

Achievement and Integration (AI) Progress Report 2015-2017

District ISD#: 0345 District Name: New London-Spicer Schools

Document prepared by:

Name: Paul Carlson

Email: __carlsonp@nls.k12.mn.us

Phone: 320-354-1401

Title: Superintendent

2015 Date Submitted: December 23, 2015 **2016 Date Submitted:** December 27, 2016 **2017 Date Submitted:** September 21, 2017

Annual Public Meeting and Report on District Website

Al districts are required to hold a public meeting to report on progress toward their plan goals. This meeting should take place at the same time as your World's Best Workforce (WBWF) annual meeting. In the table below, please provide the date of your district's WBWF/AI meeting for the year you are reporting on.

At least 30 days prior to your district's annual WBWF/AI meeting, a district must post the following on its website: the district's AI plan, analysis of progress toward that plan's goals, relevant student performance data, and other longitudinal data. Provide a link to that website in the table below.

Required	Year 1 Report: 2014-2015	Year 2 Report: 2015-2016	Year 3 Report: 2016-2017
Date of Public Meeting	Monday, October 12, 2105	Monday, November 21, 2016	Monday, November 20, 2017
Link to Al report	http://www.nls.k12.mn.us/wp- content/uploads/2016/01/New- London-Spicer-Al-Plan-2015-17.pdf	http://www.nls.k12.mn.us/wp- content/uploads/2016/12/2016- WBWF-Summary-Report- Updated.pdf	https://www.nls.k12.mn.us/site/Default.aspx?PageID=1086

Instructions: Please provide the information requested below to document progress toward the goals in your approved Achievement and Integration Plan for your district.

I. Achievement SMART Goal Statement

The proficiency gap between the Non-FRP and FRP student groups enrolled October 1 in the New London-Spicer School District on the state accountability tests will decrease from 15% in 2014 to 8.7% in 2017 by increasing the proficiency rate of each student group in the following way:

- a. Non-FRP students from 66.8% in 2014 to 81% in 2017 and
- b. FRP students from 54.3% in 2014 to 73.0% in 2017.

A. Proficiency Change: Mathematics

							On Track?			On Track?	
Student	Baseline						Check box if			Check box if	
Group	Data: 2014	2014-15 Goal	Actual	On Track?	2015-16 Goal	Actual	yes	2016-17 Goal	Actual	yes	Total Change
Non-FRP	66.8%	68.2%	74.8%	Yes	74.5%	73.0%	No	74.0%	70.2%	No	+3.4%
FRP	51.8%	54.3%	52.4%	No	64.0%	49.3%	No	53.0%	55.3%	Yes	+3.5%
Gap	15.0%	13.9%	22.4%	No	10.5%	23.7%	No	21.0%	14.9%	Yes	01%

B. Provide a short description of progress toward the achievement goal for your district:

(explain what is going well, what you have learned, areas of strength, and areas of concern; use 200 words or less)

· · ·	
	The Non-FRP student group met and exceeded proficiency targets when comparing base line data. The FRP student group did not meet proficiency targets and actually decreased comparing the baseline data so the achievement gap grew from 15% in 2014 to 22% in 2015. As a positive the
	number of students in the FRP student group in grade 8 participating in advanced math course grew from 38% to 54% so more students
Year 1 2014-15	beginning. Progress in these areas is expected to increase more efficiently in year 2. Areas of concern are ensuring all students have access to the
	same learning opportunities and quality teachers. The 8 th grade math instructor implemented the "No Zero" concept. Using this concept resulted
	in our 8 th grade math scores increasing from 58.1% in 2013 to 73.7% in 2014. For the 2014-2015 school year 68.8% of the students were proficient.
	In the prior year this group of students' proficiency level in grade 7 was at 50.1% so the students continue to make growth.
	The Non-FRP student group did not meet proficiency targets when comparing 2015-2016 goal data. The FRP student group did not meet
	proficiency targets and actually decreased comparing the baseline data so the achievement gap grew from 15% in 2014 to 22% in 2015, and then
	23.7% in 2016. The number of students in the FRP student group in grade 8 participating in advanced math course decreased from 54% to 44% so
	less students participated in a higher level math, but this followed a 16% growth in prior year. The development of a common vision and cultural
Year 2	shift needed for improving mathematics learning is just beginning. Progress in these areas is expected to increase more efficiently in year 3. Areas
2015-16	of concern are ensuring all students have access to the same learning opportunities and quality teachers. The 8 th grade math instructor
	implemented the "No Zero" concept. Using this concept resulted in our 8 th grade math scores increasing from 58.1% in 2013 to 73.7% in 2014. For
	the 2014-2015 school year 68.8% of the students were proficient and for the 2015-2016 school year 76.2% of the students were proficient. In the
	prior year this group of students' proficiency level in grade 7 was at 53.8% so the students continue to make growth gains and increase in the
	percent of students proficient.
	The Non-FRP student group did not meet proficiency targets when comparing 2016-2017 goal data. The FRP student group did meet proficiency
Year 3 2016-17	targets and actually increase proficiency targets comparing the baseline data so the achievement gap decreased from 15% in 2014 as a base line to
2010-17	14.9% in 2017. The development of a common vision and cultural shift needed for improving mathematics learning is just beginning. Progress in

these areas is expected to increase more efficiently in the next three-year plan. Areas of concern are ensuring all students have access to the same
learning opportunities and quality teachers. The 8 th grade math instructor continued implementation of the "No Zero" concept. Using this
concept resulted in our 8 th grade math scores increasing. In the 2014-2015 school year 68.8% of the students were proficient and for the 2015-
2016 school year 76.2% of the students were proficient. This type of proficiency rate remained very similar at 75.6% for the 2016-2017 school
year. In the prior year this group of students' proficiency level in grade 7 was at 61.7% so the students continue to make growth gains and increase
or maintain the percent of students proficient.

II. Integration SMART Goal Statement

The proportion of students eligible for free or reduced lunch and the proportion of students not eligible for free or reduced lunch who are enrolled in grade 8 Algebra will change to reduce enrollment disproportionality by at least one third, from a gap of 16% in 2014 to a gap 6% in 2017. And the proportion of protected class students and the proportion of white students who are enrolled in grade 8 Algebra will change to reduce enrollment disproportionality by at least one fourth, from a gap of 49% in 2014 to a gap 25% in 2017.

A. Integration Goal Change for Students Enrolled in Grade 8 Advanced Mathematics Courses

Student	Baseline Data:		Actual:	On		Actual:	On		Actual:	On	
Group	Fall 2013	2014-15 Goal	Fall 2015	Track?	2015-16 Goal	Fall 2016	Track?	2016-17 Goal	Fall 2017	Track?	Total Change
	54%		43%			50%			55%		+1%
NON-FRP	(38/70)	Enrollment	(33/76)		Enrollment	(41/82)		Enrollment	(46/84)		
EPD	38%	Difference	54%	Yes	Difference	44%	Yes	Difference	49%		+11%
FNF	(9/24)	of 15%	(21/39)		of 11%	(12/27)		of 6%	(18/37)		
Gap	16%		-11%			8%			6%		-10%
W/hito	56%		50%			50%			54%		-2%
white	(48/86)	Enrollment	(52/105)		Enrollment	(52/103)		Enrollment	(65/120)		
Protected	7%	Difference	20%	Yes	Difference	17%	Yes	Difference	25%		+18%
Class	(1/8)	of 43%	(2/10)		of 37%	(1/6)		of 25%	(2/8)		
Gap	49%		30%			33%			29%		-20%

(Difference in participation proportions for each student group should ideally be close to zero, regardless of the number of students enrolled.)

B. Indicate level of progress that has been made toward achieving your integration goal above: (place X in appropriate box for year reporting)

Year 1: 2014-15		Yea	r 2: 2015-16	Year 3: 2016-17		
	Goal has been achieved		Goal has been achieved	Х	Goal has been achieved	
	Significant progress toward reaching goal by end of plan.	Х	Significant progress toward reaching goal by end of plan.	Х	Significant progress toward reaching goal by end of plan.	
Х	Some progress toward reaching goal.		Some progress toward reaching goal.		Some progress toward reaching goal.	
	Not making progress as expected.		Not making progress as expected.		Not making progress as expected.	
Х	Other. Please explain.		Other. Please explain.	Х	Other. Please explain.	
	Infrastructure changes need to be addressed.		Insert explanation as needed.		Insert explanation as needed.	

C. Provide a short description of progress toward the integration goal for your district:

(explain what is going well, what you have learned, areas of strength, and areas of concern; use 200 words or less)

	Since 2013, data on grade 8 Algebra participation is decreasing for non-FRP and for our white students. We will continue to work on
	increasing the participating of students in these subgroups; the gap between non-FRP and FRP participation was 16% in 2013. The gap
Voor 1	was eliminated in 2014, but the number of non-FRP decreased. Ideally it would be beneficial to have our gap eliminated while our
Year 1 2014-15	participation numbers increase for non-FRP. The proportions of protected class and non-protected class students enrolled in the
	advanced algebra course shows a move to equality, with so few student of protected class it is difficult to determine is this is
	statistically significant. The Tracking of students beginning in grade 5 is eliminating the impact of the work being done at the elementary
	schools, where students are taught mathematics in heterogeneous groups.
	For the school year 2015-2016, data on grade 8 Algebra participation is decreasing for non-FRP and for our white students. We will
	continue to work on increasing the participating of students in these subgroups; the gap between non-FRP and FRP participation was
Year 2 2015-16	0% in 2015. The gap was eliminated in 2015, but the number of non-FRP decreased. Ideally it would be beneficial to have our gap
	eliminated while our participation numbers increase for non-FRP. For the 2015-2016 school year our enrollment difference goal was
	11%. The actual enrollment difference was 8%. The proportions of protected class and non-protected class students enrolled in the
	advanced algebra course shows a move to equality.

	For the school year 2016-2017, data on grade 8 Algebra participation is increasing for non-FRP and for our white students. This is due to
	an increase in enrollment for this class with similar demographics from prior years. We will continue to work on increasing the
Year 3 2016-17	participating of students in these subgroups; the gap between non-FRP and FRP participation was 0% in 2015. The gap was eliminated
	in 2015, but the number of non-FRP decreased. In 2016-2017 the number of student in each sub group increased reducing the gap to
	meet targets identified in the SMART goal. Ideally it would be beneficial to have our gap eliminated while our participation numbers
	increase for non-FRP. The proportion of protected class students and the proportion of white students who were enrolled in grade 8
	Algebra changed to reduce enrollment disproportionality by at least one fourth, from a gap of 49% in 2014 to a gap 20% in 2017. The
	goal was achieved with a target gap set for 25%.

III. Longitudinal Data Analysis. Choose one of the options below—either A, B, or C.

Al districts are to report on one of the longitudinal data sets A, B, or C below Based on its relevance to the goals in the AI plan for your district. Districts may also report on college and career readiness listed in D below (Minn. Stat. §124D.861, Subd.3 (d).

- A. School enrollment choices impacted by your AI plan: Not applicable to West Central Achievement & Integration Collaborative
- **B.** The number of World Language Proficiency certificates awarded: Not applicable to West Central Achievement & Integration Collaborative
- C. Indicators of school safety, students' engagement, and student's connection at school: Results could include state and local school climate, health and safety surveys disaggregated by student groups and grade levels as included in Minnesota Student Survey.







D. Optional Data on students' progress toward college and career readiness or rigorous course work completed:

Results include 8th grade MCA mathematics proficiency scores, participation in AP/IB courses by student group, and/or ACT performance and proficiency scores by student group.

Year 1	See Part II: Integration Goal
2014-15	
Year 2	See Part II: Integration Goal
2015-16	
Year 3	Insert data here.
2016-17	Insert interpretation here.

IV. Cross District Integration or Intra-district Integration for Racially Identifiable Schools

Please summarize the impact of the interventions you are implementing with other districts in your integration collaborative. For a racially identifiable school summarize the impact of integration interventions for that school. Briefly describe how this work has enabled your district to realize racial and economic integration and increase academic achievement, create equitable educational opportunities, and reduce academic disparities based on student's diverse racial, ethnic and economic backgrounds.

Year 1	New London-Spicer Schools is in the process of implementing the five-Step Model for leading classroom math discussion. This is a way							
2014-15	to conduct classroom math discussions that builds on and honors student thinking while ensuring that the key ideas being taught							
	remain central.							
	1) Anticipate student responses –							
	2) Monitoring students' work and engagement –							
	3) Selecting students to present –							
	4) Sequencing student responses for display –							
	5) Connecting different student responses and linking them to key math ideas –							
	Initial changes in student learning which were observed anecdotally showed students were starting to communicate about							
	mathematics in classroom discussion. More work needs to be done to increase persistence in problem solving and student							
	collaboration related to problem solving. The impact the summer Jumpstart course will be measured during the coming year as data is							
	collected on student learning in the regular classroom and on how students performing on OLPA/MCA assessments. Future course							
	enrollment will be available next year.							
Year 2	The instructional staff was organized into professional learning teams (PLT's) during the 2015-2016 school year. Each team met for 30 minutes							
2015-16	weekly before school or after school for their PLT meetings. The goals of the PLTs for the 2015-2016 school year was to review academic standards							
	to identify essential standards, assess student needs, create SMART goals to address these needs, develop common formative assessments, and							
	evaluate the continuous improvement process. The leadership teams from each school site in the district and PLI's also reviewed MCA Benchmark							
	Reports. The benchmark report compares school-level performances on MICA Items from each benchmark against the performance expected in the							
	school given student scores on the entire test. The reports are a tool teachers can use to identify benchmarks and standards on which student in							
	their school show performance above, below, or at the same level relative to expectations based on overall test performance. A synthetic measure							
	or expected state performance is also included as a reference for interpretation of school performance. The reports were used for students who participated in the CANANA program. The program was effected in New London Spicer (lune 2016) and Willman (August 2016)							
	participated in the GAIVIVIA program. The program was offered in New London-Spicer (June 2016) and Willmar (August 2016)							

Year 3 2016-17 Instructional staff continued to meet in professional learning teams. PLT's created SMART goals to address these needs, develop common formative assessments, and evaluate the continuous improvement process. The leadership teams from each school site in the district and PLTs also reviewed MCA Benchmark Reports. The benchmark report compares school-level performances on MCA items from each benchmark against the performance expected in the school given student scores on the entire test. The reports are a tool teachers' can use to identify benchmarks and standards on which student in their school show performance above, below, or at the same level relative to expectations based on overall test performance. A synthetic measure of expected state performance is also included as a reference for interpretation of school performance. The reports were used for students who participated in the GAMMA program. The program was offered in New London-Spicer (June 2017) and Willmar (August 2017). GAMMA is a supplemental summer math program for students entering the 7th and 8th grade in the achievement and integration collaborative. The program is aimed at enriching the math standards through high level lessons and activities. Seventeen students participate in the June session and 90 students in the August session form all districts that are members of the West Central Achievement and Integration Collaborative.

Results of student surveys - 61 of 72 students competed surveys.

Activities you most enjoyed: 11% listed meeting friends; 56% listed the math games and activities; 42% listed the collaborative time with multi grade projects; 7% listed Valleyfair (survey was done before our trip to Valleyfair); 14% listed the teachers; 39% listed recess time.

Comments from students on surveys: "best math program ever"; "coming back next year"; "I loved it!" "I will probably come back." (from a student with not many positives listed); "it was fun"; "I love GAMMA and hope I can come again"; "I'm totally coming back next year."; "I want to do it again next year."

Results of teacher surveys - What you enjoyed most: Every teacher listed the collaboration (especially with teachers from other districts and levels); Seeing kids excited about math; Time to do activities (the right way)

Improvements:

More teachers (6th grade needed a couple more teachers for true collaboration) **100% of teachers said they would participate again in the program.**