more progress than our at grade level students. We hypothesized the underlying issue is teacher mindsets about what our kids are capable of, the teachers skill in scaffolding grade level content, and the ability to structure activities so students are doing more of the work.

\

4. Systems, Strategies and Support Category

4a. Students

- *Describe the areas below. Include only the district focus areas for the 2016-2017 school year and limit response to 300 words. Bulleted points are welcome and appreciated.*
 - *Process for assessing and evaluating student progress toward meeting state and local academic standards.*
 - *Process to disaggregate data by student group.*

We identified that our teachers need more coaching and that our students need to produce more in classes across content areas. One strategy we focused on was scaffolding content for students where students do more of the academic production versus teacher lectures where teachers are doing more of the work. We also wanted our EL students to be producing more language during lessons. We concluded that we need to develop better assessments that measure grade level competency of standards. We worked with our teachers to develop assessments that are varied in language, modality, format, formality, collaboration (collaborative vs independent). We also concluded that we need more overall focus in our math instruction – lesson planning, objectives, and assessments. We hired a math coach to support the teachers in these areas. We also developed a goal of significantly increasing the engagement level of our lessons by increasing the Depth of Knowledge level of our learning objectives more consistently. We also strongly believe that our students lack of prior knowledge in many areas restricts their command of vocabulary and academic vocabulary.

We assess and evaluate student progress toward meeting state and local academic standards with several assessment instruments. We use the NWEA assessment in the fall to determine the grade level equivalent for our students in reading and math. The only significant sub group of students we have is ELL. So, we do this aggregate the data to see how our EL students are doing and support them with strategies. During the school year we also use the NWEA assessment to track student progress in reading and math. We do regular assessments as well in each classroom. We use professional learning community meetings to analyze this regular curriculum-based data to see how students are progressing. The classroom teachers assess students in class and results, disaggregated by student group, are shared as a staff with the intent to improve and find out how to best address that student's learning goals. Classroom teachers give formative and summative evaluations. We use the information from the assessments to set useful measurable learner goals to improve all pupil learning and all student achievement. There are weekly PLCs held every Friday where the teaching staff, led by the school's instructional leader, discuss interventions based on data review.

4b. Teachers and Principals

- *Describe the areas below. Include only the district focus areas for the 2016-2017 school year and limit response to 300 words. Bulleted points are welcome and appreciated.*
 - *System to review and evaluate the effectiveness of*
 - *Instruction*
 - *Curriculum*
 - *Teacher evaluations*
 - *Principal evaluations*

The Instructional Leadership Team meets regularly to review benchmark data and the curriculum and instruction program. They also meet to examine what is working and not working overall in the program as well as discuss the data from Practice Profiles from the schools School Improvement Plan. The team also reviewed curriculum needs and purchased significant new materials for ELA courses and math. Our ILT continually monitor's teacher needs for any new curriculum resources.

All teachers complete a professional development plan with goals and aligned activities. The Individual Growth and Development Plan is worth 15% of the overall teacher evaluation. Teachers are encouraged to develop a portfolio to present their results. The instructional leader and other teacher leaders, peers, and qualified individuals conduct "walk through" observations using a more basic rubric and provide teachers timely feedback and coaching to improve classroom management, student engagement, and lesson implementation. The Instructional Leader evaluates all teachers three times a year. 35% of teacher evaluation results will be based on teachers meeting student learning goals explicitly aligned with the elements of curriculum for which teachers are responsible.

The school's Board of Directors evaluates the Executive Director annually.

4c. District

- *Describe the areas below. Include only the district focus areas for the 2016-2017 school year and limit response to 300 words. Bulleted points are welcome and appreciated.*
 - *Include the district practices around high-quality instruction and rigorous curriculum which integrate:*
 - *Technology*
 - *Collaborative professional culture*

Metro Schools has a building-based administrator that aims to build the capacity to work as a team at all levels, collaboratively. The Instructional Leadership Team consists of a teacher representative for each of the core academic subjects plus special education, the math coach, and the Instructional Leader. This team participates in a continuous improvement model consisting of ongoing needs assessment, targeted goals, identified strategies, a professional development plan, ongoing, job embedded professional development including the analysis of regular assessment data, and teacher evaluation system aimed at results.

The staff use weekly Professional Learning Communities (PLC) to focus on how to achieve grade level proficiency benchmarks, how to track student progress, and how to implement key components of the curriculum. Metro Schools utilizes a comprehensive technology based program for credit recovery utilizing an interactive curriculum that is aligned to Minnesota State Standards. The school also focused on preparing students for post-high school success through offering a college-prep course and invested in a comprehensive online program to allow for a full high school curriculum and the option for credit recovery.

5. Equitable Access to Excellent 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 excellent educators. The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), signed on December 10, 2015, now requires states to evaluate and publicly report whether low-income and minority students are disproportionately served by ineffective, out-of-field, or inexperienced teachers.

To reach the goals of the WBWF, it is important to ensure that all students, particularly students from low income families, students of color and American Indian students have equitable access to teachers and principals who can help them reach their potential. WBWF now requires:

1. Districts to have a process to examine the equitable distribution of teachers and strategies to ensure low-income and minority children are not taught at higher rates than other children by inexperienced, ineffective, or out-of-field teachers.

2. District advisory committees to recommend to the school board the means to improve students' equitable access to effective and more diverse teachers.

In this 2016-2017 summary report submission, please provide the information below.

- *Describe the areas below. Limit response to 300 words. Bulleted points are welcome and appreciated.*
 - *District process to examine the distribution of experienced, effective and in-field teachers across the district and within school sites using data.*
 - *Include how the district reviews data to examine the equitable distribution of teachers.*
 - *Strategies used to improve students' equitable access to experienced, effective and in-field teachers.*

Metro Schools employs certified classroom teachers and provides them with the assistance that they need to be a effective. We recruit educators that are committed to our program and mission, as well as to our students and families. We look for teachers attracted to teaching recent immigrants and that enjoy the challenge of helping students that need both language and academic support. We use the normal processes to find and hire teachers such as the Minnesota Association of Charter Schools website, Edpost, Craigslist, and other Minnesota job service sites. But we also try to recruit from the community in which we serve. We have several teachers and para professionals on staff that came to us from our connections to community organizations that serve many of our students. Several of our teachers came to us from our relationship with Teach for America as well.