

2014-2015 World's Best Workforce Report Summary

District or Charter Name ISD 2198 Fillmore Central
Contact Person Name and Position Richard Keith, 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.

Stakeholder Engagement

Report

www.fillmorecentral.k12.mn.us

Annual Public Meeting

November 24, 2015

District Advisory Committee

The District Advisory Committee members for the 2014-2015 school year was comprised of 16 individuals – 12 of which are parents and community members. These parents represent students in all age categories and represent all demographic groups of our school district.

Alissa Stepflug, Parent
Angi Kaase, Community Ed. Director
Chris Mensink, Parent
Connie Berg, Parent
Dan Schoepski, Parent
Darla Ebner, Parent
Heath Olstad, Principal
Jason Sethre, Parent
Josh Krage, Parent
Mary Hershberger, Parent
Michelle Van Hee, Parent
Micki Breitsprecher, Director of Special Education
Richard Keith, Superintendent
Rick Prinsen, Parent

Shannon Love, Parent
 Tonya Keim, Parent

Goals and Results

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

	2014-2015 Goals	2014-2015 Goal Results
All Students Ready for Kindergarten	The percentage of students who are eligible to enter kindergarten in the fall of 2015 who are "Ready" according to School Readiness assessments (social and cognitive readiness) or on the Kindergarten Readiness Test (cognitive readiness) will be maintained at least 90% in 2015.	26/44 Scored Ready + 14/44 Scored Ready 4/44 Scored Marginally Ready 0/44 Scored Not Ready 91% Scored Ready or Higher (on target)
All Students in Third Grade Achieving Grade-Level Literacy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The percentage of 3rd grade students who score in Tier 1 or Tier 2 on the AIMSweb reading comprehension assessment will be maintained at 96% from the fall of 2014 to the spring of 2015. The percentage of 3rd grade students who score in Tier 1 or Tier 2 on the AIMSweb reading curriculum-based measurement (oral reading fluency) assessment will increase from 94% in the fall of 2014 to 96% in the spring of 2015. The percentage of 2nd grade students who score in Tier 1 or Tier 2 on the AIMSweb reading comprehension assessment will increase from 69% in the fall of 2014 to 80% in the spring of 2015. The percentage of 2nd grade students who score in Tier 1 or Tier 2 on the AIMSweb reading curriculum-based measurement (oral reading fluency) assessment will increase from 91.2% in the fall of 2014 to 95% in the spring of 2015. The percentage of 1st grade students who score in Tier 1 or Tier 2 on the AIMSweb phoneme segmentation fluency assessment will increase from 93% in the fall of 2014 to 95% in the spring of 2015. The percentage of 1st grade students who score in Tier 1 or Tier 2 on the AIMSweb nonsense word fluency assessment will 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 89% (slightly lower) 94% (on target) 95% (significantly higher) 91.1% (slightly lower) 96% (slightly higher) 82% (significantly lower)

	2014-2015 Goals	2014-2015 Goal Results
	<p>increase from 93% in the fall of 2014 to 95% in the spring of 2015.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The percentage of kindergarten students who score in Tier 1 or Tier 2 on the AIMSweb letter naming fluency assessment will increase from 92.6% in the fall of 2014 to 95% in the spring of 2015. The percentage of kindergarten students who score in Tier 1 or Tier 2 on the AIMSweb letter sound fluency assessment will increase from 92.5% in the fall of 2014 to 95% in the spring of 2015. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 86.1% (significantly lower) 93.1% (slightly lower)
<p>Close the Achievement Gap(s) Among All Groups</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reading Goals for Free and Reduced-price lunch students: District: The proficiency gap between the non-free and reduced price lunch (non-FRP) and the free and reduced price lunch (FRP) students enrolled the full academic year in grades 3-8 and 10 at Fillmore Central on all state reading accountability tests (MCA, MOD, MTAS) will decrease from 26.4% in 2014 to 20.0% in 2015 by increasing the proficiency rate of the groups as follows: a) non-FRP students from 68.5% in 2014 to 72.5% in 2015 and b) FRP students from 42.5% in 2014 to 52.5% in 2015. Elementary: The proficiency gap between the non-free and reduced price lunch (non-FRP) and the free and reduced price lunch (FRP) students enrolled the full academic year in grades 3-6 at Fillmore Central Elementary on all state reading accountability tests (MCA, MOD, MTAS) will decrease from 34.8% in 2014 to 27.0% in 2015 by increasing the proficiency rate of the groups as follows: a) non-FRP students from 77.9% in 2014 to 79.6% in 2015 and b) FRP students from 43.1% in 2014 to 52.6% in 2015. High School: The proficiency gap between the non-free and reduced price lunch (non-FRP) and the free and reduced price lunch (FRP) students enrolled the full academic year in grades 7, 8, 	<p>24.3% (slightly higher)</p> <p>a) 70.3%</p> <p>b) 46.0%</p> <p>27.1% (on target)</p> <p>a) 74.3%</p> <p>b) 47.2%</p> <p>19.6% (significantly higher)</p> <p>a) 64.2%</p> <p>b) 44.6%</p>

	2014-2015 Goals	2014-2015 Goal Results
	<p>and 10 at Fillmore Central High School on all state reading accountability tests (MCA, MOD, MTAS) will decrease from 17.6% in 2014 to 12.1% in 2015 by increasing the proficiency rate of the groups as follows:</p> <p>a) non-FRP students from 58.1% in 2014 to 64.6% in 2015 and</p> <p>b) FRP students from 40.5% in 2014 to 52.5% in 2015.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Math Goals for Free and reduced-price lunch students: <p>District: The proficiency gap between the non-free and reduced price lunch (non-FRP) and the free and reduced price lunch (FRP) students enrolled the full academic year in grades 3-8 and 11 at Fillmore Central on all state mathematics accountability tests (MCA, MOD, MTAS) will decrease from 21.0% in 2014 to 13.9% in 2015 by increasing the proficiency rate of the groups as follows:</p> <p>a) non-FRP students from 68.4% in 2014 to 69.8% in 2015 and</p> <p>b) FRP students from 47.4% in 2014 to 55.9% in 2015.</p> <p>Elementary: The proficiency gap between the non-free and reduced price lunch (non-FRP) and the free and reduced price lunch (FRP) students enrolled the full academic year in grades 3-6 at Fillmore Central Elementary on all state mathematics accountability tests (MCA, MOD, MTAS) will decrease from 26.9% in 2014 to 19.4% in 2015 by increasing the proficiency rate of the groups as follows:</p> <p>a) non-FRP students from 81.1% in 2014 to 81.4% in 2015 and</p> <p>b) FRP students from 54.2% in 2014 to 62.0% in 2015.</p> <p>High School: The proficiency gap between the non-free and reduced price lunch (non-FRP) and the free and reduced price lunch (FRP) students enrolled the full academic year in grades 7, 8, and 11 at Fillmore Central High School on all state mathematics accountability tests (MCA, MOD, MTAS) will decrease from 16.2% in 2014 to 11.3% in 2015 by increasing the proficiency rate of the groups as follows:</p>	<p>16.3% (slightly higher)</p> <p>a) 63.8%</p> <p>b) 47.5%</p> <p>20.1% (on target)</p> <p>a) 74.3%</p> <p>b) 54.2%</p> <p>11.6% (on target)</p> <p>a) 48.6%</p> <p>b) 37.0%</p>

	2014-2015 Goals	2014-2015 Goal Results
	<p>a) non-FRP students from 52.6% in 2014 to 55.7% in 2015 and b) FRP students from 36.4% in 2014 to 44.4% in 2015.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading Goals for Special Education students: <p>District: The proficiency gap between the non-special education (non-Sp Ed) and the special education (Sp Ed) students enrolled the full academic year in grades 3-8 and 10 at Fillmore Central on all state reading accountability tests (MCA, MOD, MTAS) will decrease from 40.8% in 2014 to 31.4% in 2015 by increasing the proficiency rate of the groups as follows: a) non-Sp Ed students from 61.6% in 2014 to 67.3% in 2015 and b) Sp Ed students from 20.8% in 2014 to 35.9% in 2015.</p> <p>Elementary: The proficiency gap between the non-special education (non-Sp Ed) and the special education (Sp Ed) students enrolled the full academic year in grades 6-6 at Fillmore Central Elementary on all state reading accountability tests (MCA, MOD, MTAS) will decrease from 34.8% in 2014 to 28.0% in 2015 by increasing the proficiency rate of the groups as follows: a) non-Sp Ed students from 65.6% in 2014 to 70.1% in 2015 and b) Sp Ed students from 30.8% in 2014 to 42.1% in 2015.</p> <p>High School: The proficiency gap between the non-special education (non-Sp Ed) and the special education (Sp Ed) students enrolled the full academic year in grades 7, 8, and 10 at Fillmore Central High School on all state reading accountability tests (MCA, MOD, MTAS) will decrease from 47.3% in 2014 to 34.9% in 2015 by increasing the proficiency rate of the groups as follows: a) non-Sp Ed students from 56.4% in 2014 to 63.7% in 2015 and b) Sp Ed students from 9.1% in 2014 to 28.8% in 2015.</p>	<p>24.6% (significantly lower)</p> <p>a) 62.5%</p> <p>b) 37.9%</p> <p>14.4% (significantly lower)</p> <p>a) 64.4%</p> <p>b) 50.0%</p> <p>33.1% (on target)</p> <p>a) 59.8%</p> <p>b) 26.7%</p>

	2014-2015 Goals	2014-2015 Goal Results
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Math Goals for Special Education students: District: The proficiency gap between the non-special education (non-Sp Ed) and the special education (Sp Ed) students enrolled the full academic year in grades 3-8 and 11 at Fillmore Central on all state mathematics accountability tests (MCA, MOD, MTAS) will decrease from 30.5% in 2014 to 26.4% in 2015 by increasing the proficiency rate of the groups as follows: a) non-Sp Ed students from 62.3% in 2014 to 66.3% in 2015 and b) Sp Ed students from 31.8% in 2014 to 39.9% in 2015. Elementary: The proficiency gap between the non-special education (non-Sp Ed) and the special education (Sp Ed) students enrolled the full academic year in grades 3-6 at Fillmore Central Elementary on all state mathematics accountability tests (MCA, MOD, MTAS) will be maintained at not more than 19.1% in 2015 while increasing the proficiency rate of the groups as follows: a) non-Sp Ed students from 70.8% in 2014 to 74.6% in 2015 and b) Sp Ed students from 53.8% in 2014 to 55.5% in 2015. High School: The proficiency gap between the non-special education (non-Sp Ed) and the special education (Sp Ed) students enrolled the full academic year in grades 7, 8, and 11 at Fillmore Central High School on all state mathematics accountability tests (MCA, MOD, MTAS) will decrease from 50.5% in 2014 to 37.9% in 2015 by increasing the proficiency rate of the groups as follows: a) non-Sp Ed students from 50.5% in 2014 to 54.5% in 2015 and b) Sp Ed students from 0% in 2014 to 16.6% in 2015. 	<p>30.5% (slightly higher)</p> <p>a) 60.1%</p> <p>b) 29.6%</p> <p>17.5% (slightly lower)</p> <p>a) 67.5%</p> <p>b) 50.0%</p> <p>40.9% (slightly lower)</p> <p>a) 48.6%</p> <p>b) 7.7%</p>
All Students Career- and College-Ready by Graduation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading Goals for All Students: District: The percentage of all students 	<p>60.5% (slightly lower)</p>

	2014-2015 Goals	2014-2015 Goal Results
	<p>enrolled October 1 in grades 3-8 and 10 at Fillmore Central who are proficient on all reading state accountability tests (MCA, MOD, MTAS) will increase from 58.6% in 2014 to 65.0% in 2015.</p> <p>Elementary: The percentage of all students enrolled October 1 in grades 3-6 at Fillmore Central Elementary who are proficient on all reading state accountability tests (MCA, MOD, MTAS) will increase from 63.4% in 2014 to 68.2% in 2015.</p> <p>High School: The percentage of all students enrolled October 1 in grades 7, 8, and 10 at Fillmore Central High School who are proficient on all reading state accountability tests (MCA, MOD, MTAS) will increase from 52.3% in 2014 to 61.0% in 2015.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Math Goals for All Students: <p>District: The percentage of all students enrolled October 1 in grades 3-8 and 11 at Fillmore Central who are proficient on all mathematics state accountability tests (MCA, MOD, MTAS) will increase from 59.9% in 2014 to 64.4% in 2015.</p> <p>Elementary: The percentage of all students enrolled October 1 in grades 3-6 at Fillmore Central Elementary who are proficient on all mathematics state accountability tests (MCA, MOD, MTAS) will increase from 68.9% in 2014 to 72.7% in 2015.</p> <p>High School: The percentage of all students enrolled October 1 in grades 7, 8, and 11 at Fillmore Central High School who are proficient on all mathematics state accountability tests (MCA, MOD, MTAS) will increase from 47.5% in 2014 to 52.2% in 2015.</p>	<p>63.4% (slightly lower)</p> <p>56.6% (slightly lower)</p> <p>57.7% (significantly lower)</p> <p>66.9% (significantly lower)</p> <p>44.1% (significantly lower)</p>

	2014-2015 Goals	2014-2015 Goal Results
All Students Graduate	The 4-year graduation rate will be maintained at approximately 94% in 2014.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 88.1% Graduated • 4.8% Continuing • 4.8% Dropped Out • 2.4% Unknown

Identified Needs Based on Data

Fillmore Central utilizes a variety of assessments and data sources to determine areas of need. The primary data sources reviewed in the fall of 2014 include preschool kindergarten readiness scores to determine the percentage of students socially and cognitively ready to start kindergarten. Reading scores from AIMSweb assessments were used to identify needs relating to 3rd grade literacy. Math and reading scores from the Minnesota Comprehensive Assessments were reviewed to identify needs for closing achievement gaps and preparing students to be college and career ready. Student graduation data is used to determine needs relating to our graduation rate. The primary areas of concern identified through these data sources were a continued focus on improving math and reading instruction.

Systems, Strategies and Support Category

Students

During the 2014-15 school year we offered support programs at every level of learning to assist students in our effort to meet our goals. At the pre-kindergarten level students and parents were offered ECFE, ECSE, preschool classes and Head Start. In the elementary we offered SRBI, RTI, Title I, special education, SAT, and homework help. In the high school we offered PBIS, special education, TNT, SADD, SAT and homework help.

Students are monitored throughout the school year with a variety of assessments to track progress towards goals. These assessments include classroom observations and assessments as well as formal assessments such as AIMSweb and DRA.

Our school is not very diverse culturally with nearly 100% of our students white. However, we do disaggregate our assessment data to study our achievement gaps within SES and special education statuses.

Having students kindergarten-ready continues to be a success. While our growth in reading and math achievement was relatively small, we feel we are making progress towards our goals. We will continue to provide staff with skills and resources necessary for continued growth in these areas.

Teachers and Principals

Our staff is on a three-year evaluation cycle that is focused on the Danielson model. Years 1 and 2 are formative in nature as we utilize informal observations, peer observations, and PLC groups to work on individual, building, and school-wide goals. Year 3 includes the same components of years 1 and 2 plus formal observations and a summative evaluation.

The staff had access to online professional learning modules to support their goals. We utilized the Infinetec and Educational Impact programs for trainings and professional development. Through these programs staff were able to personalize their learning opportunities to match both their individual needs as well as the needs of the district to address our WBWF goals.

District

A review and study of assessment data showed a need to focus on enhancing our math and reading instruction throughout the district. We attempted to accomplish this through supports for students and staff at all levels. Fillmore Central provided additional instructional support for students showing deficiencies in math and reading throughout the year with various educational programs. Staff had unlimited access to two online professional development programs – Educational Impact and Infinetec – that directly linked to their personal professional goals, the goals of their PLC groups, individual building goals, and district-wide WBWF goals.

Equitable Access to Excellent Teachers

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

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

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

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