## 2018-19 Combined World's Best Workforce (WBWF) Summary

District or Charter Name: Spring Grove School District

Grades Served: K-12

WBWF Contact: Rachel Udstuen

Title: Superintendent

Phone: 507-498-3221

Email: Rachel.udstuen@springgrove.k12.mn.us

## World's Best Workforce

## Annual Report

Website link to District's World's Best Workforce Annual Report:
https://www.springgrove.k12.mn.us/page/3694

## Annual Public Meeting

The annual public meeting was held on November 18, 2019.

## District Advisory Committee

| District Advisory Committee Members | Role in District |
| :--- | :--- |
| Aaron Solum | School Board Chairman/Parent |
| Christian Myrah | School Board/Parent |
| Thomas Trehus | School Board/Community Member |
| Brad Hernandez | School Board/Parent |


| District Advisory Committee Members | Role in District |
| :--- | :--- |
| Stephanie Jaster | School Board/Parent |
| Jennifer Stender | School Board/Parent |
| Kelly Rohland | School Board/Parent |
| Gavin Thorson | Student/School Board Representative |
| Scott Solberg | Teacher/Counselor/Parent |
| Melissa Bratland | Teacher/Parent |
| Cindy Thorson | Administrative Assistant/Community Education <br> Coordinator |
| Kristine Jepsen | Parent/Community Member |
| Nancy Gulbranson | Principal |
| Rachel Udstuen | Superintendent/Parent |

## Equitable Access to Excellent and Diverse Educators

The Spring Grove School District is a small, rural school district with 360 students K - 12. 32.02\% of our students receive free/reduced-price meals, therefore we are considered neither a high- nor low-poverty district. We have one $\mathrm{K}-6$ school and one 7-12 school, so there is not a case of teachers being unevenly distributed across school sites within the District. The administrations reviews the following equitable access data shown below annually. Conversations about this data also include members of the teaching staff and school board.

|  | Educators at Spring <br> Grove School District | Educators in high- <br> poverty districts <br> statewide | Educators in low- <br> poverty districts <br> statewide |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percent of Educators <br> Experienced (more than 3 <br> years of teaching experience) | $77.14 \%$ | $79.08 \%$ | $88.22 \%$ |


|  | Courses at Spring <br> Grove School District | Courses in high- <br> poverty districts <br> statewide | Courses in low- <br> poverty districts <br> statewide |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percent taught by licensed <br> educators | $98.77 \%$ | $86.31 \%$ | $95.83 \%$ |


|  | Educators at Spring <br> Grove School District | Educators in high- <br> poverty districts <br> statewide | Educators in low- <br> poverty districts <br> statewide |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percent with advanced <br> degrees | $31.43 \%$ | $48.26 \%$ | $62.60 \%$ |

Examining the data for the 2018-19 school year, it is evident that we have a high level of experienced teachers, although our percentage is lower that the number of experienced educators in high-poverty and low-poverty districts. We have a higher level of courses taught by licensed educators than those in high-poverty and lowpoverty districts. We have a lower percentage of educators with advanced degrees. A root cause that we feel contributes to our percentages is that we are a small, rural district. It is not uncommon for districts like us to employee teachers who are new to the profession who have not yet had the opportunity to pursue advanced degrees.

To reduce the equitable access gap, we employ the follow strategies:

- Competitive hiring process - recruit, attract teachers to our district - teach lesson with students
- Developing relationships with preparation institutions
- Mentorship program for our new teachers
- Programs to develop and retain teachers - mentorship and coaching
- Professional development learning focused on diverse student groups, particularly poverty and mental health.
- Continuously improve local teacher development and evaluation (TDE) systems and Q Comp systems, including ensuring that no student is taught in two consecutive years by a teacher on an improvement plan under the TDE system


## Access to Diverse Teachers

Our District Race/Ethnicity is as follows:

| Race/Ethnicity | Staff <br> percent | Student <br> percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Hispanic or Latino | $0.00 \%$ | $1.12 \%$ |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| Asian | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| Black or African-American | $0.00 \%$ | $1.12 \%$ |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| White | $100.00 \%$ | $96.63 \%$ |
| Two or more races | $0.00 \%$ | $1.12 \%$ |
| Unknown race | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |

Racial or Ethnic student groups that are present in our district that are not yet presented in our licensed teaching staff include: Hispanic or Latino, Black or African-American, and two or more races. One staff member in any of these areas would represent $2 \%$ of our staff, and as a result would reflect our student population. Again, we believe a that being a small, rural district is a root cause contributing to a lack of student access to teachers of color. We have had staff members in the past who represent the diversity of our enrolled students. We advertise in multiple areas to reach a large audience of applicants.

## Local Reporting of Teacher Equitable Access to Excellent and Diverse Educators Data

Districts are required to publicly report data on an annual basis related to student equitable access to teachers, including data on access for low-income students, students of color, and American Indian students to experienced, in-field, and effective teachers and data on all student access to racially and ethnically diverse teachers.

For this 2018-19 WBWF summary report submission, please check the boxes to confirm that your district publicly reported this data.

X 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.

X District/charter publicly reports data on an annual basis related to student access to racially and ethnically diverse teachers.

## Goals and Results

## All Students Ready for School

| Goal | Result | Goal Status |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| The Spring Grove School District <br> will maintain or increase the <br> number of Pre-K children who <br> receive a "Transition to K" <br> assessment from 96.2\% in 2018 to <br> $96.2 \%$ or higher in 2019. | The Spring Grove School District <br> decreased the number of Pre-K <br> children who receive a "Transition <br> to K" assessment from 96.2\% in <br> 2018 to $86.1 \%$ in 2019. | Check one of the following: <br> On Track (multi-year goal) <br> - Not On Track (multi-year goal) |
| Goal Met (one-year goal) |  |  |

## Narrative is required; 200-word limit.

The Transition to K assessment is given in all preschool programs in our community. We want all students in our community to have equitable access to preschool regardless of financial ability to pay. The Transition to $K$ assessment allow us to track whether families in need have equitable access to preschool, as well as provides feedback to parents about their child's readiness for kindergarten.

Through our ECFE programming and Early Childhood Screening, we discuss preschool options, as well as options for scholarships with our families.

We had a number of students enroll in kindergarten the summer prior to kindergarten which impacted our number of students who received the "Transition to K" assessment. For the students who were in our district during the 2018-19 school year, we were able to identify any students, or student groups, who are not receiving preschool services.

## All Students in Third Grade Achieving Grade-Level Literacy

| Goal | Result | Goal Status |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The District 3-year trend for third grade students who are proficient on the MCA III Reading Assessment will increase from 74.1\% in 2018 to 76.1\% in 2019. | The District 3-year trend for third grade students who are proficient on the MCA III Reading Assessment decreased from 74.1\% in 2018 to 65.4\% in 2019. | Check one of the following: <br> _ On Track (multi-year goal) <br> _ Not On Track (multi-year goal) <br> _ Goal Met (one-year goal) <br> X Goal Not Met (one-year goal) <br> _ Met All (multiple goals) <br> _ _ Met Some (multiple goals) <br> _ Met None (multiple goals) <br> _ District/charter does not enroll students in grade 3 |

We are using the MCA III Reading Assessment to determine students' 3rd Grade-Level Literacy performance. Due to our small school size we need to look at a three-year trend to provide some stability to our goal setting. Despite this, we still find that our three-year trend still is affected by the student population taking the test. Three years ago, our District 3 -year trend was $47.8 \%$, so we are making improvements.

Strategies in place to support this goal area:

- Benchmark Literacy Curriculum is used universally grades K-6.
- Concentrated our efforts on improving our Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) in the last 2 years.
- Working with all stakeholders to identify, install, and implement fidelity measures aligned with the Reading Tiered Fidelity Instrument (R-TFI). Our baseline results in the elementary in the fall
of 2016-17 were $49 \%$ on the R-TFI. At the end of the 2017-18 school year our R-TFI was 84.2\%, and at the end of the current 2018-19 school year our elementary TFI was at 86.1\%.


## Close the Achievement Gap(s) Between Student Groups

| Goal |  |  | Result | Goal Status |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Check one of the following: |
| READING <br> Student Group | Percent Achieving in 2018 | Goal Percent Achieving in 2019 | Actual Percent Achieving in 2019 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { _ On Track (multi-year goal) } \\ & \text { _ Not On Track (multi-year } \end{aligned}$ |
| All Students | 72.5\% | 75.5\% | 69.4\% | goal) |
| White Students | 72.1\% | 75.2\% | 68.1\% |  |
| Special Education Students | 27.8\% | 30.8\% | 32.0\% | _ Goal Met (one-year goal) |
| Students Eligible for FRP Meals | 58.2\% | 61.2\% | 60.9\% |  |
| Non Special Education Students | 77.2\% | 80.2\% | 75.0\% | Goal Not Met (one-year |
| Students Not Eligible for FRP Meals | 78.4\% | 81.4\% | 73.6\% | goal) |
|  |  |  |  | _ Met All (multiple goals) |
| MATH <br> Student Group | Achieving in 2018 | Percent Achieving in 2019 | Achieving in 2019 | X Met Some (multiple goals) <br> Met None (multiple goals) |
| All Students | 55.8\% | 58.8\% | 45.0\% |  |
| White Students | 55.7\% | 58.7\% | 45.1\% |  |
| Special Education Students | 20.0\% | 23.0\% | 13.0\% |  |
| Students Eligible for FRP Meals | 33.3\% | 36.3\% | 33.3\% |  |
| Non Special Education Students | 60.0\% | 63.0\% | 49.4\% |  |
| Students Not Eligible for FRP Meals | 65.4\% | 68.4\% | 50.4\% |  |

We use the data from the MDE website for groups meeting proficiency target. The data is disaggregated into the following student groups in our district: white, free/reduced price lunch, non-free/reduced price lunch, special education, and non-special education. Proficiency, growth, and trend data is analyzed by our PLC's and MTSS team, and used to set specific learning goals for child, or cohorts of students. Our primary strategy to support this goal area is that we are becoming very focused on the interventions implemented in Tier 2 and Tier 3, through our MTSS framework.

Because many of our student groups are small, we see a lot of volatility with the data in this area. For the 201819 school year, our goal was to increase proficiency of all of our student groups by $3 \%$ across the board.
Unfortunately, of the 12 subgroups, we only made our goal in the area of Reading - Special Education Students. We saw a $2.7 \%$ increase in our Reading - Students Eligible for FRP Meals, however, we did not reach our goal of a $3 \%$.

## All Students Career- and College-Ready by Graduation

| Goal | Result | Goal Status |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Using the Redefining Ready criteria for Career Ready, the Spring Grove School District will increase the number of students who are "career ready" from 92.0\% in 2018 to 94.0\% in 2019. | Using the Redefining Ready criteria for Career Ready, the Spring Grove School District maintained the number of students who are "career ready" from $92.0 \%$ in 2018 to $92.0 \%$ in 2019. | Check one of the following: <br> _ On Track (multi-year goal) <br> _ Not On Track (multi-year goal) <br> _ _ Goal Met (one-year goal) <br> X Goal Not Met (one-year goal) <br> _ Met All (multiple goals) <br> _ Met Some (multiple goals) <br> _ Met None (multiple goals) |

The Spring Grove District uses the Redefining Ready National College and Career Indicators to identify needs for all students to be career-and-college-ready. We review 9-12 grade data annual to track student progress. We disaggregated the data by the following student groups - those who are identified as career ready and those who aren't.

Students who are identified as not being career or college ready have a meeting with the principal and school counselor. They look through the following criteria that identify them as being ready and discuss options to do so. The team decides, based on student input, what steps to take to ensure success in this goal area.

Redefining Ready National Career Indicators: Career Cluster Identified and two or more of the following benchmarks:

- 90\% Attendance
- 25 hours of Community Service
- Workplace Learning Experience
- Industry Credential
- Dual Credit Career Pathway Course
- Two or more organized Co-Curricular activities

Although we did not increase our high percentage, we were able to maintain it. We feel that we are making significant progress towards our goal which would be for $100 \%$ of our students to be Career Ready.

## All Students Graduate

| Goal | Result | Goal Status |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The Spring Grove School District will maintain a 2018 4-year target graduation rate of $100 \%$. | The Spring Grove School District will maintain a 2018 4-year target graduation rate of $100 \%$. | Check one of the following: $\qquad$ On Track (multi-year goal) $\qquad$ Not On Track (multi-year goal) <br> X Goal Met (one-year goal) $\qquad$ Goal Not Met (one-year goal) $\qquad$ Met All (multiple goals) $\qquad$ Met Some (multiple goals) $\qquad$ . Met None (multiple goals) <br> _ District/charter does not enroll students in grade 12 |

The "All Students Graduate" goal is an area of pride for our district. Our 4-Year and 5-Year Graduation Rates are100\%. Our 6-Year graduation rate is $92.31 \%$ and our 7 -Year Graduation rate is $95.65 \&$. All are well above the statewide goal that $90 \%$ of students graduate within four years with no student group below 85\% by the year 2020.

We believe this strong graduation rates are due to the strong relationships we are able to make with our students over time. Our small school size is a strong asset in this category.

