

## 2014-2015 World's Best Workforce Report Summary

District or Charter Name: Urban Academy Charter School

Contact Person Name and Position: Dr. Mongsher Ly, Superintendent

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

This document serves as the required template for submission of the 2014-2015 report summary. Districts must submit this completed template by **December 1, 2015** to [MDE.WorldsBestWorkForce@state.mn.us](mailto: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.]

- *Urban Academy Charter School Website:*
  - [www.urbanacademymn.org](http://www.urbanacademymn.org)
  - Select: Board Information
  - Select: Annual Report

#### 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.]

- *August 18, 2015 Board Meeting*

#### 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.]

- *Dr. Mongsher Ly, Superintendent*
- *Mai Saevang, Principal*
- *Robert McCabe, Teacher*
- *Pakou Yang, Title I Teacher*
- *Panyia Ly, Teacher*
- *Roger Sykes, Parent*
- *Dr. Tamara Mattison, Community*
- *Melissa Jensen, Community*

## Goals and Results

For 2014-2015, Urban Academy adopted a new performance framework with its authorizer, NEO. The framework includes smart goals (measures and indicators) in areas addressing grade level proficiency and growth using MCA assessments for Grades 3-6; and addressing growth in reading and math for grades K-6. In addition, the school used MCA data to also demonstrate that the school is closing the achievement gap. Following is the school's performance on these measures:

- *All Students Achieving Grade-Level Literacy as Measured by Proficiency on State Tests vs. State and District*

			Results		
			ALL Students		
School Performance Rating	MCA-Math Criteria (Grades 3-6)		Urban 2014	Urban 2015	State 2015
<b>Exemplary</b>	School's proficiency rates are at least 11 percentage points above the state average				
<b>Satisfactory</b>	The school's proficiency rate exceeds the state average by 1-10 percentage points AND/OR school improves proficiency rate by at least 10 percentage points				
<b>Not Satisfactory</b>	The school's proficiency rate does not exceed the state average AND the school does not improve by at least 10 percentage points.	x	31.5%	35.6%	65.8%
School	MCA-Reading Criteria (Grades 3-6)		Urban 2014	Urban 2015	State 2015

<b>Performance Rating</b>				
<b>Exemplary</b>	School's proficiency rates are at least 11 percentage points above the state average			
<b>Satisfactory</b>	The school's proficiency rate exceeds the state average by 1-10 percentage points AND/OR school improves proficiency rate by at least 10 percentage points	x		
<b>Not Satisfactory</b>	The school's proficiency rate does not exceed the state average AND the school does not improve by at least 10 percentage points.		21.3%	37.1%
				62.7%

		ALL Students		
School Performance Rating	MCA-Math Criteria (Grades 3-6)	Urban 2014	Urban 2015	Saint Paul 2015
<b>Exemplary</b>	School's proficiency rates are at least 11 percentage points above their resident district average			
<b>Satisfactory</b>	The school's proficiency rate exceeds their resident district average by 1-10 percentage points			
<b>Not Satisfactory</b>	The school's proficiency rate does not exceed the school's resident district average	x	31.5%	35.6%
				42.4%
School Performance Rating	MCA-Reading Criteria (Grades 3-6)	Urban 2014	Urban 2015	Saint Paul 2015
<b>Exemplary</b>	School's proficiency rates are at least 11 percentage points above their resident district average			
<b>Satisfactory</b>	The school's proficiency rate exceeds their resident district average by 1-10 percentage points			
<b>Not Satisfactory</b>	The school's proficiency rate does not exceed the school's resident district average	x	21.3%	37.1%
				40.5%

- *Close the Achievement Gap(s) Among All Groups as Measured by Proficiency on State Tests by the English Learner and Free and Reduced Subgroups vs. State and District*

		EL Students		
School Performance Rating	MCA-Math Criteria (Grades 3-6)	Urban 2014	Urban 2015	State 2015

<b>Exemplary</b>	School's proficiency rates are at least 11 percentage points above the state average	x			
<b>Satisfactory</b>	The school's proficiency rate exceeds the state average by 1-10 percentage points AND/OR school improves proficiency rate by at least 10 percentage points				
<b>Not Satisfactory</b>	The school's proficiency rate does not exceed the state average AND the school does not improve by at least 10 percentage points		38.2%	43.6%	31.3%
<b>School Performance Rating</b>	<b>MCA-Reading Criteria (Grades 3-6)</b>		Urban 2014	Urban 2015	State 2015
<b>Exemplary</b>	School's proficiency rates are at least 11 percentage points above the state average				
<b>Satisfactory</b>	The school's proficiency rate exceeds the state average by 1-10 percentage points AND/OR school improves proficiency rate by at least 10 percentage points	x			
<b>Not Satisfactory</b>	The school's proficiency rate does not exceed the state average AND the school does not improve by at least 10 percentage points		11.8%	27.3%	21.5%

			EL Students		
<b>School Performance Rating</b>	<b>MCA-Math Criteria (Grades 3-6)</b>		Urban 2014	Urban 2015	Saint Paul 2015
<b>Exemplary</b>	School's proficiency rates are at least 11 percentage points above their resident district average	x			
<b>Satisfactory</b>	The school's proficiency rate exceeds their resident district average by 1-10 percentage points				
<b>Not Satisfactory</b>	The school's proficiency rate does not exceed the school's resident district average		38.2%	43.6%	29.7%
<b>School Performance Rating</b>	<b>MCA-Reading Criteria (Grades 3-6)</b>		Urban 2014	Urban 2015	Saint Paul 2015
<b>Exemplary</b>	School's proficiency rates are at least 11 percentage points above their resident district average				
<b>Satisfactory</b>	The school's proficiency rate exceeds their resident district average by 1-10 percentage points	x			
<b>Not Satisfactory</b>	The school's proficiency rate does not exceed the school's resident district average		11.8%	27.3%	21.6%

School Performance Rating	MCA-Math Criteria (Grades 3-6)		FRP Students		
			Urban 2014	Urban 2015	State 2015
<b>Exemplary</b>	School's proficiency rates are at least 11 percentage points above the state average				
<b>Satisfactory</b>	The school's proficiency rate exceeds the state average by 1-10 percentage points AND/OR school improves proficiency rate by at least 10 percentage points				
<b>Not Satisfactory</b>	The school's proficiency rate does not exceed the state average AND the school does not improve by at least 10 percentage points	x	30.9%	34.1%	46.8%
School Performance Rating	MCA-Reading Criteria (Grades 3-6)		Urban 2014	Urban 2015	State 2015
<b>Exemplary</b>	School's proficiency rates are at least 11 percentage points above the state average				
<b>Satisfactory</b>	The school's proficiency rate exceeds the state average by 1-10 percentage points AND/OR school improves proficiency rate by at least 10 percentage points	x			
<b>Not Satisfactory</b>	The school's proficiency rate does not exceed the state average AND the school does not improve by at least 10 percentage points		21.5%	35.7%	43.8%

School Performance Rating	MCA-Math Criteria (Grades 3-6)		FRP Students		
			Urban 2014	Urban 2015	Saint Paul 2015
<b>Exemplary</b>	School's proficiency rates are at least 11 percentage points above their resident district average				
<b>Satisfactory</b>	The school's proficiency rate exceeds their resident district average by 1-10 percentage points	x			
<b>Not Satisfactory</b>	The school's proficiency rate does not exceed the school's resident district average		30.9%	34.1%	30.2%
School Performance Rating	MCA-Reading Criteria (Grades 3-6)		Urban 2014	Urban 2015	Saint Paul 2015
<b>Exemplary</b>	School's proficiency rates are at least 11 percentage points above their resident district average				
<b>Satisfactory</b>	The school's proficiency rate exceeds their resident district average by 1-10 percentage	x	21.5%	35.7%	27.7%

	points			
<b>Not Satisfactory</b>	The school's proficiency rate does not exceed the school's resident district average			

➤ *All Students Career- and College-Ready by Graduation as Measured by School Performance and Growth Data*

School Performance Rating	Multiple Measurement Rating		Designation
<b>Exemplary</b>	Reward School or Celebration School	x	Celebration Eligible
<b>Satisfactory</b>	No Designation		
<b>Not Satisfactory</b>	Priority or Focus School		

*Positive Z Scores – Students Making More than Expected Growth on Average*

School Performance Rating	MCA-Math Growth Z Score		Urban 2015
<b>Exemplary</b>	Above 0.2		0.088180
<b>Satisfactory</b>	Between -0.2 and 0.2		
<b>Not Satisfactory</b>	Below -0.2		
School Performance Rating	MCA-Reading Growth Z Score		Urban 2015
<b>Exemplary</b>	Above 0.2		0.466107
<b>Satisfactory</b>	Between -0.1 and 0.2		

*Positive Z Scores – Students Making More than Expected Growth on Average*

Urban Academy Charter School Average Growth Z Scores		
Subject	Number of Students	Growth Z Score Average
M	84	0.088180
R	83	0.466107
Combined	167	0.276012

*Growth on MCA Tests – More Students Make Medium/High Growth than the State in Reading (same in Math)*

2015	Proficient Students with Medium/High Growth	Non-Proficient Students with High Growth	Proficient Students with Medium/High Growth	Non-Proficient Students with High Growth
------	---	--	---	--

Subject	Urban	Urban	State	State
M	75.0%	40.4%	75.1%	26.9%
R	84.6%	51.4%	73.9%	33.8%

*Growth on Nationally Normed Tests in Reading and Math*

School Performance Rating	Growth on NWEA MAPs Reading Criteria (Grades 2-6)	Result
<b>Exemplary</b>	Over 70% of all students increase their national percentile ranking based on Fall to Spring administration of the NWEA MAP AND/OR with an average percentile increase of over 10	
<b>Satisfactory</b>	Between 60% and 70% of all students increase their national percentile ranking based on Fall to Spring administration of the NWEA MAP AND/OR have an average percentile increase of between 5 and 10 percentage points	<b>x</b>
<b>Not Satisfactory</b>	Less than 60% of all students increase their national percentile ranking AND/OR have the average percentile ranking increase less than 5	
School Performance Rating	Growth on NWEA MAPs Math Criteria (Grades K-6)	Result
<b>Exemplary</b>	Over 70% of all students increase their national percentile ranking based on Fall to Spring administration of the NWEA MAP AND/OR with an average percentile increase of over 10	
<b>Satisfactory</b>	Between 60% and 70% of all students increase their national percentile ranking based on Fall to Spring administration of the NWEA MAP AND/OR have an average percentile increase of between 5 and 10 percentage points	<b>x</b>
<b>Not Satisfactory</b>	Less than 60% of all students increase their national percentile ranking AND/OR have the average percentile ranking increase less than 5	

<b>School Performance Rating</b>	<b>Growth on NWEA MAPs Reading Criteria (Grades K-6)</b>	
<b>Exemplary</b>	Over 70% of students that had a Fall RIT score at or above grade level on the Fall NWEA maintain or improve their at or above grade level status.	
<b>Satisfactory</b>	Between 60% and 70% of students that had a score at or above grade level on the Fall NWEA maintain or improve their at or above grade level status.	<b>x</b>
<b>Not Satisfactory</b>	Less than 60 of students that had a score at or above grade level on the Fall NWEA maintain or improve their at or above grade level status.	
<b>School Performance Rating</b>	<b>Growth on NWEA MAPs Math Criteria (Grades K-6)</b>	
<b>Exemplary</b>	Over 70% of students that had a Fall RIT score at or above grade level on the Fall NWEA maintain or improve their at or above grade level status.	<b>x</b>
<b>Satisfactory</b>	Between 60% and 70% of students that had a score at or above grade level on the Fall NWEA maintain or improve their at or above grade level status.	
<b>Not Satisfactory</b>	Less than 60 of students that had a score at or above grade level on the Fall NWEA maintain or improve their at or above grade level status.	
<b>School Performance Rating</b>	<b>Growth on NWEA MAPs Reading Criteria (Grades K-6)</b>	
<b>Exemplary</b>	Over 70% of all students that were below the 50th percentile on the Fall NWEA increase their national percentile ranking based on Fall to Spring administration of the NWEA MAP AND/OR as a group will have an average percentile ranking increase of over 10	<b>x</b>
<b>Satisfactory</b>	Between 60% and 70% of that were below the 50th percentile on the Fall NWEA increase their national percentile ranking based on Fall to Spring administration of the NWEA MAP AND/OR as a group have an average percentile ranking increase of between 5 and 10 percentage points	
<b>Not Satisfactory</b>	Less than 60 percent of students increase their national percentile ranking AND the group average percentile ranking increase is less than 5	



School Performance Rating	Growth on NWEA MAPs Math Criteria (Grades K-6)	
Exemplary	Over 70% of all students that were below the 50th percentile on the Fall NWEA increase their national percentile ranking based on Fall to Spring administration of the NWEA MAP AND/OR as a group will have an average percentile ranking increase of over 10	
Satisfactory	Between 60% and 70% of that were below the 50th percentile on the Fall NWEA increase their national percentile ranking based on Fall to Spring administration of the NWEA MAP AND/OR as a group have an average percentile ranking increase of between 5 and 10 percentage points	x
Not Satisfactory	Less than 60 percent of students increase their national percentile ranking AND the group average percentile ranking increase is less than 5	

### 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 2014-2015 school year, and the data the needs were based upon.*
- *Include only the key data used to determine identified needs and limit response to 200 words.*

The school assessed students in a variety of ways in reading. Using the Fountas and Pinell Leveled Literacy, High Frequency Word List Assessments, NWEA MAP, and MCA assessments. The school triangulated the data and found that students in grades 2-4 were struggling with high frequency words and literal and inferential comprehension skills. We also were not satisfied with the percent of students that met their growth targets. We still have a majority of students that enter each grade level below grade level in reading. Basic skills of word recognition and comprehension monitoring continue to be a challenge. The school assesses students in math using curriculum based assessments, NWEA MAP, and MCA assessments. The school learned, based on triangulating the data from these various sources that students struggle with basic facts and problem solving skills. The school continues to have a majority of the students start the year behind grade level in these skills.

## Systems, Strategies and Support Category

### Students

- *Describe the support offered to students during the 2014-2015 school year to meet the goals.*
  - *Include the process for assessing and evaluating student progress toward meeting state and local academic standards.*
  - *Include the process to disaggregate data by student group.*
  - *Include key indicators of progress to demonstrate evidence of implementation.*
  - *Include only the district focus areas for the 2014-2015 school year and limit response to 200 words.*



UA has a variety of structures for analyzing student data and developing interventions to help students meet grade level proficiency. The staff use weekly Professional Learning Communities (PLC) to disaggregate and analyze weekly student data by subgroups from performance on benchmark assessments based on the Minnesota Standards in Language Arts and Reading. Teachers in the PLCs examine student results and collaborate on developing strategies to help all students meet grade level proficiency. The Instructional Leadership Team/Q Comp Team meets weekly to review benchmark data and plan aligned professional development activities to support teachers in helping students that are not achieving their full potential. For reading, staff utilizes teaching methods defined by the National Reading Panel and Balanced Literacy strategies for teaching reading. The skills are implemented within a Balanced Literacy instructional approach within the Readers and Writers Workshop framework of instruction. Key elements of the framework include: Interactive Read Aloud, Modeled Shared Readings, Guided Reading, Phonics/Word Study, Rigorous Independent Reading, and Literature Circles. UA teachers have regularly taught and provide practice opportunities for students to use key reading strategies to improve comprehension. UA applies a wide range of reading interventions to ensure all students are reading at grade level by 3rd grade, and thereby meeting the standards for the World's Best Workforce. Reading interventions are built off of a variety of student achievement results. Teachers use the Fountas and Pinnell reading level assessment system to assess students reading level. Reading Corps staff tutors students one-on-one using research based specific interventions. This provides K-3 students additional practice to improve deficient skills such as letter sound and nonsense word fluency correspondence, phoneme blending, phoneme segmenting, word blending, repeated reading with comprehension, and oral reading fluency. The Title I program also has a specific focus on reading literacy. The Title I teacher works with one-on-one or small groups of students focusing on increasing the students reading skills. UA also uses two ESL teachers to improve the reading skills of ELL students. The ELL teachers will provide small group English and reading instruction for the ELL students on a daily basis during the literacy block to provide additional instruction in reading. In math, UA utilizes the Envisions mathematics curriculum, which aligns to the Minnesota Mathematics Standards. UA teachers analyze student MCA results from the previous year and MAP results to identify key concepts and skills that students need to master in order to become grade level proficient. Then they identify assessments that measure mastery of those benchmarks and identify curriculum resources that will help students understand the concepts and develop the skills that lead to mastery. This is commonly referred to as "backwards lesson design." The Envisions curriculum has the advantage of providing a more visual approach to helping students understand math concepts. UA teachers are also trained to implement the concrete-abstract-representational instructional design that

increases student engagement and conceptual understanding. UA utilizes a Title I mathematics teacher to provide additional classroom support to students slightly below grade level in mathematics. □

### Teachers and Principals

- Describe the support offered to teachers and principals during the 2014-2015 school year to meet the goals.
  - Include the system to review and evaluate the effectiveness of instruction and curriculum, including teacher and principal evaluations.
  - Include key indicators of progress to demonstrate evidence of implementation.
  - Include only the district focus areas for the 2014-2015 school year and limit response to 200 words.

The Instructional Leadership Team/Q-comp Team is tasked to support and evaluate teachers. They are expected to be coaches, models and support of staff, for individual growth as well as the team as a whole. The leaders are self-starters, and take initiative based on these expectations. The leaders help staff by building relationships between staff members and by generating by-in with staff on the school improvement process. The team meets weekly for 30 minutes to look at data from weekly assessments, examine trends, and identify professional development needs that will help students succeed. They also talk through feedback from teachers and Q Comp observations to identify effective teaching strategies that can be model during upcoming PLC. Additionally, the leadership team meets monthly for 60 minutes to review the overall School Improvement Plan and to review progress on team goals, stay focused on student learning, improve communication, and build capacity across staff. Teachers are evaluated to a new rubric based on teaching standards aligned to Urban Academy's SOAR system. \*(See below). Teachers are evaluated three times a year formally by two trained evaluators. As part of the Q Comp teacher incentive program, teachers need to reach or maintain a high standard for their teaching, need to reach student performance goals, and need to demonstrate overall professionalism. The Superintendent of Urban Academy, Dr. Mongsher Ly, has effectively managed the school operations since its inception and continually grows professionally by attending national and local conferences, networking with other school leaders, and maintaining a professional development plan reviewed by the school's board of directors.

SOAR Teacher Evaluation Rubric for:

\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

**Focused on: Classroom Management, SOAR (Standards, Objectives, Assessments, Responding) Planning, Objectives, Lesson Implementation, Analyzing Data and Troubleshooting, and Professionalism**

**Date: 2015-2016**

**Purpose/Rationale for using this Teacher Evaluation Rubric:**

By using this rubric, teachers will be able to focus on the most important teaching strategies within UA's SOAR focus this year resulting in students achieving maximum academic growth.

**Desired Outcome:** Students will achieve maximum academic growth.

**Levels of Teacher Proficiency**

- 4 *Exceeding*
- 3 *Meeting*
- 2 *Approaching*
- 1 *Beginning*

Core Component or Critical Feature	Contribution to the Desired Outcome	Indicators of Proficiency	Level and Evidence	Recommendation
Classroom Management	A positive classroom environment provides the foundation for students to be engaged in learning.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>Expectations of student behavior are clear and communicated effectively to students.</i></li> <li>2. <i>Procedures are taught, practiced, and learned by students.</i></li> <li>3. <i>Logical consequences are used to teach students how to make better choices.</i></li> <li>4. <i>Schoolwide PBIS procedures are followed for more serious behaviors.</i></li> <li>5. <i>The focus is on building student responsibility rather than student compliance.</i></li> </ol>		
SOAR Planning	The two week backwards plan provides a road map identifying the standards to be learned by the students and the assessment that will measure student mastery.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>SOAR plan includes state standards, benchmarks, and objectives for the next two weeks of instruction.</i></li> <li>2. <i>SOAR plan includes an assessment that will appropriately assess student mastery of unit objectives and standards.</i></li> </ol>		
Objectives	By selecting the “right”	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>Objectives are directly</i></li> </ol>		Click here to

	<p>content objective helps to clarify what students are to learn and master on a day-to-day basis. The language objective tells how the students will learn and/or demonstrate their mastery of the lesson by reading, speaking, writing, or listening.</p>	<p><i>related to state standard/ benchmark.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. <i>Objectives are written in student friendly language "I can..."</i></li> <li>3. <i>Objectives are clearly posted.</i></li> <li>4. <i>Appropriate Language Objective is included.</i></li> </ol>		<p>enter text.</p>
<p>Lesson Implementation</p>	<p>When essential elements of effective instruction are evident</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>Modeling aligns to objective.</i></li> <li>2. <i>Gradual release from teacher modeling to student practice and mastery of objective.</i></li> <li>3. <i>Students of all levels have opportunity to master the objective.</i></li> <li>4. <i>Learning activity includes high levels of student engagement.</i></li> <li>5. <i>Objective is referenced at the beginning, middle, and end of the lesson.</i></li> <li>6. <i>Assessment of objective provides teacher information on students' level of understanding and need for remediation.</i></li> <li>7. <i>Closure of lesson includes review of learning objective.</i></li> </ol>		
<p>Analyzing Data and Troubleshooting</p>	<p>Measuring the learning of students</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>Assessments identify the standards, benchmarks, and learning objectives.</i></li> <li>2. <i>Assessments provide measurable evidence of student mastery or lack of mastery of standards, benchmarks, and objectives.</i></li> <li>3. <i>Assessment trackers</i></li> </ol>		

		<p><i>are turned in on time and are being used to monitor student mastery.</i></p> <p><i>4. Teachers analyze assessment data individually and collaboratively for student strengths, weaknesses, and common misunderstandings requiring remediation.</i></p> <p><i>5. Ongoing data analysis informs SOAR unit planning.</i></p>		
Professionalism		<p><i>1. Teacher is present, punctual, organized, and actively involved in school functions.</i></p> <p><i>2. Teacher embraces feedback on instructional effectiveness.</i></p> <p><i>3. Teacher is coachable.</i></p> <p><i>4. Teacher collaborates to improve instruction and student achievement.</i></p> <p><i>5. Teacher builds strong relationships with students and parents.</i></p> <p><i>6. Teacher develops positive and constructive relationships with other staff members contributing to a positive and accountable school culture.</i></p>		