Urban Academy Charter School
2022-2023

ANNUAL REPORT

Table of Contents for the Combined WBWF and Annual Report on Prior Year Progress

I. Introduction

School Information

Minnesota Charter School District #4088

Dr. Mongsher Ly, Superintendent 1668 Montreal Ave, St Paul, MN

55116 (651) 215-9419 Fax: (651)215-9571

Email: mly@urbanacademymn.org

History

Opened Fall, 2003

Grades Served

Pre-Kindergarten to 8th grade.

School Calendar/Hours of Operation

The school day at UA runs from 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, and Summer school was in session in June and July.

Programmatic Focus:

Multicultural, urban-based teaching, learner-centered.

Vision:

Inspiring, challenging, and enhancing every student's innate ability to succeed.

Mission:

Our mission is to work in partnership with urban parents to provide an opportunity for every child to meet or exceed their individual potential in basic academic and life skills by utilizing research-proven methods in a safe, structured, and respectful community.

Values:

Honesty, personal responsibility, self-discipline, cooperation and

respect for others.

Beliefs:

Urban Academy provides a quality education for urban students in grades Pre-K to 6. We believe that education plays a critical role in developing creative and responsible human beings. Children have an innate ability to learn. When nurtured and taught in an environment that respects their unique culture, abilities, resiliency, and effort, they awaken the desire to learn. Ready and willing to be taught, children grow and flourish as creative citizens, able to make their own distinctive contribution to society.

Urban Academy believes in a strong partnership with the student's home and community in which they reside. Every student is to be understood holistically, by understanding the student's academic abilities, social and personal life, which impacts their academics and behavior. Our Family Specialist is a resource to the parents by providing them resources that they need so that they can support their children at home.

Goal:

To create a school improvement process and plan that is collaborative, focuses on student learning, and is measured by multiple sources of data.

Authorizer Information

Novation Education Opportunities 3432 Denmark Ave, Ste 130

Eagan, MN 55123

612-889-2103

executive.director.neo@gmail.com

UA began its relationship with the new sponsor, Novation Education Opportunities (NEO), in the 2011- 2012 school year. The current contract is for 5 years running from 2019-2026. NEO ensures that UA is accountable and responsible in four key areas: (1) governance, (2) student and school performance, (3) operational performance, and (4) financial management. As part of NEO's oversight, NEO is contracted to attend at least two board meetings, review the annual report, review the school's report card, review the school's budget, and make at least two site visits.

Novation focuses on innovation and solutions for meeting student needs more effectively. The leaders of the innovative school models within NEO's portfolio designed the education programs specifically to meet the needs of students whose needs were not being met through existing alternatives. NEO works with schools to set high expectations and monitor and evaluate progress toward reaching them. NEO provides an ongoing, consistent, and robust evaluation in order to achieve significant and measurable student growth. NEO facilitates the connection of innovation and high-quality education by working with schools to identify best practices and share them not only with schools in the NEO portfolio but with all schools, to improve the opportunities that students have for success in meeting their hopes and dreams.

II. School Enrollment

UA actively recruited students from diverse communities as well as provided enrollment forms in multiple languages (English, Hmong, Karen, and Spanish). A limited amount of information is gathered on the forms as directed by law, including: the student's name, gender, grade (to determine if space is available), whether or not the student has a sibling enrolled at UA (applicants with enrolled siblings have higher priority), and the parent or guardian contact information.

UA's Policies and Procedures Handbook details admissions procedures. The Office/Enrollment manager manages enrollment applications, makes admission decisions, and notifies parents of admitted students. Per the Policies and Procedures Handbook, Urban Academy gives preference to and enrolls siblings of UA students and then new students on a first-come-first-served basis until space is filled. If the number of applicants exceeds the number of openings, admission is based on a lottery system. If parents or guardians contest the admissions policy, then the School Board reviews the matter and renders a decision.

Student Enrollment

Number of Students Enrolled	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022	2022-2023
Prekindergarten			28	55	44	37	32	33
Kindergarten	56	38	46	49	63	42	62	59
1st Grade	62	57	47	55	61	70	69	69
2nd Grade	47	66	62	50	68	72	64	68
3rd Grade	40	51	57	66	54	75	72	64
4th Grade	40	36	42	51	27	41	41	38
5th Grade	48	40	38	42	51	34	35	41
6th Grade	31	35	32	36	40	47	32	32

7th Grade						39	36	29
8th Grade							40	33
Total	**324**	**323**	**324**	**404**	**408**	**457**	**483**	**466**

Student Demographics (Grades preK-7 in FY2021)

Demographic Trends	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23
Total Enrollment	324	323	324	366	408	457	483	466
Male	141 (43.5%)[1]	153 (47.4%)	166 (51.2%)	163 (44.5%)	185 (45.3%)	210 (45.9%)	234 (48.45%)	235 (50.42%)
Female	183 (56.5%)	170 (52.6%)	189 (58.3%)	203 (55.5%)	223 (54.7%)	251 (54.9%)	249 (51.55%)	231 (49.57%)
Special Education	26 (8.0%)	31 (9.6%)	25 (7.7%)	37 (10.1%)	47 (11.5%)	51 (11.15%)	42 (8.70%)	54 (11.58%)
LEP	109 (33.6%)	143 (44.3%)	186 (57.4%)	172 (47.0%)	199 (48.8%)	194 (42.45%)	191 (39.54%)	179 (38.41%)

Demographic Trends	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23
African American	132 (40.7%)	100 (31.0%)	84 (25.9%)	82 (22.4%)	81 (19.9%)	66 (14.44%)	56 (11.59%)	68 (14.59%)
Latino/Hispanic	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (0.6%)	6 (1.6%)	7 (1.7%)	4 (.0087%)	3 (0.62%)	3 (0.0064%)
Asian/PI	185 (57.1%)	215 (66.6%)	262 (80.9%)	268 (73.2%)	312 (76.5%)	385 (84.2%)	415 (85.92%)	391 (83.9%)

American Indian	3 (0.9%)	3 (0.9%)	2 (0.6%)	3 (0.8%)	3 (0.7%)	3 (.0065%)	3 (0.62%)	3 (0.0064%)
White	4 (1.2%)	5 (1.5%)	5 (1.5%)	4 (1.1%)	1 (0.2%)	3 (.0065%)	1 (0.21%)	3 (0.0064%)
2 or more races	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (.8%)	4 (1.0%)	0 (0.0%)	5 (1.04%)	1 (0.00214%)
F/R Lunch[2]	322 (99.4%)		323 (100.0%) 408 (100.0%) (100%)				>=90%	466 (100%)

III. Student Attrition

Description	Number
Students who were in attendance on October 1, 2022	439
of those students remained until the end of the school year	409
Students who left the school after October 1, 2022	30
New students enrolled after October 1, 2022	13
Total students who were enrolled on June 1, 2023	437
Students who were enrolled on June 1, 2023 and re enrolled in September of 2023.	350

Student Attendance

FY 2015	FY	FY	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023

	2016	2017							
94.10%	94.10%	96.25%	96.20%	95.72%	96.71%	99.04%	98.73%	96.9%

IV. Governance and Management

The school is administered by Dr. Mongsher Ly, the Superintendent, who holds a K-12 Principal License and Minnesota Superintendents license #450140. The board meets the third Monday of each month. The Superintendent reports on the school's progress in terms of the governance plan, management plan, and operations plan to ensure the proper execution of each. The Superintendent is primarily responsible for the school's operation performance and is evaluated formally once per year by the board.

Board of Directors

Urban Academy has 8 Board Members with a Community Member Majority. There are 5 Community, 1 Parent and 2 Teacher Members. Board Elections are held in February.

Board Structure 2022-23 School Year

Name	Date Seated	Positions	Affiliation	Current Term Month/Year to Month/Year
Melissa Jensen	July 1, 2016	Chair	Community	07/2020- 06/2023
Fong Lor	July 1, 2016	Vice Chair	Community	07/2020- 06/2023
Chao Yang	July 1, 2018	Member	UA Teacher	07/2022- 06/2025
Dr. Tamara Mattison	July 1, 2016	Finance Chair	Community	07/2022- 06/2025
Caley Long	July 1, 2016	Secretary	Community	07/2020- 06/2023
Nancy Smith	July 1, 2016	Member	Community	07/2020- 06/2023
Yuyin Liao	July 1, 2017	Member	UA Teacher	07/2020 - 06/2023
Ronsoie Xiong	July 1, 2018	Member	UA Parent	07/2022- 06/2025
Dr. Mongsher Ly	1999	Ex-Officio	Superintendent	1999-Current
Ralph Elliott	2012	Advisory	Admin Academy	2012-Current

| Luis Brown-Pena | 2010 | Advisory | Community Professional | 2010-Current |

V. Training Board Members Attended

School Board Development Plan

The Urban Academy School Board conducts a self-evaluation annually to determine areas of growth. Each Board member is surveyed and results are analyzed to determine topics of interest and need that will help the Board to improve their knowledge and skills. The table below lists the annual training topics Board members received during FY23.

Ongoing/Annual Training – 2022-2023

Board Member Name	Date	Topic	Presenter or Trainer
Melissa Jensen	February 27. 2023	Using and Applying Standards for Being a Better Board	Rod Haenke
Fong Lor	February 27. 2023	Using and Applying Standards for Being a Better Board	Rod Haenke

Chao Yang	February 27. 2023	Using and Applying Standards for Being a Better Board	Rod Haenke
Dr. Tamara Mattison	February 27. 2023	Using and Applying Standards for Being a Better Board	Rod Haenke
Caley Long	February 27. 2023	Using and Applying Standards for Being a Better Board	Rod Haenke
Nancy Smith	February 27. 2023	Using and Applying Standards for Being a Better Board	Rod Haenke
Yuyin Liao	February 27. 2023	Using and Applying Standards for Being a Better Board	Rod Haenke

Ronsoie Xiong	February 27. 2023	Using and Applying Standards for Being a Better Board	Rod Haenke

VI. Professional Development Plan of Leadership

Dr. Ly has a K-12 Principal and Superintendent License and is not required to report on a Professional Development Plan. He was formally evaluated by the Board in April FY2023 and received positive praise and feedback for the work and leadership he has provided at Urban Academy.

VII. Staffing

UA served 466 students in 2022-2023. UA believes in refining its staff to find those who best fit UA's vision and mission. The classroom teacher to student ratio was 20:1. All UA classroom teachers are Highly Qualified Teachers as defined by MDE. We are proud to announce that 100% of our staff returned for FY24.

Staff Retention Rate:

	FY18-FY19	FY19-FY20	FY20-FY21	FY21-FY22	FY22-FY23
Number of Licensed Teachers	24	26	28	26	33
Licensed Teacher Retention Rate	83.30%	92.30%	82.14%	100%	100%
Number of Non-Teaching Staff	31	25	26	25	28
Non-Teaching Staff Retention	96.80%	96.00%	76.92%	96.0%	100%
All Staff Retention Rate	90.90%	94.10%	79.63%	98.0%	100%

2022-23 Licensed Teaching Staff

Last Name	First Name	File #	Assignment	Status*
Wade	Ashley	463107	PreK	R
Yang	Chao	392714	PreK	R
Marchand	Grace	1008992	Kindergarten	R
Mooney	Michelle	1008637	Kindergarten	R

Olson	Cathleen	337623	1st Grade	R
Hessler	Sarah	499985	1st Grade	R
Iverson	Sydney	1009610	2nd Grade	R
McCabe	Robert	454698	2nd Grade	R
Anderson	Katie	478239	3rd Grade	R
McCabe	Beth	511121	3rd Grade	R
Miller	Christine	1024173	4th Grade	R
Hughes	Jessica	493569	4th Grade	R
Vue	Mai Ger	1010985	5th Grade	R
Conrad	Cheryl	297941	5th Grade	R
Cavanaugh	Matt	491923	6th Grade	R
Ollie	Virginia	1026212	6th Grade	R
Stumpner	Jodi	485097	Middle School – Soc. St.	R
Mervin	Hannah	505197	Middles School – Science	R
Yang	Char	1011665	Middle School - Reading	R
Bader	Anna	419132	Middle School – Math	R
Burkhardt	Laura	375931	Art	R
Curran	Shannon	376988	EL	R
Westra	Sherri	449476	EL	R
Calton	Cherri	490673	EL	R
Jones	Andy	438525	Special Ed	R
Liao	Yuyin	423068	Special Ed	R
Heieie	Erik	349941	Phy Ed	R

Mastel	Randall	477187	Technology	R
Xiong	Ronsoie	484456	Technology Manager	R
Earle	Brooklyn	483267	Title I – Reading	R
Yang	Pakou	360268	Title I – Math	R

2022-23 Other Licensed (non-teaching) Staff

Last Name	First Name	File #	License and Assignment	Status*
Ly	Mongsher	450140	K-12 Principal/ Superintendent	R
Thompson	Joseph	395612	K-12 Principal	R
Lang	Harold	422103	Academic Lead	R

* R = Returning, NR = Not Returning

2022-23 Non-Teaching Staff

Last Name	First Name	File #	Assignment	Status*
James	Christina		Executive Assistance	R
Vang	Maui		Administrative Assistance	R
Elliott	Ralph		Family Specialist	R
Thay	Ku		Janitor	R

Last Name	First Name	File #	Assignment	Status*
Too	Kanyaw		Janitor	R
Lay	Khu		Cafeteria	R

Paw	Za Nin		Cafeteria	R
Ly-Vang	Lisa	486393	Paraprofessional/Sub Teacher	R
Xiong	Ronsoie	484456	Paraprofessional/Sub Teacher	R
Yang	Isique	1012381	Paraprofessional/Sub Teacher	R
Wa	Bae	1012382	Paraprofessional/Sub Teacher	R
Paw	Lah Ku		Prek Paraprofessional	R
Paw	Htoo Ray		Prek Paraprofessional	R
Ly	Chaochi		Special Ed Paraprofessional	R

Brown-Pena	Victoria		Special Ed Paraprofessional	R
Paw	Eh Mu		Special Ed Paraprofessional	R
Soe	Eh Doe		Special Ed Paraprofessional	R
Htoo	Ray Ya		Paraprofessional	R
Khaing	Phoo Pwet		Paraprofessional	R
Lay	Minn		Paraprofessional	R
Say	Lwai		Paraprofessional	R
Noi	Nay Nay		Paraprofessional	R

VIII. Finances
Key financial highlights for the 2022-2023 fiscal year includes the following:

- Total net position increased by $651,633 during fiscal year 2023, from $1,332,912 to $1,984,545.
- General Fund revenues were $7,767,522 as compared to $7,428,644 of expenditures, an excess of $338,878 before a $15,434 transfer out to the Food Service Fund.
- Total fund balance increased in fiscal year 2023 by $214,723 to a positive balance of $4,146,649. The increase in the fund balance was primarily driven by increase in enrollment and COVID-19 related intergovernmental revenues.
- The School continued its teacher compensation schedule to include Quality Compensation Programs and invest in quality teachers.

In regard to the 2022-2023 fiscal year audit:

- The School's auditors issued an unmodified opinion, otherwise known as a clean opinion, indicating that all amounts and disclosures are fairly presented, in all material respects, in the 2022-2023 financial statements.
- No deficiencies related to internal controls were noted during the audit.

Fund Balance History- General Fund

Year	Annual Dollar Amount	Annual Percentage
2014-2015	$1,048,778	30%
2015-2016	$1,038,539	27%
2016-2017	$1,195,928	31%
2017-2018	$1,397,316	32%
2018-2019	$1,413,338	30%
2019-2020	$2,099,599	39%
2020-2021	$2,882,762	49%
2021-2022	$3,823,203	59%
2022-2023	4,146,649	52%

State School Finance Award History

2015 Award for 2013-2014 Reporting	Received
2016 Award for 2014-2015 Reporting	Received
2017 Award for 2015-2016 Reporting	Received
2018 Award for 2016-2017 Reporting	Received
2019 Award for 2017-2018 Reporting	Received
2020 Award for 2018-2019 Reporting	Not Received: We met all criteria except for a clerical error on our auditor's part that resulted

	in a late submission of the audit, for which we received a written apology from the auditor
2021 Award for 2020-2021 Reporting	Received
2022 Award for 2021-2022 Reporting	Received
2023 Award for 2022-2023 Reporting	All compliance deadlines have been met for FY22-23 to receive the award.

Audit Finding History and Analysis

Year	Finding	Corrective Action
2016-2017	none	
2017-2018	none	
2018-2019	Collateral for Deposits	We worked with our bank to get appropriate collateral in place within one month of receiving the finding
2019-2020	none	
2020-2021	None	
2021-2022	None	
2022-2023	None	

The school earned all points available in the area of finance in the NEO Urban Performance Framework:

VII. School is Financially Solvent/Sustainable			
VII.A Finance Awards			
Performance Rating	Awards	Point Value	Points Earned

Exemplary	NEO Stewardship Award in Finance Recipient.	4	
Satisfactory	MDE Finance Award Recipient in FY 2024.	2	
Not Satisfactory	Not an MDE or NEO Finance Award Recipient.	0	4
Analysis	The school was an MDE Finance Award Recipient in FY23 for FY22 financial reporting and an FY23 NEO Stewardship Award recipient.		

VII.B Fund Balance

Performance Rating	Fund Balance	Point Value	Points Earned
Exemplary	Reserve is at least three months' expenditures (20%) as measured by end of year reserves.	10	
Satisfactory	Reserve is enough to cover one full payroll as measured by end of year reserves in FY 2023.	5	
Not Satisfactory	Reserve is less than one full payroll as measured by end of year reserves.	0	10

Results					
	Fund Balance	**Expenditures**	**SOD Calculation**		
	$3,823,203	$6,811,903	56.13%		

Analysis	The school has built a fund balance reserve of 56.13% in 2021-2022.

VII.C Financial Audit

Performance Rating	Financial Audit	Point Value	Points Earned
Exemplary	No findings cited in the audit.	4	
Satisfactory	No more than one finding (nonmaterial) cited in the audit in FY 2024.	2	
Not Satisfactory	More than one finding cited in the audit.	0	4
Analysis	The school had no material audit findings in 2021-2022.		

IX. Academic Performance

Urban Academy has been advancing its primary purpose to improve all student learning and achievement for many years now. This is demonstrated in the latest contract period by the following longitudinal student performance and growth as shown in the Performance Framework (Authorizer School Contract Goals) aligned

to the World's Best Workforce. UA earned a 5-year contract with NEO during its previous contract. 2022-2023 was the fourth year of the new contract.

The primary way Urban Academy monitors its academic performance is through the Novation Education Opportunities- Urban Academy Charter School Performance Framework. NEO schools must achieve at least a Satisfactory Rating (50% of points possible) in the Performance Framework overall and in each performance area (Academic, Climate, Compliance, Finance) to be automatically recommended for a three-year contract renewal. NEO schools must achieve at least an Exemplary Rating (70% of points possible) in the Performance Framework overall to be automatically recommended for a five-year contract renewal. Schools that earn less than 50% of the points possible overall or in any one area are a candidate for a nonrenewal in their final contract year or intervention in the other contract years. Urban Academy earned all points possible for being compliant with contract and statute.

Summary and Analysis				
Based on information available to date, Urban Academy Charter School has earned 75 points out of a total of 100 points possible, 75.00%.				
Based on information available to date, Urban Academy would be automatically recommended for a three-year or five-year contract renewal.				
Academic Performance Points Earned	31			
Academic Performance Total Points Possible	56			
Academic Performance Percent of Points Earned	55.36%			
Academic Performance Percent of Total Framework Points	56.00%			
Climate Performance Points Earned	6			
Climate Performance Total Points Possible	6			
Climate Performance Percent of Points Earned	100.00%			
Climate Performance Percent of Total Framework Points	6.00%			
Operations Performance Points Earned	20			
Operations Performance Total Points Possible	20			

Operations Performance Percent of Points Earned	100.00%		
Operations Performance Percent of Total Framework Points	20.00%		
Finance Performance Points Earned	18		
Finance Performance Total Points Possible	18		
Finance Performance Percent of Points Earned	100.00%		
Finance Performance Percent of Total Framework Points	18.00%		
Performance Framework Points Earned	75		
Performance Framework Total Points Possible	100		
Performance Framework Percent of Total Points	75.00%		

VI. School is Compliant with Contract and Statute			
VI.A Compliance			
Performance Rating	**Compliance**	**Point Value**	**Points Earned**
Exemplary	No infractions.	20	
Satisfactory	No more than three infractions AND any infraction is resolved by assigned deadline.	10	
Not Satisfactory	More than three infractions or infractions not resolved by assigned deadline.	0	20
Analysis	The school has no compliance infractions in FY23.		

Strong and Continuing Improvements in Academic Growth – NWEA Results

Most Urban Academy students start each year below their grade level academically. Urban teachers and staff inquire and look carefully to help these students learn well to meet and exceed their Growth Targets. Much of the impressive growth data in this NWEA Math section is the result of the many below-grade-level students who

learned well in the last year.

NWEA provides a measure that compares Urban's students' growth in Math to all similar students across the nation. Each student's growth result is compared to similar students by grade and situation. Then these students are ranked into percentiles. For a student in the 50th percentile half of the students being compared have better growth results and half have lower growth results. For a student in the 99th percentile 99% of the students being compared would have lower growth results. In NWEA Assessments having over 50% of students meeting Growth Targets means that a school is performing better than average nationally. It is particularly impressive given the UA's student population. When interpreting Reading results be aware that around 50% of the students are English Language learners. UA also does well when measuring "how much" students that meet growth targets are growing – many over 120% which provides evidence that students are "catching up."

IV. All Students are Ready for Career and College (as Measured by Growth)			
IV.A Meet or Exceed National Growth Norms- Students Below Grade Level Making High Growth			
Performance Rating	Growth on NWEA MAP- Math (Grades K-8)	Point Value	Points Earned
Exemplary	More than 60 percent of students below grade level will make their NWEA expected growth target.	4	
Satisfactory	50-60 percent of students below grade level will make their NWEA expected growth target.	2	
Not Satisfactory	Less than 50 percent of students below grade level make their NWEA expected growth target.	0	4

Results	Year	Students Below Grade Level Meeting or Exceeding NWEA MAP Growth Target	Total Students Below Grade Level Tested	Percent Below Grade Level Meeting or Exceeding NWEA MAP Growth Target	
	Baseline 2016-2018	192	309	62.14%	
	2018-2019	123	180	68.33%	
	2019-2020	N/A	N/A	N/A	
	2020-2021	N/A	N/A	N/A	
	2021-2022	133	189	70.37%	
	2022-2023	101	158	63.92%	

	2018-2023	357	527	67.74%	
Analysis	The 2019-2023 percent of students meeting or exceeding their NWEA MAP Math growth target is 67.74%.				

Performance Rating	**Growth on NWEA MAP- Reading (Grades K-8)**	**Point Value**	**Points Earned**
Exemplary	More than 60 percent of students below grade level will make their NWEA expected growth target.	4	
Satisfactory	50-60 percent of students below grade level will make their NWEA expected growth target.	2	
Not Satisfactory	Less than 50 percent of students below grade level make their NWEA expected growth target.	0	2

Results	**Year**	**Students Below Grade Level Meeting or Exceeding NWEA MAP Growth Target**	**Total Students Below Grade Level Tested**	**Percent Below Grade Level Meeting or Exceeding NWEA MAP Growth Target**	
	Baseline 2016-2018	168	308	54.55%	
	2018-2019	98	169	57.99%	
	2019-2020	N/A	N/A	N/A	
	2020-2021	N/A	N/A	N/A	
	2021-2022	94	186	50.54%	
	2022-2023	62	139	44.60%	
	2018-2023	254	494	51.42%	
Analysis	The 2019-2023 percent of students meeting or exceeding their NWEA MAP Reading growth target is 51.42%.				

Performance Rating	**Growth on NWEA MAP- Math (Grades K-8)**	**Point Value**	**Points Earned**
Exemplary	At least 50 percent of the students below grade level achieve their NWEA growth target AND the students below grade level who achieve their NWEA growth target achieve more than 150 percent of the NWEA target growth.	4	
Satisfactory	At least 50 percent of the students below grade level achieve their NWEA growth target AND the students below grade level who achieve their NWEA growth target achieve 120-150 percent of the NWEA target growth.	2	

Not Satisfactory	Less than 50 percent of the students below grade level achieve their NWEA expected growth target AND/OR the students below grade level who achieve their NWEA growth target achieve less than 120 percent of the NWEA target growth.			0	

Results	Year	Aggregate of Actual RIT Growth Points Made	Aggregate of Expected RIT Growth Points	Percent of Growth Made	Percent of Students Below Grade Level Who Made Expected Growth
	Baseline 2016-2018	4310	2816	153.05%	62.14%
	2018-2019	2759	1889	146.06%	68.33%
	2019-2020	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	2020-2021	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	2021-2022	1931	1305	147.97%	70.37%
	2022-2023	1794	1225	146.45%	63.92%
	2018-2023	6484	4419	146.73%	67.74%

Analysis	The 2019-2023 combined average growth for NWEA MAP Fall-Spring for math is 146.73% and the percent of students below grade level who made expected growth is 67.74%.

Performance Rating	Growth on NWEA MAP- Reading (Grades K-8)	Point Value	Points Earned
Exemplary	At least 50 percent of the students below grade level achieve their NWEA growth target AND the students below grade level who achieve their NWEA growth target achieve more than 150 percent of the NWEA target growth.	4	
Satisfactory	At least 50 percent of the students below grade level achieve their NWEA growth target AND the students below grade level who achieve their NWEA growth target achieve 120-150 percent of the NWEA target growth.	2	
Not Satisfactory	Less than 50 percent of the students below grade level achieve their NWEA expected growth target AND/OR the students below grade level who achieve their NWEA growth target achieve less than 120 percent of the NWEA target growth.	0	4

Results	Year	Aggregate of Actual RIT Growth Points Made	Aggregate of Expected RIT Growth Points	Percent of Growth Made	Percent of Students Below Grade Level Who Made Expected Growth
	Baseline 2016-2018	3482	2371	146.86%	54.55%
	2018-2019	1336	900	148.44%	57.99%
	2019-2020	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	2020-2021	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	2021-2022	1584	970	163.30%	50.54%
	2022-2023	1090	658	165.65%	44.60%
	2018-2023	4010	2528	158.62%	51.42%
Analysis	The 2019-2023 combined average growth for NWEA MAP Fall-Spring for math is 158.62% and the percent of students below grade level who made expected growth is 51.42%.				

IV.B Meet or Exceed National Growth Norms- Students at or Above Grade Level

Performance Rating	Growth on NWEA MAP- Math (Grades K-8)	Point Value	Points Earned
Exemplary	More than 60 percent of students at or above grade level will make the NWEA expected growth target.	4	
Satisfactory	50-60 percent of students at or above grade level will make the NWEA expected growth target.	2	
Not Satisfactory	Less than 50 percent of students at or above grade level will make the NWEA expected growth target.	0	2

Results	Year	Students At/Above Grade Level Meeting or Exceeding NWEA MAP Growth Target	Total Students At/Above Grade Level Tested	Percent At/Above Grade Level Meeting or Exceeding NWEA MAP Growth Target	
	Baseline 2016-2018	89	151	58.94%	
	2018-2019	48	77	62.34%	
	2019-2020	N/A	N/A	N/A	

	2020-2021	N/A	N/A	N/A	
	2021-2022	50	98	51.02%	
	2022-2023	62	97	63.92%	
	2018-2023	160	272	58.82%	
Analysis	The 2019-2023 percent of students meeting or exceeding their NWEA MAP Math growth target is 58.82%.				

Performance Rating	Growth on NWEA MAP- Reading (Grades K-8)	Point Value	Points Earned
Exemplary	More than 60 percent of students at or above grade level will make the NWEA expected growth target.	4	
Satisfactory	50-60 percent of students at or above grade level will make the NWEA expected growth target.	2	
Not Satisfactory	Less than 50 percent of students at or above grade level will make the NWEA expected growth target.	0	2

Results	Year	Students At/Above Grade Level Meeting or Exceeding NWEA MAP Growth Target	Total Students At/Above Grade Level Tested	Percent At/Above Grade Level Meeting or Exceeding NWEA MAP Growth Target	
	Baseline 2016-2018	86	153	56.21%	
	2018-2019	50	87	57.47%	
	2019-2020	N/A	N/A	N/A	
	2020-2021	N/A	N/A	N/A	
	2021-2022	56	103	54.37%	
	2022-2023	55	115	47.83%	
	2018-2023	161	305	52.79%	
Analysis	The 2019-2023 percent of students meeting or exceeding their NWEA MAP Reading growth target is 52.79%.				

MCA Results

In the Performance Framework, UA has several measures where the school hopes to increase proficiency rates and to compare favorably to similar students in St. Paul School District. Following are those results showing some mixed success.

II. All Students are Ready for Career and College, Including Third Grade Literacy (As Measured by Grade Level Proficiency)			
II.A Attain Grade-level Proficiency- All Students State Comparison			
Performance Rating	**MCA-Math (Grades 3-8)**	**Point Value**	**Points Earned**
Exemplary	The school's proficiency rate is greater than 10 percentage points above the state average.	2	
Satisfactory	The school's proficiency rate exceeds the state average by up to 10 percentage points AND/OR the school improves its proficiency rate by at least 10 percentage points from the baseline year.	1	
Not Satisfactory	The school's proficiency rate does not exceed the state average or improve by at least 10 percentage points.	0	0

Results	Year	Proficient Students	Total Students Tested	Urban Percent Proficient	State Percent Proficient
	Baseline 2015-2018	105	371	28.30%	62.93%
	2018-2019	42	144	29.17%	58.28%
	2019-2020	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	2020-2021	25	172	14.53%	44.20%
	2021-2022	29	211	13.74%	46.49%
	2022-2023	48	191	25.13%	47.27%
	2018-2023	119	546	21.79%	50.68%

Analysis	The school's combined proficiency rate of 21.79% is 28.89 percentage points lower than the state's combined proficiency rate of 50.68%.
	From the baseline years 2015-2019 rate of 28.30% the school's proficiency decreased to 25.13%, a decrease of 3.17 percentage points.

Performance Rating	**MCA- Reading (Grades 3-8)**	**Point Value**	**Points Earned**

Exemplary	The school's proficiency rate is greater than 10 percentage points above the state average.			2	
Satisfactory	The school's proficiency rate exceeds the state average by up to 10 percentage points AND/OR the school improves its proficiency rate by at least 10 percentage points from the baseline year.			1	
Not Satisfactory	The school's proficiency rate does not exceed the state average or improve by at least 10 percentage points.			0	0
Results	Year	Proficient Students	Total Students Tested	Urban Percent Proficient	State Percent Proficient
	Baseline 2015-2018	128	371	34.50%	62.04%
	2018-2019	48	143	33.57%	60.16%
	2019-2020	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	2020-2021	44	172	25.58%	52.50%
	2021-2022	61	211	28.91%	51.14%
	2022-2023	71	191	37.17%	50.17%
	2018-2023	180	545	33.03%	53.82%
Analysis	The school's combined proficiency rate of 33.03% is 20.80 percentage points lower than the state's combined proficiency rate of 53.82%.				
	From the baseline years 2015-2019 rate of 34.50% the school's proficiency increased to 37.17%, an increase of 2.67 percentage points.				

II.B Attain Grade-level Proficiency- All Students Resident District (St Paul) Comparison

Performance Rating	MCA-Math (Grades 3-8)			Point Value	Points Earned
Exemplary	The school's proficiency rate is greater than 10 percentage points above the resident district average.			2	
Satisfactory	The school's proficiency rate exceeds the resident district average by up to 10 percentage points.			1	
Not Satisfactory	The school's proficiency rate does not exceed the resident district average.			0	0
Results	Year	Proficient	Total Students	Urban Percent	St Paul Percent

		Students	Tested	Proficient	Proficient
	Baseline 2015-2018	105	371	28.30%	38.31%
	2018-2019	42	144	29.17%	34.41%
	2019-2020	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	2020-2021	25	172	14.53%	21.40%
	2021-2022	29	211	13.74%	26.26%
	2022-2023	48	191	25.13%	26.80%
	2018-2023	119	546	21.79%	29.16%
Analysis	The school's combined proficiency rate of 21.79% is 7.36 percentage points lower than the resident district's combined proficiency rate of 29.16%.				

Performance Rating	MCA- Reading (Grades 3-8)			Point Value	Points Earned
Exemplary	The school's proficiency rate is greater than 10 percentage points above the resident district average.			2	
Satisfactory	The school's proficiency rate exceeds the resident district average by up to 10 percentage points.			1	
Not Satisfactory	The school's proficiency rate does not exceed the resident district average.			0	0
Results	Year	Proficient Students	Total Students Tested	Urban Percent Proficient	St Paul Percent Proficient
	Baseline 2015-2018	128	371	34.50%	39.34%
	2018-2019	48	143	33.57%	39.38%
	2019-2020	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	2020-2021	44	172	25.58%	33.30%
	2021-2022	61	211	28.91%	34.22%
	2022-2023	71	191	37.17%	34.14%
	2018-2023	180	545	33.03%	35.91%
Analysis	The school's combined proficiency rate of 33.03% is 2.89 percentage points lower than the resident district's combined proficiency rate of 35.91%.				

III. All Racial and Economic Achievement Gaps Between Students are Closed (As Measured by Grade Level Focus Proficiency)			
III.A Attain Grade-level Proficiency- FRP Focus Group State Comparison			
Performance Rating	**MCA-Math (Grades 3-8)**	**Point Value**	**Points Earned**
Exemplary	The school's proficiency rate is greater than 10 percentage points above the state average.	2	
Satisfactory	The school's proficiency rate exceeds the state average by up to 10 percentage points AND/OR the school improves its proficiency rate by at least 10 percentage points from the baseline year.	1	
Not Satisfactory	The school's proficiency rate does not exceed the state average or improve by at least 10 percentage points.	0	0

Results	Year	Proficient Students	Total Students Tested	Urban Percent Proficient	State Percent Proficient
	Baseline 2015-2018	102	367	27.79%	43.10%
	2018-2019	42	144	29.17%	37.59%
	2019-2020	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	2020-2021	25	172	14.53%	22.70%
	2021-2022	29	211	13.74%	24.41%
	2022-2023	48	191	25.13%	28.23%
	2018-2023	119	546	21.79%	30.08%

Analysis	The school's combined proficiency rate of 21.79% is 8.28 percentage points lower than the state's combined proficiency rate of 30.08%.
	From the baseline years 2015-2019 rate of 27.79% the school's proficiency decreased to 25.13%, a decrease of 2.66 percentage points.

Performance Rating	**MCA- Reading (Grades 3-8)**	**Point Value**	**Points Earned**
Exemplary	The school's proficiency rate is greater than 10 percentage points above the state average.	2	

0

Satisfactory	The school's proficiency rate exceeds the state average by up to 10 percentage points AND/OR the school improves its proficiency rate by at least 10 percentage points from the baseline year.			1	
Not Satisfactory	The school's proficiency rate does not exceed the state average or improve by at least 10 percentage points.			0	
Results	**Year**	**Proficient Students**	**Total Students Tested**	**Urban Percent Proficient**	**State Percent Proficient**
	Baseline 2015-2018	124	367	33.79%	43.09%
	2018-2019	48	143	33.57%	41.13%
	2019-2020	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	2020-2021	44	172	25.58%	32.40%
	2021-2022	61	211	28.91%	31.27%
	2022-2023	71	191	37.17%	33.40%
	2018-2023	180	545	33.03%	35.27%
Analysis	The school's combined proficiency rate of 33.03% is 2.24 percentage points lower than the state's combined proficiency rate of 35.27%.				
	From the baseline years 2015-2019 rate of 33.79% the school's proficiency increased to 37.17%, an increase of 3.39 percentage points.				

III.B Attain Grade-level Proficiency- FRP Focus Group Resident District Comparison

Performance Rating	MCA-Math (Grades 3-8)			Point Value	Points Earned
Exemplary	The school's proficiency rate is greater than 10 percentage points above the resident district average.			2	
Satisfactory	The school's proficiency rate exceeds the resident district average by up to 10 percentage points.			1	
Not Satisfactory	The school's proficiency rate does not exceed the resident district average.			0	1
Results	**Year**	**Proficient Students**	**Total Students Tested**	**Urban Percent Proficient**	**St Paul Percent Proficient**
	Baseline	102	367	27.79%	26.25%

	Year	Proficient Students	Total Students Tested	Urban Percent Proficient	St Paul Percent Proficient
	2015-2018				
	2018-2019	42	144	29.17%	22.58%
	2019-2020	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	2020-2021	25	172	14.53%	9.70%
	2021-2022	29	211	13.74%	14.62%
	2022-2023	48	191	25.13%	15.92%
	2018-2023	119	546	21.79%	17.71%
Analysis	The school's combined proficiency rate of 21.79% is 4.09 percentage points higher than the resident district's combined proficiency rate of 17.71%.				

Performance Rating	MCA- Reading (Grades 3-8)		Point Value	Points Earned
Exemplary	The school's proficiency rate is greater than 10 percentage points above the resident district average.		**2**	
Satisfactory	The school's proficiency rate exceeds the resident district average by up to 10 percentage points.		**1**	
Not Satisfactory	The school's proficiency rate does not exceed the resident district average.		**0**	**1**

Results	Year	Proficient Students	Total Students Tested	Urban Percent Proficient	St Paul Percent Proficient
	Baseline 2015-2018	124	367	33.79%	26.77%
	2018-2019	48	143	33.57%	26.68%
	2019-2020	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	2020-2021	44	172	25.58%	20.30%
	2021-2022	61	211	28.91%	21.50%
	2022-2023	71	191	37.17%	21.92%
	2018-2023	180	545	33.03%	23.37%
Analysis	The school's combined proficiency rate of 33.03% is 9.66 percentage points higher than the resident district's combined proficiency rate of 23.37%.				

III.C Attain Grade-level Proficiency- EL Focus Group State Comparison

Performance Rating	MCA-Math (Grades 3-8)		Point Value	Points Earned

			Point Value	Points Earned
Exemplary	The school's proficiency rate is greater than 10 percentage points above the state average.		**2**	
Satisfactory	The school's proficiency rate exceeds the state average by up to 10 percentage points AND/OR the school improves its proficiency rate by at least 10 percentage points from the baseline year.		**1**	
Not Satisfactory	The school's proficiency rate does not exceed the state average or improve by at least 10 percentage points.		**0**	**1**

Results	**Year**	**Proficient Students**	**Total Students Tested**	**Urban Percent Proficient**	**State Percent Proficient**
	Baseline 2015-2018	39	183	21.31%	26.23%
	2018-2019	20	83	24.10%	21.84%
	2019-2020	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	2020-2021	9	110	8.18%	9.20%
	2021-2022	14	126	11.11%	13.19%
	2022-2023	19	112	16.96%	14.21%
	2018-2023	53	321	16.51%	16.41%

Analysis	The school's combined proficiency rate of 16.51% is 0.10 percentage points higher than the state's combined proficiency rate of 16.41%.
	From the baseline years 2015-2019 rate of 21.31% the school's proficiency decreased to 16.96%, a decrease of 4.35 percentage points.

Performance Rating	**MCA- Reading (Grades 3-8)**		**Point Value**	**Points Earned**
Exemplary	The school's proficiency rate is greater than 10 percentage points above the state average.		**2**	
Satisfactory	The school's proficiency rate exceeds the state average by up to 10 percentage points AND/OR the school improves its proficiency rate by at least 10 percentage points from the baseline year.		**1**	
Not Satisfactory	The school's proficiency rate does not exceed the state average or improve by at least 10 percentage points.		**0**	**1**

Results	Year	Proficient Students	Total Students Tested	Urban Percent Proficient	State Percent Proficient
	Baseline 2015-2018	45	183	24.59%	18.66%
	2018-2019	18	83	21.69%	16.47%
	2019-2020	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	2020-2021	15	110	13.64%	9.10%
	2021-2022	21	126	16.67%	12.17%
	2022-2023	31	112	27.68%	11.98%
	2018-2023	70	321	21.81%	13.54%
Analysis	The school's combined proficiency rate of 21.81% is 8.27 percentage points higher than the state's combined proficiency rate of 13.54%.				
	From the baseline years 2015-2019 rate of 24.59% the school's proficiency increased to 27.68%, an increase of 3.09 percentage points.				

III.D Attain Grade-level Proficiency- EL Focus Group Resident District Comparison

Performance Rating	MCA-Math (Grades 3-8)			Point Value	Points Earned
Exemplary	The school's proficiency rate is greater than 10 percentage points above the resident district average.			2	
Satisfactory	The school's proficiency rate exceeds the resident district average by up to 10 percentage points.			1	
Not Satisfactory	The school's proficiency rate does not exceed the resident district average.			0	1
Results	Year	Proficient Students	Total Students Tested	Urban Percent Proficient	St Paul Percent Proficient
	Baseline 2015-2018	39	183	21.31%	21.84%
	2018-2019	20	83	24.10%	17.94%
	2019-2020	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	2020-2021	9	110	8.18%	5.90%
	2021-2022	14	126	11.11%	11.15%
	2022-2023	19	112	16.96%	11.53%

	2018-2023	53	321	16.51%	13.54%
Analysis	The school's combined proficiency rate of 16.51% is 2.97 percentage points higher than the resident district's combined proficiency rate of 13.54%.				

Performance Rating	MCA- Reading (Grades 3-8)			Point Value	Points Earned
Exemplary	The school's proficiency rate is greater than 10 percentage points above the resident district average.			**2**	
Satisfactory	The school's proficiency rate exceeds the resident district average by up to 10 percentage points.			**1**	
Not Satisfactory	The school's proficiency rate does not exceed the resident district average.			**0**	**2**
Results	**Year**	**Proficient Students**	**Total Students Tested**	**Urban Percent Proficient**	**St Paul Percent Proficient**
	Baseline 2015-2018	45	183	24.59%	14.82%
	2018-2019	18	83	21.69%	13.95%
	2019-2020	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	2020-2021	15	110	13.64%	7.20%
	2021-2022	21	126	16.67%	9.78%
	2022-2023	31	112	27.68%	9.89%
	2018-2023	70	321	21.81%	11.21%
Analysis	The school's combined proficiency rate of 21.81% is 10.60 percentage points higher than the resident district's combined proficiency rate of 11.21%.				

Pre-Schoolers Continue to Shine to get Ready for School - FY2023 Results
Since the start of the Preschool program at Urban Academy, a high priority for these young learners is to be well prepared for kindergarten. A trend of success was started and continued.
Assessments show that over 90% of the Pre-Kindergarten students met their target.
Urban Academy's preschool academic performance exceeded the exemplary benchmark for Work Sampling System in Math and Reading.

I. All Children are Ready for School

I.A Early Literacy and Early Numeracy Goals			
Performance Rating	**Work Sampling System- Early Math Criteria (Grade Pre-K)**	**Point Value**	**Points Earned**
Exemplary	More than 75 percent of pre-kindergarten students meet or exceed the ready for kindergarten benchmark.	**4**	
Satisfactory	60-75 percent of pre-kindergarten students meet or exceed the ready for kindergarten benchmark.	**2**	
Not Satisfactory	Less than 60 percent of pre-kindergarten students meet or exceed the ready for kindergarten benchmark.	**0**	**4**

Results	**Year**	**Students Meeting or Exceeding Kindergarten Benchmark**	**Total Students Tested**	**Percent of Students Meeting or Exceeding Kindergarten Benchmark**	
	Baseline 2016-2018	16	20	80.00%	
	2018-2019	35	40	87.50%	
	2019-2020	35	39	89.74%	
	2020-2021	23	31	74.19%	
	2021-2022	28	32	87.50%	
	2022-2023	30	32	93.75%	
	2018-2023	151	174	86.78%	

Analysis	The 2019-2024 combined average Work Sampling System early math criteria rate is 86.78%.

Performance Rating	**Work Sampling System- Early Reading Criteria (Grade Pre-K)**	**Point Value**	**Points Earned**
Exemplary	More than 75 percent of pre-kindergarten students meet or exceed the ready for kindergarten benchmark.	**4**	
Satisfactory	60-75 percent of pre-kindergarten students meet or exceed the ready for kindergarten benchmark.	**2**	

4

	Not Satisfactory	Less than 60 percent of pre-kindergarten students meet or exceed the ready for kindergarten benchmark.			0	
Results		**Year**	**Students Meeting or Exceeding Kindergarten Benchmark**	**Total Students Tested**	**Percent of Students Meeting or Exceeding Kindergarten Benchmark**	
		Baseline 2016-2018	16	20	80.00%	
		2018-2019	36	40	90.00%	
		2019-2020	35	39	89.74%	
		2020-2021	25	31	80.65%	
		2021-2022	28	32	87.50%	
		2022-2023	32	32	100.00%	
		2018-2023	156	174	89.66%	
Analysis		The 2019-2024 combined average Work Sampling System early reading criteria rate is 89.66%.				

Other Assessment Results

Literacy Plan Results

Available data for this needs assessment include the Acadience Reading (Voyager Sopris Learning) screener.

Grade	Student Below Grade Level	Students At or Above Grade Level	Percent Proficient	Percent Meeting Targeted Growth Expectation
K	21	11	34%	21%
1	19	6	24%	25%
2	13	7	35%	53%
3	20	14	41%	61%

0 students were identified as having characteristics of dyslexia.

X. **Improvement Plans Leading to the World's Best Workforce**

Urban Academy employs various measures to determine school district progress in striving to create the world's best workforce; specifically progress towards these 4 WBWF goals and also includes clearly defined district and school site goals and benchmarks for instruction and student achievement for all student subgroups:

o closing the identified achievement gap(s) in the district
o all students ready for kindergarten
o all students in third grade achieving grade level literacy
o all students attaining career and college readiness before graduating from high school

Urban Performance Framework includes all of that.

In addition, our Title One Schoolwide Plan and Literacy Plan specifically includes measures that identified the school's 3 areas of greatest need:

1. In reading, our goal is to ensure students can functionally read by 3rd grade while also greatly expanding their vocabulary and developing an appreciation of literature while thinking critically about authentic text.
2. In math, our goal is to focus on the explicit teaching of domain specific vocabulary, examples and application to real-world problems, math vocabulary and number sense. Additionally, we want to support students in developing automaticity with math facts.
3. Overall, our goal is to utilize curriculum resources that engage students in activities that require more critical thinking, inquiry, questioning, and open ended tasks.

UA, as part of its ongoing school improvement process, examines multiple sources of data, curriculum, and assessment. Teachers, administrators, and support staff meet and analyze data from MCAs, NWEA, and the core curriculum. Following are the reading and math assessments used and when they are administered:

- Students are given bi-weekly assessments in reading to evaluate their progress in phonics, phonemic awareness, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension.
- Students will be assessed regularly in oral reading fluency within guided reading groups.
- Students identified to work with the MN Reading Corps will be given weekly assessments and graded on a grade level rubric to determine proficiency.
- Informal classroom reading assessments.
- Students are assessed using the Acadiency system and the NWEA MAP test 3 times per year.
- Diagnostics tests will also be given as needed.
- Students are assessed on math concepts and data analyzed on a consistent basis. The math coach will meet with individual teachers and teams to review the data and discuss plans,

strategies, and resources to improve student achievement.

- Weekly math fact fluency tests are administered
- Bi-weekly benchmark assessment results are analyzed at PLC meetings where teachers develop targeted interventions to help students that are not meeting grade level standards in reading and math. Teachers use this formative data to identify students who are not meeting a specific benchmark and collaboratively plan for remediation as well as identify those students who meet the grade level benchmark and need enrichment.

UA also has a system is in place to periodically review and evaluate the effectiveness of all instruction and curriculum, taking into account strategies and best practices, student outcomes, school principal evaluations and teacher evaluations by doing the following:

- The teacher evaluation rubric will be adjusted to focus on student engagement and output. Evaluators will use this rubric and/or checklist during formal and informal observations to ensure that teachers are implementing strategies that allow for ALL students to engage during the lesson.
- Strategies for engagement will be shared with staff during PLCs and workshop week and will be discussed with the evaluator after observations have occurred.
- Progress will be tracked on teacher evaluation rubrics. A teacher that does not meet the standard will be placed on an improvement plan.
- A reading team was organized to review the current curriculum and continues to meet and support the implementation of a new literacy block structure in order to better meet the needs of students.
- The math team meets, reviews data and identifies goals based on the most up to date current data. Current goals were developed and shared with the staff during August workshop to include:
  - Understanding why math fact fluency is vital to the success in the math classroom.
  - Using metacognition strategies, vocabulary, and number sense via Big5/Quest!
  - Understanding how and what number sense is.
  - Supporting the implementation of the school-wide math curriculum.

UA utilizes multiple strategies for improving instruction, curriculum, and student achievement. Our educational practices integrate high-quality instruction, rigorous curriculum, instructional technology, and a collaborative professional culture that develops and supports teacher quality, performance, and effectiveness. We are able to achieve this by implementing the following:

- On-going observations, modeling, coaching, and follow-up conversations will occur to include discussions on strategies and future planning.
- PLC presentations will be provided focused on current research, best practices, and how to effectively use the curriculum and resources.
- Monthly math professional development opportunities will begin during workshop week in August.
- Training for staff will be provided focused on best practices and strategies, to include training on using and analyzing data from formative assessments and

continuous progress monitoring.

- Bi-weekly PLC meetings will occur to include data analysis of benchmark assessments and on-going PD to address the needs of the students as identified in the analysis.

XI. Innovative Practices and Implementation

UA prides itself in being a model school in the implementation of innovative practices and core instructional, assessment, and professional development practices. Core components include backwards planning, formative assessments, and analyzing data in grade-level teams and PLCs. Following innovative practices are at the core of what we do at UA:

Data-Driven Instructional Practices

UA uses a variety of structures for analyzing student data and developing interventions to help students meet grade-level proficiency. Given what UA learns about student needs, decisions are always made in the best interests of the students. And given the small size of the school, there is little "red tape" hindering the process of adapting to student needs. Staff are trained using weekly Professional Learning Communities (PLC) to share effective teaching strategies based on the results of weekly student data from benchmark assessments in reading and math. Staff are trained to "backwards plan" to benchmark assessments to determine mastery of standards. Teachers also meet in grade-level teams to examine student results and collaborate on developing strategies to help all students meet grade-level proficiency. UA also has grade-level planning and data analysis meetings on a regular basis. In addition, there are weekly team meetings (comprised of: grade level teachers, ESL, Title 1-reading and math, special education, paraprofessional, and monitored by the instructional coach) to discuss the overall progress of students and the effectiveness of interventions.

In both reading and math, we have teachers look at individual scores in the various RIT ranges. They will look at where the students need to go and what skills they need to improve. They look at class breakdown reports from NWEA and differentiate their instruction based on the RIT bands on the continuum. Teachers develop lessons and assess students in those skill areas. Teachers backward plan and develop a common formative assessment with the goal of 80% of students using the strategy successfully.

Staff apply their "backwards planning" practice to develop weekly SOAR plans to make sure lesson plans are focused on the Standards. SOAR stands for –

Standards are the curriculum.

Objectives: Teachers need to focus on both content and language objectives. Objectives need to be clear and understandable by the students.

Assessments provide teachers with valuable information on student strengths and weaknesses.

Responding with interventions for students that need extra help based on data analysis and performance.

Urban Academy goes to great lengths to align their Title One plan, School Improvement Plan, Literacy Plan, and Q Comp plan so that resources are utilized wisely and efficiently to meet the needs of the students through consistent and focused interventions that intersect each of these plans.

Leadership Team
UA has an instructional leadership team to role model instructional practices and mentor other teachers in the building. The Leadership Team meets on a regular basis to review benchmark data and plan aligned professional development activities to support teachers in helping students that are not achieving their full potential. The Team also talks through feedback from teachers and Q Comp observations to identify effective teaching strategies that can be modeled during upcoming PLCs. Additionally, the leadership team meets 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 the staff.

Job embedded professional development, high-quality instructional practices, and data-driven decision making were adapted to the distance learning framework. The Instructional Coach provides individual coaching to teachers via email, telephone, and Google Hangouts. Dr. Mongsher Ly, Instructional Coach Harold Lang, and the Instructional Leadership Team met to review the overall Distant Learning Plan and to review progress.

Parent Collaboration

Parents are invited to collaborate in a variety of ways. First, parents are invited to Reading, Math, and MCA nights. The parents are notified through goal sheets at conferences two times a year. If parents cannot attend conferences, phone calls are made to make sure they are informed of their child's score. Phone logs are kept to ensure parents are being notified of their child's progress throughout the year.

Additionally, teachers are required to make at least 10 parent contacts each month. Newsletters from the school go out monthly, and some classroom teachers have class newsletters. We have a parent survey each year. Parents are also invited to volunteer in the classroom, additionally, we have family dinners throughout the year, where parents are invited to attend. Parents are invited to participate in school improvement planning efforts.

The parents are communicated about math and reading achievement at conferences two times a year. If parents cannot attend conferences, phone calls are made to make sure they are informed of their child's score. Phone logs are kept ensuring parents are being notified of their child's progress throughout the year. A letter is sent home each year with the MCA score listed on the paper. MAP test scores and reading levels are

included on report cards.

UA's Family Specialist is a resource to the parents by providing them with resources that they need so that they can support their children at home.

Urban Academy publishes an annual report and World's Best Workforce Summary Report that is published on the school's website. UA also has an annual meeting for the community where data and plans are shared. The Instructional Coach provides quarterly reports to the board sharing reading and other data on student performance. A letter is sent home each year with the MCA score listed on the paper. MAP test scores and reading levels are included on report cards. UA will send a notice home to parents that this plan is available on our website. UA will also provide a notice that hard copies may be obtained from the front office, if needed.

Job Imbedded Professional Development

UA staff participate in professional development in how to develop and analyze formative assessments, how to understand Minnesota State Standards and grade level proficiency benchmarks, how to track student progress, how to implement key components of Balanced Literacy and how to develop goal-oriented lessons in reading. The regular Professional Learning Community meetings and the follow up support from the instructional leaders provides job embedded professional development aimed at improving teacher understanding of the concepts that students need to master. Other professional development sessions are organized by the curriculum consultant and the instructional leaders in such areas as best practices in teaching, literacy, classroom management, etc. and these sessions are provided throughout the school year.

To ensure staff are actively engaged in improving their skills, each teacher has a Professional Development Plan (PDP) that clearly articulates skills they are working on. The PDP is organized around the teacher evaluation plan rubric; the principal will work with teachers to identify appropriate goals that are directly tied to the rubric areas.

There is one week of training in August for all instructional staff; there are also 7-8 additional all staff professional development days during the school year.

Teachers are trained on collecting, processing and analyzing student data (e.g. MAP/Descartes data, data from benchmark assessments) and using it to address individualized learning goals.

UA pays for other off-site workshops (including getting a sub) if staff can justify the workshop. The form to apply for such will include pre-approved areas of focus, e.g. classroom management, assessment, data-driven decision-making, literacy, math, and fit with Professional Development Plan. Off-site workshops are approved only if part of a teacher's PDP and if the training provided is expected to demonstrate a direct impact on UA's student achievement goals.

PLC meetings are held on Monday for 60 minutes. The PLC's sole purpose is for teachers to collaborate on essential outcomes and skills, particularly in reading; and identify how to help students who are behind. Grade-level teams of teachers, with their assigned paraprofessionals, analyze MAP data, and data from curriculum-based measures, and determine what instructional strategies are utilized to help students who lack key skills or concepts.

Grade-level team meetings are held weekly, including paraprofessionals and specialists as well as classroom teachers, and monitored by the principal. At these meetings staff analyze assessment data to identify interventions and inform differentiation of instruction to meet the needs of all students.

The Instructional Coach acts as the main trainer with consultants from outside brought in as needed.

UA utilizes an ESL instructor to train and support teachers to effectively meet the needs of ELL students. The ESL instructor works with and advises classroom teachers about how to adapt lessons to better serve English Language Learners students.

IDI Resources to Support Instructional Leadership

Instructional Designs, Inc. has a longstanding relationship with UA to support its instructional leadership structure by providing coaching, support, and tools to help with the following key "best practices" used at the school.

XII. Plans, Strategies and Practices for Improving Curriculum and Instruction and Cultural Competency

Improving curriculum and instruction while promoting cultural competancy requires thoughtful planning and strategic implementation. Urban Academy plans to utilize the following plans, strategies, and practices to achieve these goals:

1. Professional Development and PLC: Urban Academy already places a strong emphasis on PD and PLC. We will continue to support our teachers in developing effective teaching strategies and methods that best meet the needs of our diverse population. We will also provide cultural competency training to our teachers that support their own growth and development. Teachers will continue to meet bi-weekly in PLC meetings where they will analyze data, collaborate, and share best practices for improving student outcomes.
2. Curriculum: Urban Academy has adopted new curriculum for FY23. A district advisory committee composed of teachers, administrators, and community members was developed to research various curriculums. In choosing new curriculum, emphasis was placed on ensuring the curriculum

was reliable, trustworthy, and had valid evidence that demonstrated a record of success in increasing students' learning outcomes. It also had to include resources that provided materials and strategies for differentiating in order to meet the needs of individual students.

3. Student Engagement: UA teachers foster an inclusive environment where all students feel welcomed, safe, and valued. They develop strong teacher-student relationships, as well as student-student relationships. Teachers have adapted their teaching methods and strategies to include an environment where all students are actively participating and engaging with the curriculum and with each other throughout the day.

4. Coaching, Modeling, Evaluating: We implement mentoring and coaching programs to support teachers in developing cultural competencies and improving instruction. We also provide regular feedback to help teachers to continuously grow in their practice.

XIII. Efforts to Equitably Distribute Diverse, Effective, and In-field Teachers

Urban Academy has implemented comprehensive policies to ensure equitable education for both low-income students, students of color, and EL students. While the school aspires to align the teacher demographic with the student population, it recognizes the challenges in finding teachers of specific ethnic backgrounds. Regardless, the focus remains on hiring qualified, experienced teachers, prioritizing expertise over ethnicity. The recruitment process places a strong emphasis on hiring educators whose experience and values align with the school's mission and vision. Priority is given to teachers who have successful experience working with these groups of students. Additionally, a rigorous teacher evaluation process is in place to continually assess and improve instructional processes, ensuring the success of these students in achieving academic success.Our teacher evaluation is built upon three foundations: 1. Teacher improvement through coaching, evaluation, and feedback 2. Job embedded professional development 3. Student proficiency and growth. Urban Academy teachers are formally observed and evaluated 3 times each year. Any teacher identified as needing improvement will be placed on a Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP).

XIV. Future Plans

For FY24, Urban Academy will be adding 2 new positions to the school community: a School Principal and a Director of Academics. The School Principal will offer strong leadership and organizational guidance, foster a positive school culture, and guide the staff towards meeting the school's vision. The Director of Academics will focus on curriculum quality, teaching strategies, and professional development. This is a critical role in leading our school towards improved learning outcomes. The addition of these 2 roles at Urban Academy will have a positive impact on our community as they will help lead our staff into continuous improvement and academic success for all.

Additionally, new for FY 23 is the adoption of new curriculum and professional development. The new K-5 Science Curriculum for 2023 will be McGraw Hill Science.The new Social Studies curriculum for 2023 K-5 and 7-8 will be McGraw Hill. Grade 6 is using Northern Lights to adhere to new social studies standards that are coming. Fishtank is our new K-8 ELA program. Furthermore, all teachers will participate in LETRS training, which focuses on the deep understanding of the process and science behind teaching reading. The course teaches teachers "the how, what, and why of literacy acquisition". Thus far, 11 teachers have completed the training, and we have seen increased and improved reading scores as a result. We are hopeful that training all our teachers will have a positive impact on the reading development and comprehension of Urban students.