# Urban Academy Charter School 2021-2022 ANNUAL REPORT

# **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 7th 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.

#### **Board of Directors**

Urban Academy has 7 Board Members with a Community Member Majority. There are 4 Community, 2 Parent and 1 Teacher Members. Board Elections are held each year in February.

# **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.

# **Student Enrollment & Demographics**

# **Student Enrollment**

Number of Students Enrolled	2015- 2016	2016- 2017	2017- 2018	2018- 2019	2019- 2020	2020- 2021	2021- 2022
Prekindergarten			28	55	44	37	32
Kindergarten	56	38	46	49	63	42	62
1st Grade	62	57	47	55	61	70	69
2nd Grade	47	66	62	50	68	72	64
3rd Grade	40	51	57	66	54	75	72
4th Grade	40	36	42	51	27	41	41
5th Grade	48	40	38	42	51	34	35
6th Grade	31	35	32	36	40	47	32
7 <sup>th</sup> Grade						39	36
8 <sup>th</sup> Grade							40
Total	324	323	324	404	408	457	483

# **Student Demographics (Grades preK-7 in FY2021)**

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

Demographic Trends	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22
African American	132 (40.7%)	100 (31.0%)	84 (25.9%)	82 (22.4%)	81 (19.9%)	66 (14.44%)	56 (11.59%)
Latino/Hispanic	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (0.6%)	6 (1.6%)	7 (1.7%)	4 (.0087%)	3 (0.62%)
Asian/PI	185 (57.1%)	215 (66.6%)	262 (80.9%)	268 (73.2%)	312 (76.5%)	385 (84.2%)	415 (85.92%)
American Indian	3 (0.9%)	3 (0.9%)	2 (0.6%)	3 (0.8%)	3 (0.7%)	3 (.0065%)	3 (0.62%)
White	4 (1.2%)	5 (1.5%)	5 (1.5%)	4 (1.1%)	1 (0.2%)	3 (.0065%)	1 (0.21%)
2 or more races	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (.8%)	4 (1.0%)	0 (0.0%)	5 (1.04%)
F/R Lunch[2]	322 (99.4%)	323 (100.0%)	324 (100.0%)	366 (100.0%)	408 (100.0%)	457 (100%)	>=90%

#### **Enrollment Procedures**

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 Attrition and Attendance**

440 ...... students were in attendance on October 1, 2021

440...... of those students remained until the end of the school year

15..... students left the school after October 1, 2021

26...... New students enrolled after October 1.

468...... total students were enrolled on June 1, 2022.

**358**...... K-8 students that were enrolled on June 1, 2022, re enrolled in September of 2021.

#### **Student Attendance**

FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022
94.10%	94.10%	96.25%	96.20%	95.72%	96.71%	99.04%	98.73%

# **Educational Approach & Curriculum**

#### **UA's Best Practices**

UA's curriculum is rigorously aligned to the Minnesota Academic Standards. UA teachers map curriculum to standards using a pacing guide and analyze student MCA results from the previous year and MAP results to identify key concepts and skills that students need to master to become grade-level proficient. Then they identify assessments that measure mastery of those benchmarks and identify curriculum resources that will help students understand the concepts and develop the skills that lead to mastery. This is commonly referred to as "backwards lesson design." Teachers also utilize Bloom's Taxonomy and Depth of Knowledge (DOK) in their objectives, lesson planning, and instruction. each lesson will include a pathway for students to go up the ladder towards higher levels of thinking.

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.

**O**bjectives: 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 strength and weaknesses.

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

The SOAR Plans consist of:

- 2-week unit plans that include the content and language objectives for each lesson.
- 2. The assessment to be administered at the end of the unit.
- 3. The results of the assessments at the end of the unit.
- 4. Analysis and troubleshooting how to support students based on results.

#### RTI

Teachers meet weekly in teams to analyze assessment results and devise interventions for students not reaching grade level in reading and math. Teachers use the Fountas and Pinnell reading level assessment system to assess students' reading level. UA also uses internally developed or selected benchmark assessments directly aligned with Minnesota standards on a bi-weekly basis to determine grade level proficiency in reading. The students are also assessed in reading and math through the NWEA MAP assessment twice a year.

#### **Reading Corps**

When doing "in-person" learning, UA uses Reading Corps staff to tutor students with one-on-one research-based interventions. This provides K-3 students additional practice to improve deficient skills such as letter sound and nonsense word fluency correspondence, phoneme blending, phoneme segmenting, word blending, repeated reading with comprehension, and oral reading fluency. This strategy is most effective for those students who are closest to achieving grade-level reading standards and will improve their performance in a timely manner. UA plans to fully re-engage with Reading Corps

once school resumes to in-person learning.

#### Title One

The Title I program also has a specific focus on reading literacy. The Title I teacher works with one-on-one or small groups of students focusing on increasing the students' reading skills.

#### English Language Learners (ELL)

UA has a high percentage of students that are identified as English Language Learners. UA has two ESL teachers to support the language skills of ELL students. English Language Learners are identified at the beginning of each year by the MNLS Survey. Only a student whose parents have completed a Minnesota Language Survey (MNLS), participated in the grade-appropriate English language screening assessment, and has been identified as an English learner can be enrolled in an English language educational program.

#### Technology

UA continued investment in Chromebooks and continued the of online subscription programs and free resources to augment the curriculum and student experience. Online resources used include:

## **Subject Area Practices**

#### Math

In math, UA's Math Team analyzed the strengths and weaknesses of the Envisions curriculum and decided to implement a new program –

#### **Meaningful math instruction - Number Talks:**

 Number Talks are short 5-to 15-minute conversations about mathematical problems, the topic of which is selected by the teacher with the intention of helping students consolidate their understanding of mathematical concepts. This strategy can be implemented at the elementary or secondary level, and it is effective for all students, including those with learning disabilities (LDs).

#### Why we use it

- Students move away from memorization and toward mathematical reasoning.
- Students are not distracted or intimidated by raised hands.
- Students interact and learn from one another.
- Errors are treated as learning opportunities, which creates a safe environment for risk-taking.
- Each student has a chance to share their thought process and solve the problem.
- Students are exposed to multiple strategies to solve the problem.
- Feedback is immediate, either from the teacher or other students.

#### 10. Meaningful math instruction - Using Real Life Problems and Data:

#### Definition

• Using real life problems and data in math lessons is a way to help students attach

meaning to the math concepts. "Real world" is <u>the</u> most repeated phrase in the MN Math Standards.

#### Why we use it

• In math (and science) lessons, real life problems and data helps students understand the math concepts.

#### Reading/Literacy

In addition, the Reading Team, made up of several teachers representing different grade levels and the Title One Reading Teacher, The purpose of this team was to evaluate Urban Academy's current Literacy program (K-8) and use that evaluation to determine how to align and structure the program to meet the needs of all students. This year the new efforts include a "Structured Literacy" block and a Reading Specialist who models and coaches classroom teachers in implementing the literacy strategies.

UA's Reading Team examined other formative assessment data and concluded that two inhibitors to students attaining grade level proficiency in the earlier grades is a the lack of fundamental reading skills by some students (phonics and phonemic awareness). This is not uncommon for EL students. In addition, learning loss during the pandemic was likely significant for many students. The other challenge the data suggests is that UA needs to challenge our proficient learners to exceed proficiency. We feel we can do this by providing more focus on phonics and phonemic awareness at those grade levels.

This data analysis demonstrates that a majority of UA students are struggling to achieve grade level proficiency. To address this, UA is committed to refocus on key elements of instruction that should have the most impact on helping students both catch up and accelerate. The foundations of quality reading instruction are present and when implemented within a data driven approach, students that are not proficient can be targeted with interventions to help them achieve. It is clear that UA students must first achieve proficiency in what the Minnesota Academic Standards categorizes as Foundational Skills:

"Foundational Skills Benchmarks - The Foundational Skills Benchmarks are not an end in and of themselves; rather, they are necessary and important components of an effective, comprehensive reading program designed to develop proficient readers with the capacity to fluently read and comprehend texts across a range of types and disciplines."

UA also learned from the teacher evaluation data that it is important to continue to emphasize student activity and engagement. UA plans to modify the teacher observation rubric to focus more on student output rather than teacher input. PLCs will continue to be an opportunity to

share strategies for increasing student engagement and outcomes; and to monitor progress regularly.

The Leadership Team and Instructional Coach guided the teachers in a significant review of reading curriculum. Gaps were identified and new resources were acquired for the 2021-2022 school year. This includes a new set of Guided Reading Books from Scholastic and additional classroom library books that represent more diversity and cultural relevance. Several teachers and leaders are undergoing the "Letters" training through MDE to strengthen teacher capacity to teach phonics and phonemic awareness. New literacy blocks were designed for the various grade levels. Following is a breakdown of the **K-3** Structured Literacy Block:

## 20 min- Whole class phonemic awareness

40 min- Phonics lesson

### 30 min- Interactive read aloud/comprehension strategies

#### 40 min- Centers

10 min small group
10 min EL or decodables
10 Sentence Building/Mechanics
10 min handwriting-(explicit instruction first)

#### 10 min- Sight words

Following is a breakdown of the **4-5 Literacy Block.** 

#### 15-30 mins- Mini lesson

(daily objective, mentor text, and spelling lesson for whole group)

**1 hour- Rotation-** small group/readworks/IXL/Free read/ Myon/ Word Work 15 mins-pre guided reading groups/4 groups daily

#### 30 mins- Writing/hand writing

Following is a breakdown of the **6-8** Structured Language Arts:

- Due to the range of readers in Middle school, data on The Five Pillars of Reading still need to be looked at; however, it will be handled differently from K-5.
- There will be much less focus on Phonemic Awareness and Phonics. If needed, materials from the lower grades will be used. Ms. Earle will advise teachers and she will also pull some students for one-on-one intensive interventions.

- Language Arts teachers' primary focus will be on building specific literacy skills from the standards. In addition, there will be an expectation of reading across the curriculum. All teachers will be expected to focus on: a different theme each trimester; essential questions; building fluency; building vocabulary; and improving comprehension.
- Language Arts teachers will study a different novel each trimester and connect different texts to it; along with connecting to the theme and other subjects.
- Language Arts teachers will build vocabulary through:
  - Word lists (vocabulary/ spelling) including looking at roots, prefixes, and suffixes.
  - Content word lists.
  - Context Clues.
- Strategies for Comprehension and Meaning:
  - Activating prior knowledge.
  - o Predicting.
  - o Visualizing.
  - Identifying/Searching and selecting.
  - Inferring.
  - o Questioning.
  - Monitoring/Clarifying.
  - o Connecting.
  - o Evaluating.
- Materials and methods used:
  - o Small Groups.
  - o The Big Five- Graphic organizers.
  - Accountable Word Bubbles.
  - DOK Levels of Questioning.
  - Novels
  - Guided Reading Books
  - Newsela
  - Readworks
  - o MyOn
  - o Content Area Text
  - A to Z reading

# Proficiency is determined by the following process:

#### 1. Students are screened:

 All students are given the NWEA MAP assessment and RIT score levels that help identify students to receive more remediation and support.

- All K-3 students are assessed using Acadience Benchmarking system. Each level corresponds to a grade level and a month within that grade level. We know what grade level they are at and so can either recommend them for individual work with Paraprofessionals targeting specific skills, Title One services, or Child Find.
- All students will be assessed on oral reading fluency until they reach grade level fluency.
- 2. Students are flagged and prioritized to receive more remediation and support; and placed in appropriate programs.
- 3. As students make progress, they are removed from the special support programs.
  - Entrance and exit criteria for Title 1 are based on a combination of MAP, MCA, and classroom-based assessments. Teacher recommendation is also used. Classroom based assessments include bi-weekly Big 5 reading assessments, oral reading fluency assessments, weekly spelling tests, benchmark assessments, and running records.
  - Entrance and exit for MN Reading Corps is determined based on Reading Corps criteria. It most often includes exiting students who are students who are almost at grade level.
  - Entrance and exit for Special Education is determined by Special Education assessments, as well as parent and teacher recommendation.

## Following are the reading assessments used and when they are administered:

- Students will be given bi-weekly assessments designed to evaluate student progress in phonics/phonemic awareness, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension.
- Students will be assessed regularly in oral reading fluency within guided reading groups.
- Students are assessed using the Acadience system three times per year.
- 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.
- The students will also be assessed through the NWEA MAP tests three times a year
- Diagnostics tests will also be given as needed.

Bi-weekly benchmark assessment results are analyzed on a bi-weekly basis at PLC meetings where teachers develop targeted interventions to help students that are not meeting grade level proficiency in phonics/phonemic awareness, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension. 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's instructional coach and teachers all share best practices. Collaboration includes all instructional staff including paraprofessionals, Title I, ESL and Special Education.

Reading interventions are based on a variety of student data. Teachers use the Acadience reading level assessment system to assess students reading level. Students need to be at level 330 - 404 to be at grade level by end of the Grade 3. UA also uses internally developed or selected benchmark assessments directly aligned with Minnesota standards on a bi-weekly basis to determine grade level proficiency in reading. Students are given weekly oral reading fluency assessments. The students are assessed through MAP tests three times a year. The MN Reading Corps members give weekly assessments to students who qualify for the MRC program. Diagnostics tests are also given to check proficiency. The observation survey will be given to students below a reading level I. The students are assessed with the DSI spelling assessment and grouped according to their assessment score.

Middle School Science and Social Studies

#### 12. Science and Social Studies - Content area reading strategies:

#### Definition

 Content-area literacy might use variety of reading strategies such as monitoring comprehension, pre-reading, setting goals and a purpose for reading, activating prior knowledge, asking, and generating questions, making predictions, re-reading, summarizing, and making inferences. The Big 5 is another example.

#### Why we use it

- Content area literacy and strategies are imbedded in the Minnesota Standards in Science and Social Studies.
- 13. <u>Science and Social Studies Hands on/minds on (maximize student centered activity and minimize sitting and listening):</u>

#### Definition

• While doing hands-on activity, the learner is learning by doing but while minds-on learning, the learner is thinking about what she or he is learning and doing.

#### Why we use it

• The hands-on learning benefits that students experience in the classroom helps children of all ages retain knowledge and grow. This is where hands-on learning truly comes into play. One of the many great hands-on learning benefits is that hands-on learning helps to stimulate growth on both sides of the brain.

# 14. English Language Learners - EL Strategies:

Definition

Strategies that support the content learning of English Language Learners include:

- Using language objectives.
- Turn and Talks.
- Sentence Frames
- RISA Dialogues
- Co-teaching

# Why we use it

• Since we have such a large % of English Language Learners - we all need to consider ourselves ELL teachers.

#### 15. Other Methods - Gradual Release Method of Instruction:

Other Practices That Teachers Use to Engage Students: games, technology, art/creativity, music, etc...

#### Definition

- The Gradual Release Method of Instruction is a way to model thinking and conceptual development and allow for student practice and mastery
- UA teachers have the flexibility to use other methods of instruction that are effective and most importantly, require high levels of student engagement.

#### Why we use it

- While there is flexibility in how it is used, it can be an effective way to plan and deliver lessons that have a clear objective, aligned assessment, and an opportunity for differentiation.
- Teachers are encouraged to try out new methods and resources that will engage students and support their innate desire to learn.

# **Innovative Practices & 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 including 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 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.

**O**bjectives: 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 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 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; here 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 Design's, Inc. has a longstanding relationship with UA to support it's instructional leadership structure by providing coaching, support, and tools to help with the following key "best practices" used at the school.

# **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. 2021-2022 was the third year of the new contract.

The primary way Urban Academy monitors it's 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.

Based on information available to date, Urban Academy Charter School has earned 73 points out of a total of 100 points possible, 73.00%. Based on information available to date, Urban Academy would be automatically recommended for a three-year or five-year contract renewal.

Academic Academic Performance Academic Performance Academic Performance Performance Points Percent of Points Percent of Total Framework **Total Points Possible** Earned Earned Points Possible 29 56 51.79% 56.00% Climate Total Performance Climate Points **Climate Total Points** Earned Possible Climate Points Percent Points Possible Percent 6 6 100.00% 6.00% Operations Points Operations Total Points **Operations Points Operations Total Performance** Points Possible Percent Earned Possible Percent 20 20 100.00% 20.00% **Finance Total Points** Finance Point Finance Total Performance **Finance Points Percent** Points Possible Percent Earned Possible 100.00% 18 18 18.00%

Total Performance Points From Each Section	Total Possible Performance Points	Total Performance Points Percent
73	100	73.00%

# Strong and Continuing Improvements in Academic Growth – NWEA Results

Most of 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 50<sup>th</sup> percentile half of the students being compared have better growth results and half have lower growth results. For a student in the 99<sup>th</sup> 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 Student	ts are Ready for C	areer and College	(as Measured	by Growth)	
IV.A Meet or E	xceed National Gr	owth Norms- Stu	dents Below G	rade Level Making	High Growth
Performance Rating		A MAP- Math (Gra		Point Value	Points Earned
Exemplary		ent of students bel ir NWEA expected		4	
Satisfactory	make their NWEA	tudents below grade expected growth to	arget.	2	
Not Satisfactory		ent of students below WEA expected gro		0	4
Results		Students Below Grade Level Meeting or Exceeding	Total Students Below	Percent Below Grade Level Meeting or Exceeding	
	Year	NWEA MAP Growth Target	Grade Level Tested	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				
Analysis	2018-2023 The 2019-2023 pe MAP Math growth	256 ercent of students n target is 69.38%.	369 neeting or exce	69.38% eding their NWEA	
Performance Rating	Growth on NWE	A MAP- Reading (	Grades K-6)	Point Value	Points Earned

Exemplary		cent of students bel eir NWEA expected		4	
Satisfactory	50-60 percent of s	students below grad		2	
Not Satisfactory		ent of students below WEA expected gro		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				
Analysis	2018-2023	192	355	54.08%	
Analysis		ercent of students n wth target is 54.08°		eding their invvEA	
Performance		J			Points
Rating		A MAP- Math (Grad		Point Value	Earned
Exemplary	level achieve their students below gr	It of the students be NWEA growth targ ade level who achie get achieve at least et growth.	get AND the eve their	4	
Satisfactory	At least 50 percer level achieve their students below gr	nt of the students be NWEA growth targ ade level who achi get achieve 120-14	get AND the eve their	2	
Not Satisfactory	level achieve their AND/OR the stude achieve their NWE	ent of the students NWEA expected gents below grade le EA growth target ac of the NWEA target	growth target evel who chieve less	0	2
Results					Percent of Students
		Aggregate of Actual RIT	Aggregate of Expected	Downant of	Below Grade Level Who Made Expected
	Year	Growth Points Made	RIT Growth Points	Percent of Growth Made	Growth
	Baseline 2016-	Made	Points	Growth Made	Growth
	Baseline 2016- 2018	<b>Made</b> 4310	Points 2816	Growth Made 153.05%	<b>Growth</b> 62.14%

	2021-2022	1931	1305	147.97%	70.37%
	2022-2023				
	2018-2023	4690	3194	146.84%	69.38%
Analysis				MAP Fall-Spring fo	
7				vel who made expe	
Performance Rating		A MAP- Reading (		Point Value	Points Earned
Exemplary		t of the students be	•		
		· NWEA growth targ			
		ade level who achion get achieve at least			
	of the NWEA targe		. 150 percent	4	
Satisfactory		it of the students be	elow grade	-	
		NWEA growth targ			
		ade level who achie			
		get achieve 120-14	9 percent of		
Not	the NWEA target		holow grada	2	
Satisfactory		ent of the students NWEA expected of			
Cationactory		ents below grade le			
		EA growth target ac			
		of the NWEA target		0	4
Results					Percent of
					Students Below Grade
			_		
		Aggregate of	Δααreaste		l evel Who
		Aggregate of Actual RIT	Aggregate of Expected		Level Who Made
		Aggregate of Actual RIT Growth Points	Aggregate of Expected RIT Growth	Percent of	Made
	Year	Actual RIT	of Expected	Percent of Growth Made	
	Baseline 2016-	Actual RIT Growth Points Made	of Expected RIT Growth Points	Growth Made	Made Expected Growth
	Baseline 2016- 2018	Actual RIT Growth Points Made	of Expected RIT Growth Points	Growth Made 146.86%	Made Expected Growth 54.55%
	Baseline 2016- 2018 2018-2019	Actual RIT Growth Points Made 3482 1336	of Expected RIT Growth Points 2371 900	Growth Made	Made Expected Growth
	Baseline 2016- 2018 2018-2019 2019-2020	Actual RIT Growth Points Made 3482 1336 N/A	of Expected RIT Growth Points 2371 900 N/A	Growth Made 146.86% 148.44% N/A	Made Expected Growth 54.55% 57.99% N/A
	Baseline 2016- 2018 2018-2019	Actual RIT Growth Points Made 3482 1336	of Expected RIT Growth Points 2371 900	Growth Made 146.86% 148.44%	Made Expected Growth 54.55% 57.99%
	Baseline 2016- 2018 2018-2019 2019-2020	Actual RIT Growth Points Made 3482 1336 N/A	of Expected RIT Growth Points 2371 900 N/A	Growth Made 146.86% 148.44% N/A	Made Expected Growth 54.55% 57.99% N/A
	Baseline 2016- 2018 2018-2019 2019-2020 2020-2021	Actual RIT Growth Points Made  3482  1336  N/A  N/A	of Expected RIT Growth Points 2371 900 N/A N/A	146.86% 148.44% N/A N/A	Made Expected Growth  54.55%  57.99%  N/A  N/A
	Baseline 2016- 2018 2018-2019 2019-2020 2020-2021 <b>2021-2022</b> 2022-2023 2018-2023	Actual RIT Growth Points Made  3482  1336  N/A  N/A  1584	of Expected RIT Growth Points 2371 900 N/A N/A 970	Growth Made  146.86%  148.44%  N/A  N/A  163.30%	Made Expected Growth  54.55%  57.99%  N/A  N/A  50.54%
Analysis	Baseline 2016- 2018 2018-2019 2019-2020 2020-2021 <b>2021-2022</b> 2022-2023 2018-2023 The 2019-2023 co	Actual RIT Growth Points Made  3482 1336 N/A N/A 1584  2920 embined average gi	of Expected RIT Growth Points  2371 900 N/A N/A 970  1870 rowth for NWEA	146.86% 148.44% N/A N/A 163.30%	Made Expected Growth  54.55% 57.99% N/A N/A 50.54%  54.08% or math is
	Baseline 2016- 2018 2018-2019 2019-2020 2020-2021 <b>2021-2022</b> 2022-2023 2018-2023 The 2019-2023 co 156.15% and the	Actual RIT Growth Points Made  3482  1336  N/A  N/A  1584  2920  mbined average gropercent of students	of Expected RIT Growth Points  2371  900  N/A  N/A  970  1870  rowth for NWEA below grade le	146.86% 148.44% N/A N/A 163.30%  156.15% MAP Fall-Spring fovel who made expe	Made Expected Growth  54.55% 57.99% N/A N/A 50.54%  54.08% or math is
IV.B Meet or E	Baseline 2016- 2018 2018-2019 2019-2020 2020-2021 <b>2021-2022</b> 2022-2023 2018-2023 The 2019-2023 co 156.15% and the 50.54%.	Actual RIT Growth Points Made  3482  1336  N/A  N/A  1584  2920  mbined average gropercent of students	of Expected RIT Growth Points  2371  900  N/A  N/A  970  1870  rowth for NWEA below grade le	146.86% 148.44% N/A N/A 163.30%  156.15% MAP Fall-Spring fovel who made expe	Made Expected Growth  54.55% 57.99% N/A N/A 50.54%  54.08% or math is ected growth is
-	Baseline 2016- 2018 2018-2019 2019-2020 2020-2021 <b>2021-2022</b> 2022-2023 2018-2023 The 2019-2023 co 156.15% and the 50.54%.	Actual RIT Growth Points Made  3482  1336  N/A  N/A  1584  2920  mbined average gropercent of students	of Expected RIT Growth Points  2371  900  N/A  N/A  970  1870  rowth for NWEA below grade le	146.86% 148.44% N/A N/A 163.30%  156.15% MAP Fall-Spring fovel who made expe	Made Expected Growth  54.55% 57.99% N/A N/A 50.54%  54.08% or math is
IV.B Meet or E	Baseline 2016- 2018 2018-2019 2019-2020 2020-2021 2021-2022 2022-2023 2018-2023 The 2019-2023 co 156.15% and the 50.54%.  Exceed National Gr  Growth on NWEA	Actual RIT Growth Points Made  3482  1336  N/A  N/A  1584  2920  mbined average groercent of students  cowth Norms- Students  a MAP- Math (Gradent of students at compared to	of Expected RIT Growth Points  2371  900  N/A  N/A  970  1870  rowth for NWEA below grade le	Growth Made  146.86%  148.44%  N/A  N/A  163.30%  156.15%  MAP Fall-Spring fovel who made expenses  Ove Grade Level	Made Expected Growth  54.55% 57.99% N/A N/A 50.54%  54.08% or math is ected growth is
IV.B Meet or E Performance Rating	Baseline 2016- 2018 2018-2019 2019-2020 2020-2021 2021-2022 2022-2023 2018-2023 The 2019-2023 co 156.15% and the 50.54%. Exceed National Gr  More than 60 percentaged level will mass	Actual RIT Growth Points Made  3482  1336  N/A  N/A  1584  2920  mbined average groercent of students  cowth Norms- Students	of Expected RIT Growth Points  2371  900  N/A  N/A  970  1870  rowth for NWEA below grade le	Growth Made  146.86%  148.44%  N/A  N/A  163.30%  156.15%  MAP Fall-Spring fovel who made expense ove Grade Level  Point Value	Made Expected Growth  54.55% 57.99% N/A N/A 50.54%  54.08% or math is ected growth is
IV.B Meet or E Performance Rating Exemplary	Baseline 2016- 2018 2018-2019 2019-2020 2020-2021 2021-2022 2022-2023 2018-2023 The 2019-2023 co 156.15% and the 50.54%.  Exceed National Gr  More than 60 perograde level will matarget.	Actual RIT Growth Points Made  3482  1336  N/A  N/A  1584  2920  ombined average groercent of students  rowth Norms- Students each of students at calculate the NWEA expenses	of Expected RIT Growth Points  2371  900  N/A  N/A  970  1870  rowth for NWEA s below grade le	Growth Made  146.86%  148.44%  N/A  N/A  163.30%  156.15%  MAP Fall-Spring fovel who made expenses  Ove Grade Level	Made Expected Growth  54.55% 57.99% N/A N/A 50.54%  54.08% or math is ected growth is
IV.B Meet or E Performance Rating	Baseline 2016- 2018 2018-2019 2019-2020 2020-2021 2021-2022 2022-2023 2018-2023 The 2019-2023 co 156.15% and the 50.54%.  Exceed National Gr  More than 60 perograde level will matarget. 50-60 percent of se	Actual RIT Growth Points Made  3482  1336  N/A  N/A  1584  2920  mbined average groercent of students  cowth Norms- Students  a MAP- Math (Gradent of students at compared to	of Expected RIT Growth Points  2371  900  N/A  N/A  970  1870  rowth for NWEA below grade ledents at or About des K-6) or above ected growth e grade level	Growth Made  146.86%  148.44%  N/A  N/A  163.30%  156.15%  MAP Fall-Spring fovel who made expense ove Grade Level  Point Value	Made Expected Growth  54.55% 57.99% N/A N/A 50.54%  54.08% or math is ected growth is
IV.B Meet or E Performance Rating Exemplary Satisfactory Not	Baseline 2016- 2018 2018-2019 2019-2020 2020-2021 2021-2022 2022-2023 2018-2023 The 2019-2023 co 156.15% and the 50.54%. Exceed National Gr  Growth on NWEA More than 60 pero grade level will matarget. 50-60 percent of si	Actual RIT Growth Points Made  3482  1336  N/A  N/A  1584  2920  mbined average growth Norms- Students cent of students at or above the students a	of Expected RIT Growth Points  2371  900  N/A  N/A  970  1870  rowth for NWEA below grade led dents at or About the grade level the target. or above	Growth Made  146.86%  148.44%  N/A  N/A  163.30%  156.15%  MAP Fall-Spring fovel who made experience over Grade Level  Point Value	Made Expected Growth  54.55% 57.99% N/A N/A 50.54%  54.08% or math is ected growth is
IV.B Meet or E Performance Rating Exemplary Satisfactory	Baseline 2016- 2018 2018-2019 2019-2020 2020-2021 2021-2022 2022-2023 2018-2023 The 2019-2023 co 156.15% and the 50.54%. Exceed National Gr  Growth on NWEA More than 60 pero grade level will matarget. 50-60 percent of si	Actual RIT Growth Points Made  3482  1336  N/A  N/A  1584  2920  mbined average gropercent of students control Students control Students at contro	of Expected RIT Growth Points  2371  900  N/A  N/A  970  1870  rowth for NWEA below grade led dents at or About the grade level the target. or above	Growth Made  146.86%  148.44%  N/A  N/A  163.30%  156.15%  MAP Fall-Spring fovel who made experience over Grade Level  Point Value	Made Expected Growth  54.55% 57.99% N/A N/A 50.54%  54.08% or math is ected growth is

Results		Students At/Above Grade Level Meeting or Exceeding NWEA MAP	Total Students At/Above Grade Level	Percent At/Above Grade Level Meeting or Exceeding NWEA MAP	
	Year	Growth Target	Tested	Growth Target	
	Baseline 2016-	90	151	E0 040/	
	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			<b></b>	
Amalusaia	2018-2023	98	175	56.00%	
Analysis	MAP Math growth	ercent of students r	neeting or exce	eaing their NVVEA	
Performance	g. c				Points
Rating	Growth on NWE	A MAP- Reading (	Grades K-6)	Point Value	Earned
Exemplary	More than 60 perc	cent of students at	or above		
	•	ake the NWEA exp	ected growth		
Satisfactory	target.	students at or above	o grado lovol	4	
Satisfactory		EA expected growt		2	
Not		ent of students at o			
Satisfactory	•	ake the NWEA exp	ected growth		
	target.	<u> </u>	T	0	2
Results		Students At/Above		Percent At/Above	
		Grade Level Meeting or	Total Students	Grade Level Meeting or	
		Exceeding	At/Above	Exceeding	
		NWEA MAP	Grade Level	NWEA MAP	
	Year	Growth Target	Tested	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				
	2018-2023	106	190	55.79%	
Analysis		ercent of students r wth target is 55.79		eding their NWEA	

# **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.

	s are Ready for Ca el Proficiency)	reer and College,	Including Thir	d Grade Literacy (A	As Measured
	ide-level Proficien	cv- All Students S	tate Comparis	on	
Performance Rating	MCA-Math (Grad	es 3-6)	•	Point Value	Points Earned
Exemplary		ciency rate is great			
Satisfactory		above the state av ciency rate exceeds		2	
·	average by up to the school improve 10 percentage points.	10 percentage poin es its proficiency ra ints from the baseli	ts AND/OR te by at least ne year.	1	
Not		ciency rate does no			
Satisfactory	percentage points	mprove by at least	10	0	0
Results	percentage points	•	Total	U	State
rtodito	Year	Proficient Students	Students Tested	Urban Percent Proficient	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%	50.09%
	2022-2023				
	2018-2023	71	355	20.00%	54.18%
Analysis				34.18% lower than	the state's
				he school's proficie	ncy decreased
Performance Rating	MCA- Reading (G			Point Value	Points Earned
Exemplary		ciency rate is great			
Satisfactory		above the state av		2	
Satisfactory	average by up to the school improve	10 percentage poin es its proficiency ra ints from the baseli	ts AND/OR te by at least	1	
Not		ciency rate does no			
Satisfactory		mprove by at least	10		•
Results	percentage points		Total	0	0 State
Results	Year	Proficient Students	Students Tested	Urban Percent Proficient	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%	53.53%
	2022-2023				
	2018-2023	109	354	30.79%	56.84%

Analysis		bined proficiency rancy rate of 56.84%.		26.05% lower than	the state's
				he school's proficie	ncy decreased
	to 28.91%, a decr				
II.B Attain Gra	de-level Proficien	cy- All Students R	esident Distric	t (St Paul) Compai	rison
Performance					Points
Rating	MCA-Math (Grad			Point Value	Earned
Exemplary		ciency rate is greate above the resident			
	average.	above the resident	uistrict	2	
Satisfactory		ciency rate exceeds	the resident	_	
_		up to 10 percentag		1	
Not		ciency rate does no	t exceed the	0	0
Satisfactory Results	resident district av	rerage.	Total	0	0 St Paul
rtodato	Year	Proficient Students	Students Tested	Urban Percent Proficient	Percent 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%	29.21%
	2022-2023				
	2018-2023	71	355	20.00%	31.81%
Analysis		bined proficiency raid by proficiency rate of		11.81% lower than	the resident
D. (	district's combined	proficiency rate of	31.0176.		D. L.C.
Performance Rating	MCA- Reading (G	Frades 3-6)		Point Value	Points Earned
Exemplary		ciency rate is greate	er than 10	1 onit value	Larrica
	percentage points	above the resident			
Octions	average.		. O	2	
Satisfactory		ciency rate exceeds / up to 10 percentag		1	
Not		ciency rate does no		•	
	I THE SCHOOLS PION	diction rate accorne	t exceed the		
Satisfactory	resident district av	•		0	0
Satisfactory Results	•	verage.	Total		St Paul
	resident district av	verage.  Proficient	Total Students	Urban Percent	St Paul Percent
	•	verage.	Total		St Paul
	resident district av Year	verage.  Proficient	Total Students	Urban Percent	St Paul Percent
	resident district av  Year  Baseline 2015-	Proficient Students	Total Students Tested	Urban Percent Proficient	St Paul Percent Proficient
	Year Baseline 2015- 2018	Proficient Students	Total Students Tested	Urban Percent Proficient 34.50%	St Paul Percent Proficient 39.34%
	Year Baseline 2015- 2018 2018-2019	Proficient Students  128 48 N/A 44	Total Students Tested 371 143 N/A 172	Urban Percent Proficient 34.50% 33.57%	St Paul Percent Proficient 39.34% 39.38%
	Year Baseline 2015- 2018 2018-2019 2019-2020	Proficient Students  128 48 N/A	Total Students Tested 371 143 N/A	Urban Percent Proficient 34.50% 33.57% N/A	St Paul Percent Proficient 39.34% 39.38% N/A
	Year Baseline 2015- 2018 2018-2019 2019-2020 2020-2021	Proficient Students  128 48 N/A 44	Total Students Tested 371 143 N/A 172	Urban Percent Proficient 34.50% 33.57% N/A 25.58%	St Paul Percent Proficient 39.34% 39.38% N/A 33.30%
Results	Year Baseline 2015- 2018 2018-2019 2019-2020 2020-2021 2021-2022 2022-2023 2018-2023	Proficient Students  128 48 N/A 44 61	Total Students Tested  371  143  N/A  172  211	Urban Percent Proficient  34.50%  33.57%  N/A  25.58%  28.91%	St Paul Percent Proficient  39.34% 39.38% N/A 33.30% 35.14%
	Year Baseline 2015- 2018 2018-2019 2019-2020 2020-2021 2021-2022 2022-2023 2018-2023 The school's coml	Proficient Students  128 48 N/A 44 61	Total Students Tested  371 143 N/A 172 211  354 te of 30.79% is	Urban Percent Proficient  34.50%  33.57%  N/A  25.58%  28.91%	St Paul Percent Proficient  39.34% 39.38% N/A 33.30% 35.14%
Analysis  III. All Racial a	Year Baseline 2015- 2018 2018-2019 2019-2020 2020-2021 2021-2022 2022-2023 2018-2023 The school's combined	Proficient Students  128 48 N/A 44 61  109 bined proficiency rate of	Total Students Tested  371 143 N/A 172 211  354 te of 30.79% is 37.26%.	Urban Percent Proficient  34.50%  33.57%  N/A  25.58%  28.91%	St Paul Percent 970 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2

Performance					Points
Rating	MCA-Math (Grade	es 3-6)		Point Value	Earned
Exemplary	The school's profic	ciency rate is greate	er than 10		
		above the state av		2	
Satisfactory		ciency rate exceeds			
		10 percentage point es its proficiency ra			
		nts from the baselir		1	
Not		ciency rate does no		•	
Satisfactory		mprove by at least			
	percentage points			0	0
Results			Total		State
		Proficient	Students	Urban Percent	Percent
	Year	Students	Tested	Proficient	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%	27.13%
	2022-2023				
	2018-2023	71	355	20.00%	32.369
Analysis	The school's comb	oined proficiency ra	te of 20.00% is	12.36% lower than	the state's
		ncy rate of 32.36%.			
			ate of 27.79% t	he school's proficier	ncy decreased
	From the baseline to 13.74%, a decre		ate of 27.79% t	he school's proficier	ncy decreased
Performance	to 13.74%, a decre	ease of 14.05%.	ate of 27.79% t		Points
Rating	to 13.74%, a decre	ease of 14.05%. Grades 3-6)		he school's proficier  Point Value	
	MCA- Reading (G	ease of 14.05%.  Grades 3-6)  ciency rate is greate	er than 10	Point Value	Points
Rating Exemplary	MCA- Reading (G The school's profic percentage points	Grades 3-6) ciency rate is greate above the state av	er than 10 erage.		Points
Rating	MCA- Reading (G The school's profic percentage points The school's profic	Grades 3-6) ciency rate is greate above the state aviciency rate exceeds	er than 10 erage. s the state	Point Value	Points
Rating Exemplary	MCA- Reading (C) The school's profit percentage points The school's profit average by up to 2	ciency rate is greate above the state avoiency rate exceeds 10 percentage point	er than 10 erage. s the state ts AND/OR	Point Value	Points
Rating Exemplary	MCA- Reading (G The school's profice percentage points The school's profice average by up to a the school improve	Grades 3-6) ciency rate is greate above the state avoiency rate exceeds 10 percentage pointes its proficiency ra	er than 10 erage. s the state ts AND/OR te by at least	Point Value	Points
Rating Exemplary	MCA- Reading (G The school's profice percentage points The school's profice average by up to a the school improved 10 percentage points	Grades 3-6) Ciency rate is greate above the state aveciency rate exceeds 10 percentage pointies its proficiency rants from the baseling	er than 10 erage. s the state ts AND/OR te by at least ne year.	Point Value 2	Points
Rating Exemplary Satisfactory	MCA- Reading (G The school's profice percentage points The school's profice average by up to a the school improved 10 percentage points The school's profice	Grades 3-6) ciency rate is greate above the state avoiency rate exceeds 10 percentage pointes its proficiency ra	er than 10 erage. s the state ts AND/OR te by at least ne year. tt exceed the	Point Value 2	Points
Satisfactory  Not Satisfactory	MCA- Reading (G The school's profice percentage points The school's profice average by up to a the school improved 10 percentage points The school's profice	ciency rate exceeds 10 percentage point es its proficiency ra nts from the baselir ciency rate does no mprove by at least	er than 10 erage. s the state ts AND/OR te by at least ne year. it exceed the	Point Value 2	Points Earned
Rating Exemplary Satisfactory Not	MCA- Reading (G The school's profice percentage points The school's profice average by up to a the school improved 10 percentage points The school's profice state average or in	ciency rate is greate above the state avoiency rate exceeds 10 percentage pointies its proficiency rate from the baselinciency rate does not approve by at least 10.	er than 10 erage. s the state ts AND/OR te by at least ne year. tt exceed the 10  Total	Point Value  2  1	Points Earned  0 State
Satisfactory  Not Satisfactory	MCA- Reading (G The school's profice percentage points The school's profice average by up to a the school improved 10 percentage points The school's profice state average or in percentage points	ciency rate is greate above the state avoiency rate exceeds 10 percentage pointies its proficiency rate from the baselinciency rate does not prove by at least of the proficient.	er than 10 erage. s the state ts AND/OR te by at least ne year. it exceed the 10  Total Students	Point Value  2  1  0  Urban Percent	Points Earned  0 State Percent
Satisfactory  Not Satisfactory	MCA- Reading (G The school's profice percentage points The school's profice average by up to a the school improved 10 percentage points The school's profice state average or in percentage points	ciency rate is greate above the state avoiency rate exceeds 10 percentage pointies its proficiency rate from the baselinciency rate does not approve by at least 10.	er than 10 erage. s the state ts AND/OR te by at least ne year. tt exceed the 10  Total	Point Value  2  1	Points Earned  0 State
Satisfactory  Not Satisfactory	MCA- Reading (G) The school's profice percentage points The school's profice average by up to a the school improved 10 percentage points The school's profice state average or in percentage points  Year  Baseline 2015-	ciency rate is greate above the state avoiency rate exceeds 10 percentage point es its proficiency rate to be selir ciency rate does not mprove by at least of the students	er than 10 erage. Is the state ts AND/OR te by at least ne year. It exceed the 10  Total Students Tested	Point Value  2  1  0  Urban Percent Proficient	Points Earned  0 State Percent Proficient
Satisfactory  Not Satisfactory	MCA- Reading (G The school's profice percentage points The school's profice average by up to a the school improved 10 percentage points The school's profice state average or in percentage points  Year  Baseline 2015- 2018	ciency rate is greated above the state avociency rate exceeds 10 percentage pointies its proficiency rate to be set its proficiency rate does not morove by at least of the students.  Proficient Students	er than 10 erage. Is the state ts AND/OR te by at least ne year. It exceed the 10  Total Students Tested	Point Value  2  1  0 Urban Percent Proficient  33.79%	Points Earned  0 State Percent Proficient  43.099
Satisfactory  Not Satisfactory	MCA- Reading (G) The school's profice percentage points The school's profice average by up to a the school improved 10 percentage points The school's profice state average or in percentage points  Year  Baseline 2015-2018 2018-2019	ciency rate is greate above the state avoiency rate exceeds 10 percentage point es its proficiency rate to be selir ciency rate does not mprove by at least of the students.	er than 10 erage. Is the state ts AND/OR te by at least ne year. It exceed the 10  Total Students Tested  367 143	Point Value  2  1  0 Urban Percent Proficient  33.79% 33.57%	Points Earned  0 State Percent Proficient  43.099 41.139
Satisfactory  Not Satisfactory	MCA- Reading (G The school's profice percentage points The school's profice average by up to a the school improved 10 percentage points The school's profice state average or in percentage points  Year Baseline 2015-2018 2018-2019 2019-2020	ciency rate is greate above the state avociency rate exceeds 10 percentage point es its proficiency rate from the baselinciency rate does nonprove by at least of the students  Proficient Students  124 48 N/A	er than 10 erage. Is the state ts AND/OR te by at least ne year. It exceed the 10  Total Students Tested  367 143 N/A	Point Value  2  1  0 Urban Percent Proficient  33.79% 33.57% N/A	Points Earned  0 State Percent Proficient  43.09% 41.13%
Exemplary  Satisfactory  Not Satisfactory	MCA- Reading (G The school's profice percentage points The school's profice average by up to a the school improved 10 percentage points The school's profice state average or in percentage points Year  Baseline 2015- 2018 2018-2019 2019-2020	ciency rate is greated above the state avociency rate exceeds 10 percentage point es its proficiency rate to be set its proficiency rate of the baseling ciency rate does not be moreove by at least of the students.  Proficient Students  124 48 N/A 44	er than 10 erage. Is the state ts AND/OR te by at least ne year. It exceed the 10  Total Students Tested  367  143  N/A  172	Point Value  2  1  0 Urban Percent Proficient  33.79% 33.57% N/A 25.58%	Points Earned  0 State Percent Proficient  43.099 41.139 N/A 32.409
Exemplary  Satisfactory  Not Satisfactory	MCA- Reading (G The school's profice percentage points The school's profice average by up to a the school improved 10 percentage points The school's profice state average or in percentage points  Year Baseline 2015-2018 2018-2019 2019-2020 2020-2021 2021-2022	ciency rate is greate above the state avociency rate exceeds 10 percentage point es its proficiency rate from the baselinciency rate does nonprove by at least of the students  Proficient Students  124 48 N/A	er than 10 erage. Is the state ts AND/OR te by at least ne year. It exceed the 10  Total Students Tested  367 143 N/A	Point Value  2  1  0 Urban Percent Proficient  33.79% 33.57% N/A	Points Earned  0 State Percent Proficient  43.099 41.139 N// 32.409
Exemplary  Satisfactory  Not Satisfactory	MCA- Reading (G The school's profice percentage points The school's profice average by up to a the school improved 10 percentage points The school's profice state average or in percentage points Year  Baseline 2015- 2018 2018-2019 2019-2020	ciency rate is greated above the state avociency rate exceeds 10 percentage point es its proficiency rate to be set its proficiency rate of the baseling ciency rate does not be moreove by at least of the students.  Proficient Students  124 48 N/A 44	er than 10 erage. Is the state ts AND/OR te by at least ne year. It exceed the 10  Total Students Tested  367  143  N/A  172	Point Value  2  1  0 Urban Percent Proficient  33.79% 33.57% N/A 25.58%	Points Earned  0 State Percent Proficient  43.099 41.139
Exemplary  Satisfactory  Not Satisfactory	MCA- Reading (G The school's profice percentage points The school's profice average by up to a the school improved 10 percentage points The school's profice state average or in percentage points  Year Baseline 2015-2018 2018-2019 2019-2020 2020-2021 2021-2022	ciency rate is greated above the state avociency rate exceeds 10 percentage point es its proficiency rate to be set its proficiency rate of the baseling ciency rate does not be moreove by at least of the students.  Proficient Students  124 48 N/A 44	er than 10 erage. Is the state ts AND/OR te by at least ne year. It exceed the 10  Total Students Tested  367  143  N/A  172	Point Value  2  1  0 Urban Percent Proficient  33.79% 33.57% N/A 25.58%	Points Earned  0 State Percent Proficient  43.099 41.139 N// 32.409

III B Attain Gr	to 28.91%, a decre	ease of 4.88%.		he school's proficier  District Compariso	
	ade-level Froncien	cy rer rocus Gr	oup Resident	District Compariso	
Performance Rating	MCA-Math (Grad	as 3-6)	Point Value	Points Earned	
Exemplary		ciency rate is great	er than 10	Foint value	Larrieu
		above the resident			
	average.			2	
Satisfactory		ciency rate exceeds		_	
N-4		up to 10 percentage		1	
Not Satisfactory	resident district av	ciency rate does no verage	ot exceed the	0	1
Results	resident district av	erage.	Total	U	St Paul
rtocuito		Proficient	Students	Urban Percent	Percent
	Year	Students	Tested	Proficient	<b>Proficient</b>
	Baseline 2015-				
	2018	102	367	27.79%	26.25%
	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%	16.35%
	2022-2023				
	2018-2023	71	355	20.00%	19.46%
Analysis				0.54% higher than t	
,		d proficiency rate of			
Performance					Points
Performance Rating	MCA- Reading (G			Point Value	Points Earned
	The school's profic	ciency rate is great		Point Value	
Rating	The school's profice percentage points				
Rating Exemplary	The school's profice percentage points average.	ciency rate is greate above the resident	district	Point Value	
Rating	The school's profice percentage points average. The school's profice p	ciency rate is greate above the resident ciency rate exceeds	district the resident	2	
Exemplary Satisfactory	The school's profit percentage points average. The school's profit district average by	ciency rate is greate above the resident ciency rate exceeds up to 10 percentage	t district s the resident ge points.		
Rating Exemplary	The school's profit percentage points average. The school's profit district average by	ciency rate is greate above the resident ciency rate exceeds up to 10 percentago ciency rate does no	t district s the resident ge points.	2	
Rating Exemplary Satisfactory Not	The school's profice percentage points average. The school's profice district average by The school's profice.	ciency rate is greate above the resident ciency rate exceeds up to 10 percentago ciency rate does no	t district s the resident ge points.	2	
Exemplary  Satisfactory  Not Satisfactory	The school's profice percentage points average. The school's profice district average by The school's profice resident district average by Year Baseline 2015-	ciency rate is greate above the resident ciency rate exceeds up to 10 percentage ciency rate does no verage.  Proficient Students	t district  s the resident ge points. It exceed the  Total Students Tested	2 1 0 Urban Percent Proficient	Earned  1 St Paul Percent Proficient
Exemplary  Satisfactory  Not Satisfactory	The school's profice percentage points average. The school's profice district average by The school's profice resident district average by Year	ciency rate is greate above the resident ciency rate exceeds up to 10 percentage ciency rate does no verage.	s the resident ge points. It exceed the  Total Students	2 1 0 Urban Percent	Earned  1 St Paul Percent
Exemplary  Satisfactory  Not Satisfactory	The school's profice percentage points average. The school's profice district average by The school's profice resident district average by Year Baseline 2015-	ciency rate is greate above the resident ciency rate exceeds up to 10 percentage ciency rate does no verage.  Proficient Students	t district  s the resident ge points. It exceed the  Total Students Tested	2 1 0 Urban Percent Proficient	Earned  1 St Paul Percent Proficient
Exemplary  Satisfactory  Not Satisfactory	The school's profice percentage points average.  The school's profice district average by The school's profice resident district average by Year  Baseline 2015-2018	ciency rate is greated above the resident ciency rate exceeds of up to 10 percentage ciency rate does not be reage.  Proficient Students	s the resident ge points. It exceed the  Total Students Tested	2 1 0 Urban Percent Proficient 33.79%	Earned  1 St Paul Percent Proficient  26.77%
Exemplary  Satisfactory  Not Satisfactory	The school's profice percentage points average. The school's profice district average by The school's profice resident district average by Year Baseline 2015-2018 2018-2019	ciency rate is greater above the resident ciency rate exceeds or up to 10 percentage ciency rate does not be reage.  Proficient Students  124 48 N/A 44	t district s the resident ge points. It exceed the  Total Students Tested  367 143 N/A 172	2 1 0 Urban Percent Proficient 33.79% 33.57%	Earned  1 St Paul Percent Proficient  26.77% 26.68%
Exemplary  Satisfactory  Not Satisfactory	The school's profice percentage points average. The school's profice district average by The school's profice resident district average by The school of	ciency rate is greater above the resident ciency rate exceeds of up to 10 percentage ciency rate does not be reage.  Proficient Students  124 48 N/A	t district s the resident ge points. It exceed the  Total Students Tested  367 143 N/A	2 1 0 Urban Percent Proficient 33.79% 33.57% N/A	Earned  1 St Paul Percent Proficient  26.77% 26.68% N/A
Exemplary  Satisfactory  Not Satisfactory	The school's profice percentage points average.  The school's profice district average by The school's profice resident district average by The school s	ciency rate is greater above the resident ciency rate exceeds or up to 10 percentage ciency rate does not be reage.  Proficient Students  124 48 N/A 44	t district s the resident ge points. It exceed the  Total Students Tested  367 143 N/A 172	2 1 0 Urban Percent Proficient 33.79% 33.57% N/A 25.58%	Earned  1 St Paul Percent Proficient  26.77% 26.68% N/A 20.30%
Exemplary  Satisfactory  Not Satisfactory	The school's profice percentage points average.  The school's profice district average by The school's profice resident district average by The school s	ciency rate is greater above the resident ciency rate exceeds on up to 10 percentage ciency rate does not rerage.  Proficient Students  124 48 N/A 44 61	t district s the resident ge points. It exceed the  Total Students Tested  367 143 N/A 172 211	2 1 0 Urban Percent Proficient 33.79% 33.57% N/A 25.58% 28.91%	1 St Paul Percent Proficient  26.77% 26.68% N/A 20.30% 21.73%
Exemplary  Satisfactory  Not Satisfactory	The school's profice percentage points average. The school's profice district average by The school's profice resident district average by The school sc	ciency rate is greater above the resident ciency rate exceeds on up to 10 percentage ciency rate does not rerage.  Proficient Students  124 48 N/A 44 61	s the resident ge points. It exceed the Total Students Tested 367 143 N/A 172 211	2 1 0 Urban Percent Proficient 33.79% 33.57% N/A 25.58%	1 St Paul Percent Proficient 26.77% 26.68% N/A 20.30% 21.73%
Rating Exemplary  Satisfactory  Not Satisfactory  Results	The school's profice percentage points average. The school's profice district average by The school's profice resident district average by The school's profice average by The school's profice percentage by The school's profice pro	ciency rate is greater above the resident ciency rate exceeds on up to 10 percentage ciency rate does not rerage.  Proficient Students  124 48 N/A 44 61	t district s the resident ge points. It exceed the  Total Students Tested  367 143 N/A 172 211 354 te of 30.79% is	2 1 0 Urban Percent Proficient 33.79% 33.57% N/A 25.58% 28.91%	1 St Paul Percent Proficient 26.77% 26.68% N/A 20.30% 21.73%
Rating Exemplary  Satisfactory  Not Satisfactory  Results	The school's profice percentage points average. The school's profice district average by The school's profice resident district average by The school's profice average by The school's profice percentage by The school's profice pro	ciency rate is greater above the resident ciency rate exceeds on up to 10 percentage ciency rate does not be reage.  Proficient Students  124 48 N/A 44 61  109 cined proficiency rate of	t district s the resident ge points. It exceed the  Total Students Tested  367 143 N/A 172 211  354 Ite of 30.79% is 24.20%.	2 1 0 Urban Percent Proficient 33.79% 33.57% N/A 25.58% 28.91% 30.79% 6.59% higher than the	1 St Paul Percent Proficient 26.77% 26.68% N/A 20.30% 21.73%
Rating Exemplary  Satisfactory  Not Satisfactory  Results	The school's profice percentage points average. The school's profice district average by The school's profice resident district average by The school's profice average	ciency rate is greater above the resident ciency rate exceeds on up to 10 percentage ciency rate does not be reage.  Proficient Students  124 48 N/A 44 61  109 cined proficiency rate of	t district s the resident ge points. It exceed the  Total Students Tested  367 143 N/A 172 211  354 Ite of 30.79% is 24.20%.	2 1 0 Urban Percent Proficient 33.79% 33.57% N/A 25.58% 28.91% 30.79% 6.59% higher than the	1 St Paul Percent Proficient 26.77% 26.68% N/A 20.30% 21.73%

Exemplary		ciency rate is great			
Satisfactory		above the state av ciency rate exceeds	2		
Satisfactory		10 percentage poin			
		es its proficiency ra			
		ints from the baseli	1		
Not		ciency rate does no			
Satisfactory		mprove by at least	10		
	percentage points			0	0
Results		D. C. C.	Total		State
	Year	Proficient Students	Students Tested	Urban Percent Proficient	Percent Proficient
	Baseline 2015-	Students	resteu	Proficient	Proficient
	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%	15.68%
	2022-2023				
	2018-2023	34	209	16.27%	18.76%
Analysis	The school's com	oined proficiency ra	te of 16.27% is	2.49% lower than the	
		ncy rate of 18.76%.			
			ate of 21.31% t	he school's proficie	ncy decreased
	to 11.11%, a decr	ease of 10.20%.			
Performance					Points
Rating	MCA- Reading (C			Point Value	Earned
EVAMBLANT					
Exemplary	The school's profi			2	
Satisfactory	percentage points	above the state av ciency rate exceeds	erage.	2	
	percentage points The school's profit average by up to	above the state av ciency rate exceeds 10 percentage poin	rerage. s the state ts AND/OR	2	
	The school's proficaverage by up to the school improve	above the state av ciency rate exceeds 10 percentage poin es its proficiency ra	erage. s the state ts AND/OR te by at least		
Satisfactory	percentage points The school's profit average by up to the school improve 10 percentage points	above the state av ciency rate exceeds 10 percentage poin es its proficiency ra ints from the baselii	erage. s the state ts AND/OR te by at least ne year.	1	
Satisfactory	percentage points The school's profit average by up to the school improve 10 percentage points The school's profit	above the state av ciency rate exceeds 10 percentage poin es its proficiency ra ints from the baselinciency rate does no	s the state ts AND/OR te by at least ne year. ot exceed the		
Satisfactory	percentage points The school's profit average by up to the school improve 10 percentage point The school's profit state average or in	above the state av ciency rate exceeds 10 percentage poin es its proficiency ra ints from the baselin ciency rate does no mprove by at least	s the state ts AND/OR te by at least ne year. ot exceed the	1	1
Satisfactory  Not Satisfactory	percentage points The school's profit average by up to the school improve 10 percentage points The school's profit	above the state av ciency rate exceeds 10 percentage poin es its proficiency ra ints from the baselin ciency rate does no mprove by at least	s the state ts AND/OR te by at least ne year. of exceed the		1 State
Satisfactory	percentage points The school's profit average by up to the school improve 10 percentage point The school's profit state average or in	above the state av ciency rate exceeds 10 percentage poin es its proficiency ra ints from the baselin ciency rate does no mprove by at least	s the state ts AND/OR te by at least ne year. ot exceed the	1	1 State Percent
Satisfactory  Not Satisfactory	percentage points The school's profit average by up to the school improve 10 percentage points The school's profit state average or in percentage points  Year	above the state av ciency rate exceeds 10 percentage poin es its proficiency ra ints from the baselin ciency rate does no mprove by at least	s the state ts AND/OR te by at least ne year. t exceed the 10	0	
Satisfactory  Not Satisfactory	percentage points The school's profit average by up to the school improve 10 percentage points The school's profit state average or in percentage points  Year  Baseline 2015-	above the state av ciency rate exceeds 10 percentage poin es its proficiency rate from the baseliciency rate does not approve by at least .  Proficient Students	s the state ts AND/OR te by at least ne year. ot exceed the 10  Total Students Tested	0 Urban Percent Proficient	Percent Proficient
Satisfactory  Not Satisfactory	percentage points The school's profit average by up to the school improve 10 percentage points The school's profit state average or in percentage points  Year  Baseline 2015- 2018	above the state av ciency rate exceeds 10 percentage poin es its proficiency rates from the baselin ciency rate does not approve by at least  Proficient Students	s the state ts AND/OR te by at least ne year. of exceed the 10  Total Students Tested	0 Urban Percent Proficient 24.59%	Percent Proficient
Satisfactory  Not Satisfactory	percentage points The school's profit average by up to the school improve 10 percentage points The school's profit state average or in percentage points  Year  Baseline 2015- 2018 2018-2019	above the state av ciency rate exceeds 10 percentage poin es its proficiency rate to be seliciency rate does not mprove by at least  Proficient Students  45	terage. s the state ts AND/OR te by at least ne year. of exceed the 10  Total Students Tested  183	0 Urban Percent Proficient 24.59% 21.69%	Percent Proficient 18.66% 16.47%
Satisfactory  Not Satisfactory	percentage points The school's profit average by up to the school improve 10 percentage poi The school's profit state average or it percentage points  Year  Baseline 2015- 2018 2018-2019 2019-2020	above the state av ciency rate exceeds 10 percentage poin es its proficiency rate that from the baselinciency rate does not mprove by at least .  Proficient Students  45  18  N/A	terage. s the state ts AND/OR te by at least ne year. ot exceed the 10  Total Students Tested  183  83  N/A	0 Urban Percent Proficient 24.59% 21.69% N/A	Percent Proficient 18.66% 16.47% N/A
Satisfactory  Not Satisfactory	percentage points The school's profit average by up to the school improve 10 percentage points The school's profit state average or in percentage points  Year  Baseline 2015- 2018 2018-2019 2019-2020 2020-2021	above the state aveciency rate exceeds 10 percentage pointes its proficiency rate that from the baseling ciency rate does not a prove by at least  Proficient Students  45  18  N/A  15	s the state ts AND/OR te by at least ne year. of exceed the 10  Total Students Tested  183  83  N/A  110	1 0 Urban Percent Proficient 24.59% 21.69% N/A 13.64%	Percent Proficient  18.66%  16.47%  N/A  9.10%
Satisfactory  Not Satisfactory	percentage points The school's profit average by up to the school improve 10 percentage poi The school's profit state average or it percentage points  Year  Baseline 2015- 2018 2018-2019 2019-2020	above the state av ciency rate exceeds 10 percentage poin es its proficiency rate that from the baselinciency rate does not mprove by at least .  Proficient Students  45  18  N/A	terage. s the state ts AND/OR te by at least ne year. ot exceed the 10  Total Students Tested  183  83  N/A	0 Urban Percent Proficient 24.59% 21.69% N/A	Percent Proficient 18.66% 16.47% N/A
Satisfactory  Not Satisfactory	percentage points The school's profit average by up to the school improve 10 percentage points The school's profit state average or in percentage points  Year  Baseline 2015- 2018 2018-2019 2019-2020 2020-2021	above the state aveciency rate exceeds 10 percentage pointes its proficiency rate that from the baseling ciency rate does not a prove by at least  Proficient Students  45  18  N/A  15	s the state ts AND/OR te by at least ne year. of exceed the 10  Total Students Tested  183  83  N/A  110	1 0 Urban Percent Proficient 24.59% 21.69% N/A 13.64%	Percent Proficient  18.66%  16.47%  N/A  9.10%
Satisfactory  Not Satisfactory	percentage points The school's profit average by up to the school improved 10 percentage points The school's profit state average or in percentage points  Year Baseline 2015-2018 2018-2019 2019-2020 2020-2021 2021-2022	above the state aveciency rate exceeds 10 percentage pointes its proficiency rate that from the baseling ciency rate does not a prove by at least  Proficient Students  45  18  N/A  15	s the state ts AND/OR te by at least ne year. of exceed the 10  Total Students Tested  183  83  N/A  110	1 0 Urban Percent Proficient 24.59% 21.69% N/A 13.64%	Percent Proficient  18.66%  16.47%  N/A  9.10%
Satisfactory  Not Satisfactory	percentage points The school's profit average by up to the school improve 10 percentage points The school's profit state average or in percentage points  Year  Baseline 2015- 2018 2018-2019 2019-2020 2020-2021 2021-2022 2022-2023 The school's coml	above the state aveciency rate exceeds 10 percentage point es its proficiency rate does not mprove by at least  Proficient Students  45  18  N/A  15  21  39  Dinied proficiency rate aveciency rate does not mprove by at least aveciency rate avec avec avec avec avec avec avec ave	s the state ts AND/OR te by at least ne year. of exceed the 10  Total Students Tested  183  83  N/A  110  126  209 tte of 18.66% is	1 0 Urban Percent Proficient 24.59% 21.69% N/A 13.64% 16.67%	Percent Proficient  18.66%  16.47%  N/A  9.10%  13.96%
Satisfactory  Not Satisfactory  Results	percentage points The school's profit average by up to the school improved 10 percentage points The school's profits state average or in percentage points  Year Baseline 2015-2018 2018-2019 2019-2020 2020-2021 2021-2022 2022-2023 The school's combined proficie	above the state aveciency rate exceeds 10 percentage pointes its proficiency rate ints from the baseling ciency rate does not approve by at least and a students  Proficient Students  45  18  N/A  15  21  39  Dined proficiency rate of 15.21%	terage. s the state ts AND/OR te by at least ne year. ot exceed the 10  Total Students Tested  183 83 N/A 110 126  209 te of 18.66% is	1 0 Urban Percent Proficient  24.59% 21.69% N/A 13.64% 16.67%  18.66% 3.45% higher than	Percent Proficient  18.66% 16.47% N/A 9.10% 13.96%  15.21% the state's
Satisfactory  Not Satisfactory  Results	percentage points The school's profit average by up to the school improved 10 percentage points The school's profits state average or in percentage points  Year Baseline 2015-2018 2018-2019 2019-2020 2020-2021 2021-2022 2022-2023 The school's combined proficie From the baseline	above the state aveciency rate exceeds 10 percentage pointes its proficiency rate does not a prove by at least students  Proficient Students  45  18  N/A  15  21  39  Dined proficiency rate of 15.21%, a years 2015-2019 residuency rate exceeds	terage. s the state ts AND/OR te by at least ne year. ot exceed the 10  Total Students Tested  183 83 N/A 110 126  209 te of 18.66% is	1 0 Urban Percent Proficient 24.59% 21.69% N/A 13.64% 16.67%	Percent Proficient  18.66% 16.47% N/A 9.10% 13.96%  15.21% the state's
Satisfactory  Not Satisfactory  Results  Analysis	percentage points The school's profit average by up to the school improved 10 percentage points The school's profits state average or in percentage points  Year Baseline 2015-2018 2018-2019 2019-2020 2020-2021 2021-2022 2022-2023 The school's combined proficie From the baseline to 16.67%, a decre	above the state aveciency rate exceeds 10 percentage pointes its proficiency rate into from the baselinciency rate does not more by at least  Proficient Students  45  18  N/A  15  21  39  prined proficiency rate of 15.21%. Expears 2015-2019 rease of 7.92%	terage. s the state ts AND/OR te by at least ne year. of exceed the 10  Total Students Tested  183  83  N/A  110  126  209 te of 18.66% is eate of 24.59% tested	1 0 Urban Percent Proficient  24.59% 21.69% N/A 13.64% 16.67%  18.66% 3.45% higher than	Percent Proficient  18.66%  16.47%  N/A  9.10%  13.96%  15.21% the state's  ncy decreased

Performance Rating	MCA-Math (Grade	os 3-6)		Point Value	Points Earned
Exemplary		ciency rate is greate	er than 10	Politi Value	Earneu
Exomplary		above the resident			
	average.			2	
Satisfactory		ciency rate exceeds		_	
N. 4		up to 10 percentage		1	
Not Satisfactory	resident district av	ciency rate does no	it exceed the	0	1
Results	resident district av	erage.	Total	U	St Paul
results	Year	Proficient Students	Students Tested	Urban Percent Proficient	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%	13.64%
	2022-2023				
	2018-2023	34	209	16.27%	15.79%
Analysis				0.48% higher than	
		l proficiency rate of			
Performance Rating	MCA- Reading (G	Grades 3-6)		Point Value	Points Earned
Exemplary		ciency rate is greate	er than 10		
	percentage points	above the resident	district		
	average.			2	
Satisfactory		ciency rate exceeds		1	
Not		up to 10 percentago ciency rate does no		i i	
Satisfactory	resident district av		it exceed the	0	1
Results	. co.do diot.iot di	<u>go.</u>	Total	•	St Paul
		Proficient	Students	Urban Percent	Percent
	Year	Students	Tested	Proficient	Proficient
	Baseline 2015-	ΛE	100	24 500/	4.4.000/
	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 <b>21</b>	110	13.64%	7.20%
	2021-2022	21	126	16.67%	11.03%
	2022-2023				
Analysis	2018-2023	39	209	18.66% 6.17% higher than	12.49%

# Pre-Schoolers Continue to Shine to get Ready for School - FY2021 Results

Since the start of the Pre-School 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 as over 80% 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.

	are Ready for Sch				
I.A Early Liter	acy and Early Nun	neracy Goals			
Performance Rating	Work Sampling S (Grade Pre-K)	System- Early Matl	h Criteria	Point Value	Points Earned
Exemplary		t of pre-kindergarte e ready for kinderg		4	
Satisfactory	or exceed the rea	ore-kindergarten stu dy for kindergarten	benchmark.	2	
Not Satisfactory		ent of pre-kinderga e ready for kinderg		0	4
Results	Year	Students Meeting or Exceeding Kindergarten Benchmark	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				
	2018-2023	121	142	85.21%	
Analysis	The 2019-2024 co	ombined average W 21%.	ork Sampling S	system early math	
Performance Rating	(Grade Pre-K)	System- Early Rea	_	Point Value	Points Earned
Exemplary	meet or exceed the benchmark.	nt of pre-kindergarte e ready for kinderg	arten	4	
Satisfactory	60-74 percent of por exceed the read	2			
Not Satisfactory		ent of pre-kinderga e ready for kinderg		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	36	40	90.00%	

	2019-2020	35	39	89.74%				
	2020-2021	25	31	80.65%				
	2021-2022	28	32	87.50%				
	2022-2023							
	2018-2023	124	142	87.32%				
Analysis	The 2019-2024 combined average Work Sampling System early							
	reading criteria rate is 87.32%.							

#### **Other Assessment Results**

# **Literacy Plan Results**

In the Fountas and Pinnell Benchmarking system we identified:

Kindergarten 17/27 students were at grade level.

1st Grade: 6/18 students were at grade level.

2t=ns Grade: 15/36 students were at grade level.

3rd Grade: 12/35 students were at grade level.

In total, 50/121 or 41% students were at grade level in grades K-3.

On the NWEA fall to spring measure,

87/269 or 32% students were below grade level on the NWEA reading assessment.

# Reading - Students at Grade Level Spring 2022

Grade Level	К	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	All Grades
# Students at Grade Level or better	11	5	10	13	17	17	13	18	19	123
# Students Tested Spring	27	21	35	34	36	35	31	32	38	289
% At Grade Level	40.7%	23.8%	28.6%	38.2%	47.2%	48.6%	41.9%	56.3%	50.0%	42.6%

Grade	# Students	# Met	# Not Met	% Met Target (all
Level	Tested	Target	Target	students)
K	27	9	18	33.3%
1	21	7	14	33.3%
2	35	16	19	45.7%
3	34	15	19	44.1%
4	36	22	14	61.1%
5	35	19	16	54.3%
6	31	19	12	61.3%
7	32	23	9	71.9%
8	38	20	18	52.6%
All				
Students	289	150	139	51.9%

# **Parent Satisfaction**

Parents have consistently shown high satisfaction with their students' education and treatment at Urban Academy. During the 2021-2022 school year Urban Academy continued to get high ratings from parents (93.4%).

V.B Parent Sa	tisfaction				
Performance Rating	5-Point Parent Sa	atisfaction Survey	Point Value	Points Earned	
Exemplary		t of parents agree are satisfied with		2	
Satisfactory		parents agree (4) or are satisfied with		1	
Not Satisfactory		ent of parents agre that they are satisf		0	2
Results	Year	Number of Parents Agreeing or Strongly Agreeing	Total Number of Parents	Parent Satisfaction Survey Percent	Percent Participation of Parent Respondents
	Baseline 2016- 2018	257	281	91.46%	79.83%
	2018-2019	169	180	93.89%	94.24%
	2019-2020	197	215	91.63%	100.00%
	2020-2021	220	228	96.49%	76.51%
	2021-2022	163	175	93.14%	
	2022-2023				
	2018-2023	749	798	93.86%	113.35%
Analysis	The 2019-2024 co	mbined average p	arent satisfactio	n rate is 94.06%.	

In addition, parents gave high ratings when asked other questions:

How safe do you feel your child is (children are) at Urban Academy? 82%

How satisified are you with the communication from teachers at Urban Academy? 85%

How welcome do you feel at Urban Academy? 84%

How satisfied are you with how well your child's (or children's) teacher responds to your calls or concerns? 83%

How satisfied are you with how well Urban Academy staff show respect for families from different cultures? 85%

When asked, "What do you think is Urban Academy's greatest strength?" Following are some of the responses:

Always being there to answer phone

Close cummunity feel with staff

Close to my home

Different cultures that teach together

Diversity

Diversity, Cultures, communication

Even going through COVID they were fo helpful with food and education

Everyone works together, small class size

Everything is good

Family orientated, they care about my kids, they care if the students learn

Family orientation, caring and supportive staff

Family orientation, caring, empathetic and supportive staff

Friendly, care about students

Great teachers

Happy and nice staff, they always help with questions

Have a after school program

Help me and my kids

Help students and families, Diversity

Helping families, small classes

I love the family environment, staff makes parents feel welcome. We can talk about issues if we have any I really like that the special education team do their best to help my child become better in academics

If I really need a ride to my childs IEP, they can pick me up

Like the location

Location, helping others, happy staff

Making sure students do their best

My kids are always happy to come to school

One on one teachers, good communication

Patience with students

Pushing students to be successful

Respect for families

Respect to everyone

Responsible, they help my children to achieve goal

Small class size, friendly place

Small class sizes, one on one teaching

Small classes-more focus on each child

Small community, family orientated, helpful

Staff is loving and care

Staff works well with parents and with students

Teachers are great

Teachers take their time to help my children to grow academically teachers and socially

Teachers, staff, been open for a long time

Teaching during COVID-they did a great job

The school gives my student a ride to school and home

The teachers

Their sense of community

They care

They help families with food and anything I might need help with

They help my child learn English

They were awesome for distant lear4ning

They work hard with every child

This is a good school

Uniforms, Staff

Very unsatisfied

Very welcoming feels very tight knit with students, parents, teachers. Staff are great with providing helpful resources Way of teaching is effective, one on one help Welcoming and respecting families Welcoming, close community Working with families if we need help with anything

## **Staffing**

UA served 457 students in 2020-2021. 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.

#### **Staff Retention Rate:**

	FY17-FY18	FY18-FY19	FY19-FY20	FY20-FY21	FY21-FY22
Number of Licensed Teachers	21	24	26	28	26
Licensed Teacher Retention Rate	71.40%	83.30%	92.30%	82.14%	100%
Number of Non-Teaching Staff	23	31	25	26	25
Non-Teaching Staff Retention	78.30%	96.80%	96.00%	76.92%	96.0%
All Staff Retention Rate	75.00%	90.90%	94.10%	79.63%	98.0%

#### 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.

2021-22 Licensed Teaching Staff

Last Name	First Name	File #	Assignment	Status*
Wade	Ashley	463107	PreK	R
Scheuer	Kelly	495896	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	2 <sup>nd</sup> Grade	R
McCabe	Robert	454698	2 <sup>nd</sup> Grade	R
Anderson	Katie	478239	3 <sup>rd</sup> Grade	R
McCabe	Beth	511121	3 <sup>rd</sup> Grade	R
Heieie	Erik	349941	4 <sup>th</sup> Grade	R
Yang	Chao	392714	4 <sup>th</sup> Grade	R
Vue	Mai Ger	1010985	5 <sup>th</sup> Grade	R
Conrad	Cheryl	297941	5 <sup>th</sup> Grade	R

Cavanaugh	Matt	491923	6 <sup>th</sup> Grade	R
Olson	Luke	500698	6 <sup>th</sup> Grade	R
Hughes	Clint	473960	7 <sup>th</sup> Grade – Soc. St.	R
Christopher	Jane	370443	7 <sup>th</sup> Grade – Science	R
Burkhardt	Laura	375931	Art	R
Curran	Shannon	376988	ESL	R
Jones	Andy	438525	Special Ed	R
Liao	Yuyin	423068	Special Ed	R
McCauley	Patricia	285948	Technology	R
Xiong	Ronsoie	484456	Technology Manager	R
Earle	Brooklyn	483267	Title I – Reading	R
Yang	Pakou	360268	Title I – Math	R

<sup>\*</sup> R = Returning, NR = Not Returning

#### 2021-22 Other Licensed (non-teaching) Staff

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

<sup>\*</sup> R = Returning, NR = Not Returning

## 2021-22 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
Hickman	Shelley		Student Specialist	R
Thay	Ku		Janitor	R
Тоо	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
Bauert	Janine		Paraprofessional	R
Htoo	Ray Ya		Paraprofessional	R
Khaing	Phoo Pwet		Paraprofessional	R
Lay	Minn		Paraprofessional	R
Say	Lwai		Paraprofessional	R
Nung	Aung		Paraprofessional	NR
Noi	Nay Nay		Paraprofessional	R

R = Returning, NR = Not Returning

## **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. Monthly, the board meets and 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**

#### **Board Structure 2021-22 School Year**

Name	Date Seated	Positions	Affiliation	Current Term Month/Year to Month/Year
Melissa Jensen	July 1, 2016	Chair	Community	07/2019- 06/2022
Fong Lor	July 1, 2016	Vice Chair	Community	07/2019- 06/2022
Chao Yang	July 1, 2018	Member	UA Teacher	07/2018- 06/2021
Dr. Tamara Mattison	July 1, 2016	Finance Chair	Community	07/2018- 06/2021
Caley Long	July 1, 2016	Secretary	Community	07/2019- 06/2022
Nancy Smith	July 1, 2016	Member	Community	07/2019- 06/2022
Yuyin Liao	July 1, 2017	Member	UA Teacher	07/2020 - 06/2023
Ronsoie Xiong	July 1, 2018	Member	UA Parent	07/2018- 06/2021
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

#### **Board Training**

MN Statute 124E.07 Subd. 7. States, "Every charter school board member shall attend annual training throughout the member's term. All new board members shall attend initial training on the board's role and responsibilities, employment policies and practices, and financial management. A new board member who does not begin the required initial training within six months after being seated and complete that training within 12 months after being seated is automatically ineligible to continue to serve as a board member. The school shall include in its annual report the training each board member attended during the previous year."

All board members received and completed their required initial training within their first year of board service.

#### **Initial Board Training**

Board member name	Date of Training	Topic
Melissa Jensen	11/12/2016	Governance, Employment, Finance, Academics
Fong Lor	11/12/2016	Governance, Employment, Finance, Academics
Chao Yang	1/22/2018	Governance, Employment, Finance, Academics
Dr. Tamara Mattison	11/12/2016	Governance, Employment, Finance, Academics
Caley Long	11/12/2016	Governance, Employment, Finance, Academics
Nancy Smith	11/12/2016	Governance, Employment, Finance, Academics
Yuyin Liao	1/22/2018	Governance, Employment, Finance, Academics
Ronsoie Xiong	1/22/2018	Governance, Employment, Finance, Academics
Dr. Mongsher Ly	11/12/2016	Governance, Employment, Finance, Academics
Ralph Elliott	11/12/2016	Governance, Employment, Finance, Academics
Luis Brown-Pena	11/12/2016	Governance, Employment, Finance, Academics

#### Ongoing/Annual Training – 2021-2022

Board Member Name	Date	Topic	Presenter or Trainer
Melissa Jensen	,	Charter School Board Roles and Responsibilities and Remote Board Meeting Requirements	Rod Haenke
Fong Lor	,	Charter School Board Roles and Responsibilities and Remote Board Meeting Requirements	Rod Haenke

Chao Yang	March 21, 2021	Charter School Board Roles and Responsibilities and Remote Board Meeting Requirements	Rod Haenke
Dr. Tamara Mattison	March 21, 2021	Charter School Board Roles and Responsibilities and Remote Board Meeting Requirements	Rod Haenke
Ying Thao	March 21, 2021	Charter School Board Roles and Responsibilities and Remote Board Meeting Requirements	Rod Haenke
Caley Long	March 21, 2021	Charter School Board Roles and Responsibilities and Remote Board Meeting Requirements	Rod Haenke
Nancy Smith	March 21, 2021	Charter School Board Roles and Responsibilities and Remote Board Meeting Requirements	Rod Haenke
Yuyin Liao	March 21, 2021	Charter School Board Roles and Responsibilities and Remote Board Meeting Requirements	Rod Haenke
Ronsoie Xiong	March 21, 2021	Charter School Board Roles and Responsibilities and Remote Board Meeting Requirements	Rod Haenke

## Superintendent Evaluation and Professional Development

Dr. Ly has a K-12 Principal and Superintendent License and not required to report on an Professional Development Plan. He was formally evaluated by the Board in FY2022.

#### **Finances**

Key financial highlights for the 2021-2022 fiscal year include:

- General Fund revenues were \$7,753,032 as compared to \$6,812,589 of expenditures, an excess of \$940,443.
- Total fund balance increased in fiscal year 2022 by \$1,023,451 to a positive balance of \$3,931,926.
- The School continued its teacher compensation schedule to include Quality Compensation Programs and invest in quality teachers.
- School management continues to carefully monitor enrollment which is key to the financial stability of its programs.
- General fund revenues increased by 18% over the prior year, while expenditures increased by 17%.
- 2021-2022 student enrollment increased from 412 ADMs to 444 ADMs.

In regard to the 2021-2022 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 2021-2022 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%

#### **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

## **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	

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

	Financially Solvent/Sustainable		
VII.A Finance	Awards		
Performance Rating	Awards	Point Value	Points Earned
<b>Exemplary</b>	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 a MDE Finance Award Recipient in FY22 and NEO S Award for FY21 for FY20 reporting.	tewardsh	nip
VII.B Fund Ba	lance		
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	10

Not Satisfactory	Reserve is less than one reserves.					
Results	Fund Balance					
	\$3,823,203	\$6,811,903	56.13%			
Analysis	The school has built a fu	56.13% in 2021-2022				
VII.C Financia	l Audit					
Performance Rating	Financial Audit					
Exemplary	No findings cited in the a	No findings cited in the audit.				
Satisfactory	No more than one finding (nonmaterial) cited in the audit in FY 2024.					
Not						
Satisfactory	More than one finding ci	ted in the audit.		0	4	
Analysis	The school had no mate	rial audit findings in 202	20-2021.			

#### **Future Plans**

Urban Academy remodeled the former cafeteria and converted the space into four new classrooms. The school added seventh grade in FY2021 and grade 8 in the 2021-2022 school year.

Urban Academy continues to place its emphasis on curriculum development and instructional coaching daily provided by Tony Lang, Academic Lead for the elementary and Joe Thompson for the middle school. Rod Haenke, a consultant, continues to provide support for the instructional leadership team and curriculum training. The instructional leadership team also conducts learning walks with teachers to they can share and learn from each other.

Something new for 2022-2023 is an update to the Q Comp Teacher Improvement Plan with the goal of empowering teachers to take more control of their own growth. The Why of UA's teacher evaluation system is rooted in the following rubric adapted from Charlotte Danielson focused on teacher's having ownership of their own growth. Accomplished teachers have high ethical standards and a deep sense of professionalism, focused on improving their own teaching and supporting the ongoing learning of colleagues. Their record-keeping systems are efficient and effective, and they communicate with families clearly, frequently, and with cuural sensitivity. Accomplished teachers assume leadership roles in both school and LEA projects, and they engage in a wide range of professional development activities to strengthen their practice. Reflection on their own teaching results in ideas for improvement that are shared across professional learning communities and contribute to improving the practice of all.

It is built upon three foundations:

- 1. Teacher improvement through coaching, evaluation and feedback,
- 2. Job imbedded professional development, and
- 3. student proficiency and growth

The system meets all requirements of Mn State Statute 122A.40. Where appropriate - the statute section is referenced in *italics*. Key elements include:

- (2) must establish review cycle for each teacher that includes an individual growth and development plan, a peer review process, and at least one summative evaluation performed by a qualified and trained evaluator such as a school administrator.
- (3) must be based on professional teaching standards established in rule;
- (4) must coordinate staff development activities
- (5) may provide for peer coaching and teacher collaboration;
- (6) may include job-embedded learning opportunities such as professional learning communities;
- (7) may include mentoring
- (8) an option for teachers to develop and present a portfolio
- (9) (10) use data on student growth and on student engagement
- (11) use qualified and trained evaluators
- (12) give teachers not meeting professional teaching standards a teacher improvement process
- (13) discipline for a teacher for not making adequate progress that may include a last chance warning, termination, discharge, or nonrenewal.

The UA system exceeds this requirement as each teacher completes a full cycle of activities each year. The professional development activities and Professional Learning Community topics are based on needs established through the system. UA's Q Comp Teacher Evaluation System is also designed to encourage teachers to take ownership of their professional development. UA provides coaching on a variety of teaching competencies that are defined and that teachers receive coaching and job imbedded professional development during PLCs. These competencies include:

Each teacher is observed and evaluated three times a year using the adapted Danielson rubric. Qualified evaluators observe and evaluate three lessons each year as well as conducting walkthroughs of each classroom to gather ongoing data on the domains of planning, classroom environment and instruction; and interacts with the teachers during PLCs and team meetings. After each formal observation, the Lead Evaluator gives feedback and scores with the adapted Danielson rubric. UA encourages teachers to reflect on their own practice and seek to improve for the benefit of our students. The teacher must average a score of 2 on the rubric to qualify for the Q Comp incentive pay for this category — Teachers Observations and Evaluation.

Following are the key steps of the process.

Step 1: Design the Lesson Plan for the Observation - Each teacher submits a lesson plan prior to observation using the Lesson Plan Template. The expectation is that the teacher coordinates knowledge of standards, students, and resources, to plan a lesson that appropriately challenges and engages students with some differentiation.

Step 2: Lesson Plan Feedback - The Lead Evaluator provides feedback on lesson plan and provides the opportunity for the teacher to resubmit if warranted. The Lead Evaluator may provide this feedback prior to the lesson so the teacher can incorporate the feedback into possible adaptations of the lesson.

Step 3: The Formal Observation – Qualified evaluators observe and making noticing's and wonderings focused on the Culture for Learning and Lesson Alignment and Implementation.

Step 4: The Lead Evaluator provides the teacher feedback using the completed Teacher Observation Form during a brief meeting.

Step 5: The teacher sets a growth goal based on the feedback using the Individual Growth Plan and submitting to the Lead Evaluator within a week of receiving the feedback.

Step 6: The Lead Evaluator completes the following rubric after each formal observation. Keep in mind that the rubric includes not only the lesson observation but also the teacher's contributions to PLCs and team meetings. The teacher must average a 2 on all three Formal Observations to be eligible for the Q Comp financial incentive.

Steps 1-6 are repeated two more times to complete the formal observation cycle for the year.

Step 7: At the conclusion of the three Formal Observations, the Lead Evaluator tallies the rubric scores for the three Formal Observations. The teacher must score a 2 to be eligible for the Q Comp financial incentive.

If any of the three following conditions exist, a Teacher Improvement Plan is required:

- 1. A teacher does not adequately participate in the teacher observation evaluation process including the lesson planning and implementation of the formal observations, setting goals, and self-reflection on their practice.
- 2. A teacher averages a score of "1" on after any or all teacher observations.
- 3. A teacher does not adequately participate in data gathering and analysis, PLCs, job imbedded professional development activities, and/or team meetings.

The purpose of the TIP is for the teacher to demonstrate progress in the area(s) of concern within a reasonable timeframe agreed upon by the Instructional Leader and the teacher. The TIP will include very specific goals and action steps that the teacher plans to take, as well as supports that the school will either provide for the teacher or connect the teacher to. Progress will be evaluated by the Q Comp Lead Evaluator. If the Lead Evaluator determines that inadequate progress has been made, the teacher will be notified by Human Resources that the school is searching for candidates to fill his/her position. In this case, the teacher is expected to continue to perform the duties of his/her job and continue to strive to achieve the goals of the TIP. If the teacher does make satisfactory progress toward the goals of the TIP during the time that the school is searching for a replacement, the administration will consider not replacing that teacher. Or, the teacher will be notified by Human Resources that his/her contract is terminated.

## **Urban Academy's Safe Learning Summary for FY22**

Urban Academy followed the guidance in Minnesota's <u>Safe Learning Plan</u> to continue to educate students and keep our community healthy during the COVID-19 pandemic. Minnesota's Safe Learning Plan was created at the request of Governor Tim Walz and Lt. Governor Peggy Flanagan by the Minnesota Department of Education (MDE) and the Minnesota Department of Health (MDH). The State allowed schools to implement different learning models as long as schools take steps to prevent the spread of COVID-19.

# Novation Education Opportunities- Urban Academy Charter School Performance Framework

#### **Urban Academy Charter School**

Date of Last Update/Review: 10/3/2022 Contract Term: July 1, 2019- June 30, 2024

**Baseline Year Results: 2016-2019** 

**Charter Number: 4088** 

**Initial Year of Operation: 2003** 

Grades Served: 2016-2017 (PK-6), 2017-2018 (PK-6), 2020-2021 (PK-7)

These are the Academic Performance Indicators. They are 56.00% of the points possible.

## I. All Children are Ready for School

I.A Early Literacy and Early Numeracy Goals

2021-2022

2022-2023

criteria rate is 85.21%.

Performan ce Rating	Work Sampling Sys K)	Point Value	Points Earned		
Exemplary	At least 75 percent of	_			
	exceed the ready for	4			
Satisfactor	60-74 percent of pre-				
У	the ready for kinderga	2			
Not					
Satisfactor		of pre-kindergarten s			
У	exceed the ready for	kindergarten benchm	ark.	0	4
Results	Year	Students Meeting or Exceeding Kindergarten Benchmark	Total Students Tested	Percent of Students Meeting or Exceeding Kindergart en Benchmar k	
	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%	

Analysis

The 2019-2024 combined average Work Sampling System early math

28

121

87.50%

85.21%

32

142

Performan ce Rating	Work Sampling Sys Pre-K)	tem- Early Reading (	Criteria (Grade	Point Value	Points Earned
Exemplary		At least 75 percent of pre-kindergarten students meet or exceed the ready for kindergarten benchmark.			
		4			
Satisfactor		kindergarten students	meet or exceed	_	
у	the ready for kinderg	arten benchmark.		2	
Not					
Satisfactor		of pre-kindergarten s		•	
y	exceed the ready for	kindergarten benchma	ark.	0	4
Results				Percent of	
				Students	
				Meeting or	
		Studente Meeting		Exceeding Kindergart	
		Students Meeting or Exceeding	Total	en	
		Kindergarten	Students	Benchmar	
	Year	Benchmark	Tested	k	
	Baseline 2016-	Bonomian	100104		
	2018	16	20	80.00%	
	2010	10	20	00.0070	
	2018-2019	36	40	90.00%	
		_			
	2018-2019	36	40	90.00%	
	2018-2019 2019-2020	36 35	40 39	90.00% 89.74%	
	2018-2019 2019-2020 2020-2021	36 35 25	40 39 31	90.00% 89.74% 80.65%	
	2018-2019 2019-2020 2020-2021 2021-2022	36 35 25	40 39 31	90.00% 89.74% 80.65%	
Analysis	2018-2019 2019-2020 2020-2021 2021-2022 2022-2023 2018-2023	36 35 25 28	40 39 31 32 142	90.00% 89.74% 80.65% 87.50%	

| criteria rate is 87.32%.

II. All Students are Ready for Career and College, Including Third Grade Literacy (As Measured by Grade Level Proficiency)

II.A Attain G	rade-level Proficienc	y- All Students State	Comparison		
Performan ce Rating	MCA-Math (Grades 3-6)			Point Value	Points Earned
Exemplary	The school's proficier points above the stat	2			
Satisfactor y	The school's proficier up to 10 percentage its proficiency rate by				
	the baseline year.			1	
Not	T				
Satisfactor		ncy rate does not exce			•
Desvite	average or improve b	y at least 10 percenta	<u> </u>	0	0
Results		Proficient	Total Students	Urban Percent	State Percent
	Year	Students	Tested	Proficient	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%	50.09%
	2022-2023				

	2018-2023	71	355	20.00%	54.18%
Analysis		ed proficiency rate of 2			
2 <b>.</b>	combined proficiency		,		
		ars 2015-2019 rate of	28.30% the school	ol's proficiency	decreased to
	13.74%, a decrease				
Performan				Point	Points
ce Rating	MCA- Reading (Grad	des 3-6)		Value	Earned
Exemplary	The school's proficier	10 percentage			
	points above the state			2	
Satisfactor		ncy rate exceeds the s			
У		points AND/OR the sc			
	the baseline year.	at least 10 percentag	e points from	1	
Not	the baseline year.			•	
Satisfactor	The school's proficier	ncy rate does not exce	ed the state		
у		y at least 10 percenta		0	0
Results			Total	Urban	State
		Proficient	Students	Percent	Percent
-	Year	Students	Tested	Proficient	Proficient
	Baseline 2015- 2018	128	371	34.50%	62.04%
_	2018-2019	48	143	33.57%	60.16%
-	2019-2020	N/A	N/A	33.37 / <sub>0</sub>	N/A
_	2020-2021	44	172	25.58%	52.50%
-	2020-2021	61	211	28.91%	53.53%
-	2021-2022	<u> </u>		20.91/6	33.33 /6
-	2018-2023	109	354	30.79%	56.84%
Analysis		ed proficiency rate of 3			
Analysis	combined proficiency		0.7 0 70 10 20.00 70	iower than the	State 5
-		ars 2015-2019 rate of	34.50% the school	ol's proficiency	decreased to
	28.91%, a decrease				
II.B Attain Gr	rade-level Proficiency	y- All Students Resid	ent District (St P	aul) Comparis	on
Performan				Point	Points
ce Rating	MCA-Math (Grades	3-6)		Value	Earned
Exemplary		ncy rate is greater than	10 percentage		
	points above the resid			2	
Satisfactor		ncy rate exceeds the r	esident district	4	
y Not	average by up to 10 p	percentage points.		1	
Satisfactor	The school's proficier	ncy rate does not exce	ed the resident		
y	district average.	.5, 1410 4000 1101 0000		0	0
Results	J		Total	Urban	St Paul
		Proficient	Students	Percent	Percent
-	Year	Students	Tested	Proficient	Proficient
	Baseline 2015- 2018	105	371	28.30%	38.31%
ļ	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%	29.21%

	2018-2023	71	355	20.00%	31.81%
Analysis		ed proficiency rate of 2		lower than the	resident
	district's combined pr	oficiency rate of 31.81	%.		
Performan				Point	Points
ce Rating	MCA- Reading (Grad			Value	Earned
Exemplary		ncy rate is greater than	n 10 percentage		
Satisfactor	points above the resi	2			
Satisfactor	The school's proficier average by up to 10 p	1			
Not	average by up to 10 p	•			
Satisfactor	The school's proficier				
у	district average.	0	0		
Results		Urban	St Paul		
	Year	Proficient Students	Students Tested	Percent Proficient	Percent Proficient
	Baseline 2015-	Students	resteu	FIORCIER	FIORCIERI
	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%
	2020-2021	61	211	28.91%	35.14%
	2022-2023			20.9170	33.1470
		100	254	20.70%	27.269/
Analysis	2018-2023	109	354	30.79%	37.26%
Analysis The school's combined proficiency rate of 30.79% is 6.47% lower than the resident					
				ower man me r	esideni
III. All Racial		oficiency rate of 37.26	5%.		
Grade Level	district's combined pr and Economic Achie Focus Proficiency)	oficiency rate of 37.26 evement Gaps Betwe	een Students are	Closed (As M	
Grade Level	district's combined pr	oficiency rate of 37.26 evement Gaps Betwe	een Students are	Closed (As M	
Grade Level	district's combined pr and Economic Achie Focus Proficiency)	oficiency rate of 37.26 evement Gaps Betwe	een Students are	Closed (As M	
III.A Attain G Performan ce Rating	district's combined properties of the combined properties of the combined professional professio	oficiency rate of 37.26 evement Gaps Betwee ey- FRP Focus Group 3-6)	en Students are State Comparise	Closed (As M	easured by
III.A Attain G	district's combined properties and Economic Achie Focus Proficiency)  Grade-level Proficience  MCA-Math (Grades  The school's proficience	evement Gaps Betweent Gaps Betweent Gaps Brown  Ey-FRP Focus Group  3-6)  ncy rate is greater than	en Students are State Comparise	Closed (As Moon Point Value	easured by Points
Grade Level III.A Attain G Performan ce Rating Exemplary	district's combined properties and Economic Achie Focus Proficiency)  Grade-level Proficience  MCA-Math (Grades  The school's proficiency points above the state	evement Gaps Betweent Gaps Betweent Gaps Betweent Gaps Betweent Gaps Betweent Gaps Betweent Gaps Group Gaps Gaps Gaps Gaps Gaps Gaps Gaps Gap	een Students are State Comparise 10 percentage	Closed (As Moon	easured by Points
Grade Level III.A Attain G Performan ce Rating Exemplary Satisfactor	district's combined property and Economic Achie Focus Proficiency)  Trade-level Proficiency  MCA-Math (Grades  The school's proficient points above the state  The school's proficient prof	evement Gaps Betweent Gaps Betweent Gaps Betweent Gaps Betweent Gaps Betweent Gaps Betweent Gaps Group Gaps Gaps Gaps Gaps Gaps Gaps Gaps Gap	een Students are  State Compariso  10 percentage	Closed (As Moon Point Value	easured by Points
Grade Level III.A Attain G Performan ce Rating Exemplary	district's combined property and Economic Achie Focus Proficiency)  Trade-level Proficiency  MCA-Math (Grades  The school's proficient points above the state  The school's proficient up to 10 percentage	evement Gaps Betweent Gaps Betweent Gaps Betweent Gaps Betweent Gaps Betweent Gaps Betweent Gaps Group Gaps Gaps Gaps Gaps Gaps Gaps Gaps Gap	en Students are State Compariso 10 percentage state average by hool improves	Closed (As Moon Point Value	easured by Points
Grade Level III.A Attain G Performan ce Rating Exemplary Satisfactor y	district's combined property and Economic Achie Focus Proficiency)  Trade-level Proficiency  MCA-Math (Grades  The school's proficient points above the state  The school's proficient up to 10 percentage	evement Gaps Betweent Gaps Bet	en Students are State Compariso 10 percentage state average by hool improves	Closed (As Moon Point Value	easured by Points
Grade Level III.A Attain G Performan ce Rating Exemplary Satisfactor y Not	district's combined property and Economic Achie Focus Proficiency)  Grade-level Proficience  MCA-Math (Grades  The school's proficient points above the state up to 10 percentage its proficiency rate by the baseline year.	evement Gaps Betweent Gaps Group Gaps Gaps Gaps Gaps Gaps Gaps Gaps Gap	systate Comparise of 10 percentage state average by hool improves e points from	Closed (As Moon Point Value	easured by Points
Grade Level III.A Attain G Performan ce Rating Exemplary Satisfactor y	district's combined properties and Economic Achie Focus Proficiency)  Grade-level Proficience  MCA-Math (Grades  The school's proficient points above the state up to 10 percentage pits proficiency rate by the baseline year.  The school's proficiency rate by the sc	evement Gaps Betweent Gaps Group Gaps Gaps Gaps Gaps Gaps Gaps Gaps Gap	sen Students are  State Comparise  10 percentage  State average by thool improves e points from	Closed (As Moon Point Value 2	Points Earned
Grade Level III.A Attain G Performan ce Rating Exemplary  Satisfactor y  Not Satisfactor y	district's combined properties and Economic Achie Focus Proficiency)  Grade-level Proficience  MCA-Math (Grades  The school's proficient points above the state up to 10 percentage pits proficiency rate by the baseline year.  The school's proficiency rate by the sc	evement Gaps Betweent Gaps Group Gaps Gaps Gaps Gaps Gaps Gaps Gaps Gap	en Students are  State Compariso  10 percentage  state average by hool improves e points from  eed the state ge points.	Closed (As Moon Point Value 2	Points Earned
Grade Level III.A Attain G Performan ce Rating Exemplary Satisfactor y Not	district's combined properties and Economic Achie Focus Proficiency)  Grade-level Proficience  MCA-Math (Grades  The school's proficient points above the state up to 10 percentage pits proficiency rate by the baseline year.  The school's proficiency rate by the sc	evement Gaps Betweent Gaps Group Gaps Gaps Gaps Gaps Gaps Gaps Gaps Gap	sen Students are  State Comparise  10 percentage  State average by thool improves e points from	Closed (As Moon Point Value 2	Points Earned
Grade Level III.A Attain G Performan ce Rating Exemplary  Satisfactor y  Not Satisfactor y	district's combined properties and Economic Achie Focus Proficiency)  Trade-level Proficience  MCA-Math (Grades  The school's proficient points above the state  The school's proficient up to 10 percentage its proficiency rate by the baseline year.  The school's proficient average or improve by the school	evement Gaps Betweent Gaps Betweent Gaps Betweent Gaps Betweent Gaps Betweent Gaps Betweent Gaps Group Gaps Gaps Gaps Gaps Gaps Gaps Gaps Gap	en Students are  State Compariso  10 percentage  State average by chool improves e points from  ed the state ge points.  Total	Closed (As Moon Point Value 2 1 0 Urban	Points Earned  0 State
Grade Level III.A Attain G Performan ce Rating Exemplary  Satisfactor y  Not Satisfactor y	district's combined properties and Economic Achie Focus Proficiency)  Trade-level Proficience  MCA-Math (Grades  The school's proficient points above the state  The school's proficient up to 10 percentage pits proficiency rate by the baseline year.  The school's proficient average or improve by the school's proficient average or improve by the baseline 2015-	actionary rate of 37.26  Every FRP Focus Group  3-6)  Incy rate is greater than e average.  Incy rate exceeds the spoints AND/OR the screat least 10 percentage at least 10 percentage	sys.  State Compariso  10 percentage  State average by hool improves e points from  ed the state ge points.  Total  Students  Tested	Point Value  2  1  0 Urban Percent Proficient	Points Earned  0 State Percent Proficient
Grade Level III.A Attain G Performan ce Rating Exemplary  Satisfactor y  Not Satisfactor y	district's combined properties and Economic Achie Focus Proficiency)  Grade-level Proficience  MCA-Math (Grades  The school's proficient points above the state of the school's proficient proficient proficiency rate by the baseline year.  The school's proficient average or improve by the school's proficient proficient proficient proficient proficient proficient proficiency rate by the baseline year.  The school's proficient pr	acceptance of 37.26  Every FRP Focus Group  3-6)  Incy rate is greater than e average.  Incy rate exceeds the spoints AND/OR the screat least 10 percentage at l	en Students are  State Compariso  10 percentage  Itate average by hool improves e points from  ed the state ge points.  Total Students Tested	Closed (As Moon Point Value  2  1  0 Urban Percent Proficient 27.79%	Points Earned  O State Percent Proficient  43.10%
Grade Level III.A Attain G Performan ce Rating Exemplary  Satisfactor y  Not Satisfactor y	district's combined property and Economic Achie Focus Proficiency)  Trade-level Proficiency  MCA-Math (Grades  The school's proficient points above the state The school's proficient up to 10 percentage its proficiency rate by the baseline year.  The school's proficient average or improve by the baseline 2015-2018  2018-2019	evement Gaps Betweent Gaps Group Gaps Gaps Gaps Gaps Gaps Gaps Gaps Gap	sys.  Seen Students are  State Compariso  10 percentage  State average by shool improves e points from  ed the state ge points.  Total Students Tested  367 144	Point Value  2  1  0 Urban Percent Proficient  27.79% 29.17%	Points Earned  O State Percent Proficient  43.10% 37.59%
Grade Level III.A Attain G Performan ce Rating Exemplary  Satisfactor y  Not Satisfactor y	district's combined properties and Economic Achie Focus Proficiency)  Grade-level Proficience  MCA-Math (Grades  The school's proficient up to 10 percentage pits proficiency rate by the baseline year.  The school's proficient average or improve by the baseline 2015-2018  2018-2019  2019-2020	according to the server of the	sys.  Seen Students are  State Compariso  10 percentage  State average by  shool improves  e points from  seed the state  ge points.  Total  Students  Tested  367  144  N/A	Point Value  2  1  0 Urban Percent Proficient  27.79%  29.17%  N/A	Points Earned  O State Percent Proficient  43.10% 37.59% N/A
Grade Level III.A Attain G Performan ce Rating Exemplary  Satisfactor y  Not Satisfactor y	district's combined properties and Economic Achie Focus Proficiency)  Trade-level Proficiency  MCA-Math (Grades  The school's proficient points above the state of the school's proficient proficiency rate by the baseline year.  The school's proficiency rate by the baseline year.  The school's proficient proficient proficiency rate by the baseline year.  The school's proficient proficient proficiency rate by the baseline year.  The school's proficient proficie	arcy rate does not exceed at least 10 percentage at least 10 percent	sen Students are state Compariso a 10 percentage state average by shool improves e points from sed the state ge points. Total Students Tested  367 144 N/A 172	Point Value  2  1  0 Urban Percent Proficient  27.79% 29.17% N/A 14.53%	Points Earned  O State Percent Proficient  43.10% 37.59% N/A 22.70%
Grade Level III.A Attain G Performan ce Rating Exemplary  Satisfactor y  Not Satisfactor y	district's combined properties and Economic Achie Focus Proficiency)  Trade-level Proficiency  MCA-Math (Grades  The school's proficiency to 10 percentage its proficiency rate by the baseline year.  The school's proficiency rate by the baseline year.  The school's proficiency rate by the baseline year.  Year  Baseline 2015-2018  2018-2019  2019-2020  2020-2021  2021-2022	according to the server of the	sys.  Seen Students are  State Compariso  10 percentage  State average by  shool improves  e points from  seed the state  ge points.  Total  Students  Tested  367  144  N/A	Point Value  2  1  0 Urban Percent Proficient  27.79%  29.17%  N/A	Points Earned  O State Percent Proficient  43.10% 37.59% N/A
Grade Level III.A Attain G Performan ce Rating Exemplary  Satisfactor y  Not Satisfactor y	district's combined properties and Economic Achie Focus Proficiency)  Trade-level Proficiency  MCA-Math (Grades  The school's proficient points above the state of the school's proficient proficiency rate by the baseline year.  The school's proficiency rate by the baseline year.  The school's proficient proficient proficiency rate by the baseline year.  The school's proficient proficient proficiency rate by the baseline year.  The school's proficient proficie	arcy rate does not exceed at least 10 percentage at least 10 percent	sen Students are state Compariso a 10 percentage state average by shool improves e points from sed the state ge points. Total Students Tested  367 144 N/A 172	Point Value  2  1  0 Urban Percent Proficient  27.79% 29.17% N/A 14.53%	Points Earned  O State Percent Proficient  43.10% 37.59% N/A 22.70%

combined proficiency rate of 32.36%.  From the baseline years 2015-2019 rate of 27.79% the school's proficiency decreased to					
13.74%, a decrease of 14.05%.					
D.1.1.					
Points Earned					
0					
State					
Percent					
Proficient					
43.09%					
41.13%					
N/A					
32.40%					
32.81%					
02.0170					
36.97%					
ate's					
ecreased to					
Points					
Earned					
1					
St Paul					
Percent					
<b>Proficient</b>					
26.25%					
22.58%					
N/A					
9.70%					
16.35%					
13.00,0					
19.46%					

Analysis		ed proficiency rate of 2 oficiency rate of 19.46		igher than the	resident
Performan ce Rating	MCA- Reading (Grad	MCA- Reading (Grades 3-6)			
Exemplary	The school's proficier	ncy rate is greater thar	n 10 percentage	_	
Satisfactor	points above the resident		esident district	2	
y	The school's proficiency rate exceeds the resident district average by up to 10 percentage points.			1	
Not					
Satisfactor	The school's proficier district average.	0	4		
Results	district average.	0 Urban	St Paul		
110001100		Total Students	Percent	Percent	
	Year	Students	Tested	Proficient	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%	21.73%
	2022-2023				
	2018-2023	109	354	30.79%	24.20%
Analysis		ed proficiency rate of 3		igher than the	resident
III C Attain C	district's combined pr Brade-level Proficienc	oficiency rate of 24.20			
III.C Attaili C	raue-level Froncienc	y- EL Focus Group s	state Companisor		
<b>D</b>				<b>5</b> · ·	5
Performan	MCA-Math (Grades	3-6)		Point Value	Points Farned
Performan ce Rating Exemplary	MCA-Math (Grades : The school's proficier	<b>3-6)</b> ncy rate is greater than	n 10 percentage	Point Value	Points Earned
ce Rating Exemplary	The school's proficier points above the state	ncy rate is greater than a average.			
ce Rating Exemplary Satisfactor	The school's proficier points above the state. The school's proficier	ncy rate is greater than e average. ncy rate exceeds the s	tate average by	Value	
ce Rating Exemplary	The school's proficier points above the state The school's proficier up to 10 percentage p	ncy rate is greater than e average. ncy rate exceeds the so points AND/OR the sc	state average by hool improves	Value	
ce Rating Exemplary Satisfactor y	The school's proficier points above the state The school's proficier up to 10 percentage p	ncy rate is greater than e average. ncy rate exceeds the s	state average by hool improves	Value	
ce Rating Exemplary Satisfactor y Not	The school's proficier points above the state. The school's proficier up to 10 percentage pits proficiency rate by the baseline year.	ncy rate is greater than e average. ncy rate exceeds the so points AND/OR the sc at least 10 percentag	state average by hool improves e points from	Value 2	
ce Rating Exemplary Satisfactor y	The school's proficier points above the state. The school's proficier up to 10 percentage pits proficiency rate by the baseline year.  The school's proficier.	ncy rate is greater than e average. Incy rate exceeds the society and a second that a second that is a secon	state average by hool improves e points from	Value 2 1	Earned
ce Rating Exemplary Satisfactor y Not	The school's proficier points above the state. The school's proficier up to 10 percentage pits proficiency rate by the baseline year.  The school's proficier.	ncy rate is greater than e average. ncy rate exceeds the so points AND/OR the sc at least 10 percentag	state average by hool improves e points from	Value 2	Earned 0
ce Rating Exemplary  Satisfactor y  Not Satisfactor y	The school's proficier points above the state. The school's proficier up to 10 percentage pits proficiency rate by the baseline year.  The school's proficier average or improve by	ncy rate is greater than e average. ncy rate exceeds the so oints AND/OR the so at least 10 percentagency rate does not except at least 10 percental Proficient	etate average by hool improves e points from eed the state ge points.  Total Students	Value  2  1  0 Urban Percent	Earned  0  State Percent
ce Rating Exemplary  Satisfactor y  Not Satisfactor y	The school's proficier points above the state. The school's proficier up to 10 percentage pits proficiency rate by the baseline year.  The school's proficier average or improve both Year	ncy rate is greater than e average. ncy rate exceeds the societs AND/OR the societat least 10 percentage at least	etate average by hool improves e points from eed the state ge points.	Value 2 1 0 Urban	Earned 0 State
ce Rating Exemplary  Satisfactor y  Not Satisfactor y	The school's proficier points above the state. The school's proficier up to 10 percentage pits proficiency rate by the baseline year.  The school's proficier average or improve both Year  Baseline 2015-	ncy rate is greater than e average. ncy rate exceeds the so oints AND/OR the so at least 10 percentagency rate does not except at least 10 percenta	etate average by hool improves e points from eed the state ge points.  Total Students Tested	Value  2  1  0 Urban Percent Proficient	0 State Percent Proficient
ce Rating Exemplary  Satisfactor y  Not Satisfactor y	The school's proficier points above the state. The school's proficier up to 10 percentage pits proficiency rate by the baseline year.  The school's proficier average or improve box Year  Baseline 2015-2018	ncy rate is greater than e average. Incy rate exceeds the sociated AND/OR the sociat least 10 percentage at least	etate average by hool improves e points from eed the state ge points.  Total Students Tested	Value  2  1  0 Urban Percent Proficient  21.31%	0 State Percent Proficient
ce Rating Exemplary  Satisfactor y  Not Satisfactor y	The school's proficier points above the state. The school's proficier up to 10 percentage pits proficiency rate by the baseline year.  The school's proficier average or improve both Year  Baseline 2015-	ncy rate is greater than e average. ncy rate exceeds the so oints AND/OR the so at least 10 percentagency rate does not except at least 10 percenta	etate average by hool improves e points from eed the state ge points.  Total Students Tested	Value  2  1  0 Urban Percent Proficient	0 State Percent Proficient
ce Rating Exemplary  Satisfactor y  Not Satisfactor y	The school's proficier points above the state. The school's proficier up to 10 percentage pits proficiency rate by the baseline year.  The school's proficier average or improve box average or improve box 2018—2018—2018—2018—2019	ncy rate is greater than e average. ncy rate exceeds the sooints AND/OR the so at least 10 percentagency rate does not except at least 10 percentagency at least 10 percentage	etate average by hool improves e points from eed the state ge points.  Total Students Tested  183	Value  2  1  0 Urban Percent Proficient  21.31% 24.10%	0 State Percent Proficient 26.23% 21.84%
ce Rating Exemplary  Satisfactor y  Not Satisfactor y	The school's proficier points above the state. The school's proficier up to 10 percentage pits proficiency rate by the baseline year.  The school's proficier average or improve box average or improve box 2018—2018—2018—2019—2020	ncy rate is greater than e average. ncy rate exceeds the so points AND/OR the so at least 10 percentage ncy rate does not exceed at least 10 percentage at least	tate average by hool improves e points from eed the state ge points.  Total Students Tested  183  83  N/A	Value  2  1  0 Urban Percent Proficient  21.31% 24.10% N/A	0 State Percent Proficient  26.23% 21.84% N/A
ce Rating Exemplary  Satisfactor y  Not Satisfactor y	The school's proficier points above the state. The school's proficier up to 10 percentage pits proficiency rate by the baseline year.  The school's proficier average or improve be seen average or improve be 2018-2018 2018-2019 2019-2020 2020-2021	ncy rate is greater than e average. ncy rate exceeds the so points AND/OR the so at least 10 percentage ncy rate does not exceed at least 10 percentage of the solution of the	tate average by hool improves e points from eed the state ge points.  Total Students Tested  183  83  N/A  110	Value  2  1  0 Urban Percent Proficient  21.31% 24.10% N/A 8.18%	0 State Percent Proficient 26.23% 21.84% N/A 9.20%
ce Rating Exemplary  Satisfactor y  Not Satisfactor y	The school's proficier points above the state. The school's proficier up to 10 percentage pits proficiency rate by the baseline year.  The school's proficier average or improve box average or improve box 2018-2018 2018-2019 2019-2020 2020-2021 2021-2022	ncy rate is greater than e average. ncy rate exceeds the so points AND/OR the so at least 10 percentage ncy rate does not exceed at least 10 percentage of the solution of the	tate average by hool improves e points from eed the state ge points.  Total Students Tested  183  83  N/A  110	Value  2  1  0 Urban Percent Proficient  21.31% 24.10% N/A 8.18%	0 State Percent Proficient 26.23% 21.84% N/A 9.20%
ce Rating Exemplary  Satisfactor y  Not Satisfactor y	The school's proficier points above the state. The school's proficier up to 10 percentage pits proficiency rate by the baseline year.  The school's proficier average or improve be seen as a seen a s	ncy rate is greater than e average. ncy rate exceeds the so points AND/OR the so at least 10 percentage at least 1	tate average by hool improves e points from eed the state ge points.  Total Students Tested  183  83  N/A  110  126	Value  2  1  0 Urban Percent Proficient  21.31%  24.10%  N/A  8.18%  11.11%	0 State Percent Proficient 26.23% 21.84% N/A 9.20% 15.68%
ce Rating Exemplary  Satisfactor y  Not Satisfactor y Results	The school's proficier points above the state. The school's proficier up to 10 percentage pits proficiency rate by the baseline year.  The school's proficier average or improve be seen asseline 2015-2018  2018-2019  2019-2020  2021-2022  2021-2022  2021-2023  The school's combined proficiency	rate is greater than e average.  recy rate exceeds the social percentage at least 10 percen	tate average by hool improves e points from eed the state ge points.  Total Students Tested  183  83  N/A  110  126  209  6.27% is 2.49% lo	Value  2  1  0 Urban Percent Proficient  21.31%  24.10%  N/A  8.18%  11.11%  16.27% ower than the seconds.	0 State Percent Proficient  26.23%  21.84%  N/A  9.20%  15.68%  18.76% state's
ce Rating Exemplary  Satisfactor y  Not Satisfactor y Results	The school's proficier points above the state. The school's proficier up to 10 percentage pits proficiency rate by the baseline year.  The school's proficier average or improve be seen asseline 2015-2018  2018-2019  2019-2020  2021-2022  2021-2022  2021-2023  The school's combined proficiency	rate is greater than e average. The average are exceeds the special percentage at least 10	tate average by hool improves e points from eed the state ge points.  Total Students Tested  183  83  N/A  110  126  209  6.27% is 2.49% lo	Value  2  1  0 Urban Percent Proficient  21.31%  24.10%  N/A  8.18%  11.11%  16.27% ower than the seconds.	0 State Percent Proficient  26.23%  21.84%  N/A  9.20%  15.68%  18.76% state's

Performan ce Rating	MCA- Reading (Grad		Point Value	Points Earned	
Exemplary	points above the state			2	
Satisfactor		ncy rate exceeds the s			
У		points AND/OR the sc at least 10 percentag			
	the baseline year.	e points from	1		
Not	•				
Satisfactor	The school's proficier		0	4	
Results	average or improve b	0 Urban	State		
rtoouno		Percent	Percent		
	Year	Students	Tested	Proficient	Proficient
	Baseline 2015-	4.5	400	04.500/	40.000/
	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 21	110 126	13.64%	9.10%
	2021-2022	21	120	16.67%	13.96%
	2022-2023			40.0004	
Amaluaia	2018-2023	39	209	18.66%	15.21%
Analysis	combined proficiency	ed proficiency rate of 1	18.00% IS 3.45% I	igner man me	state s
		ars 2015-2019 rate of	24.59% the school	ol's proficiency	decreased to
	16.67%, a decrease	of 7.92%			
III.D Attain G	Frade-level Proficienc	y- EL Focus Group F	Resident District	Comparison	
Performan ce Rating	MCA-Math (Grades	3-6)		Point Value	Points Earned
Exemplary		ncy rate is greater than	n 10 percentage		
	points above the resid			2	
Satisfactor		ncy rate exceeds the r	esident district	1	
Not	average by up to 10 p	bercentage points.			
Satisfactor	The school's proficier	ncy rate does not exce	ed the resident		
у	district average.			0	1
Results		Dueficions	Total Students	Urban	St Paul
	Year	Proficient Students	Tested	Percent Proficient	Percent Proficient
	Baseline 2015-	- Ctudoc		11011010111	
	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%	13.64%
	2022-2023				
	2018-2023	34	209	16.27%	15.79%
Analysis	The school's combine district's combined pr	ed proficiency rate of 1		igher than the	resident

Performan ce Rating	MCA- Reading (Gra	des 3-6)		Point Value	Points Earned
Exemplary	The school's proficient points above the resi	ncy rate is greater that	n 10 percentage	2	
Satisfactor	The school's proficie	ncy rate exceeds the r	esident district	-	
y Not	average by up to 10	percentage points.		1	
Satisfactor	The school's proficie	ncy rate does not exce	ed the resident		
у	district average.			0	1
Results		Proficient	Total Students	Urban Percent	St Paul Percent
	Year	Students	Tested	Proficient	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 21	110 126	13.64%	7.20%
	2021-2022	21	120	16.67%	11.03%
	2022-2023				
Anabraia	2018-2023	39	209	18.66%	12.49%
Analysis		ed proficiency rate of forciency rate of 12.49		ligner than the	resident
IV. All Stude	nts are Ready for Ca			owth)	
	Exceed National Gro				ligh Growth
Performan				Point	Points
ce Rating		IAP- Math (Grades K		Value	Earned
Exemplary	•	t of students below gra	ade level will		
Satisfactor		pected growth target. dents below grade leve	al will make their	4	
V	NWEA expected grow	•	a will make their	2	
Not					
Satisfactor		t of students below gra	ide level make	0	4
Results	their NWEA expected	d growth target.		0 Percent	4
Results				Below	
				Grade	
		Students Below		Level	
		Grade Level		Meeting or Exceeding	
		Meeting or	Total	NWEA	
		Exceeding NWEA	Students	MAP	
	Year	MAP Growth Target	Below Grade Level Tested	Growth Target	
	Baseline 2016-	raiyet	Level lested	raryet	
	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				
	2018-2023	256	369	69.38%	

Analysis	The 2019-2023 percent of students meeting or exceeding their NWEA MAP Math growth target is 69.38%.				
Performan ce Rating	Growth on NWEA M		Point Value	Points Earned	
Exemplary	·	t of students below grapected growth target.	ade level will	4	
Satisfactor y		dents below grade leve	el will make their	2	
Not Satisfactor	Less than 50 percent their NWEA expected	t of students below gra	ade level make	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-		Level rested		
	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 2022-2023	94	186	50.54%	
	2022-2023	192	355	54.08%	
Analysis		ent of students meeting			
Performan ce Rating	Growth on NWEA M	IAP- Math (Grades K	-6)	Point Value	Points Earned
Exemplary	At least 50 percent of achieve their NWEA grade level who achieved the at least 150 percent of the second sec	4			
Satisfactor y	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				
Not	120-149 percent of the NWEA target growth.  Less than 50 percent of the students below grade level			2	
Satisfactor y	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				
D	target growth.	T		0	2
Results		Aggregate of Actual RIT	Aggregate of	Percent of	Percent of Students Below Grade
	Year	Growth Points Made	Expected RIT Growth Points	Growth Made	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				
	2018-2023	4690	3194	146.84%	69.38%
Analysis		oined average growth cent of students below			
	69.38%.	oon or oragonic bolov	r grade level who	made expected	2 g. o
Performan				Point	Points
ce Rating		AP- Reading (Grade		Value	Earned
Exemplary		f the students below g growth target AND the			
		eve their NWEA growt			
	· ·	of the NWEA target gr	•	4	
Satisfactor		f the students below g			
У		growth target AND the eve their NWEA growt			
		ne NWEA target growt		2	
Not	Less than 50 percent	of the students below	grade level		
Satisfactor		expected growth targe			
У		e level who achieve the less than 120 percer			
	target growth.	71000 triair 120 percer	it of the fave.	0	4
Results	0				Percent of
					Students
					Below Grade
		Aggregate of			Level Who
		Actual RIT	Aggregate of	Percent of	Made
	Year	Growth Points Made	Expected RIT Growth Points	Growth Made	Expected Growth
	Baseline 2016-	IVIAUC	STOWLIT FULLS	Made	OTOWIII
	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				
	2018-2023	2920	1870	156.15%	54.08%
Analysis		oined average growth cent of students below			
IV.B Meet or	Exceed National Gro	wth Norms-Student	s at or Above Gr	ade Level	

Performan			Point	Points	
ce Rating	Growth on NWEA N	IAP- Math (Grades K	-6)	Value	Earned
Exemplary	More than 60 percen	t of students at or abo	ve grade level		
		expected growth targe		4	
Satisfactor	50-60 percent of student the NWEA expected	dents at or above grad	e level will make	2	
Not	the NWEA expected	growth target.		2	
Satisfactor	Less than 50 percent	t of students at or abov	e grade level		
у	will make the NWEA	expected growth targe	et.	0	2
Results		Students At/Above Grade	Total Students	Percent At/Above Grade Level Meeting or Exceeding NWEA	
		Level Meeting or Exceeding NWEA	At/Above	MAP	
		MAP Growth	Grade Level	Growth	
	Year	Target	Tested	Target	
	Baseline 2016-	00	454	50.040/	
	2018	89	151	58.94%	
	2018-2019	48	77	62.34%	
	2019-2020	N/A	N/A	N/A	
	2020-2021 2021-2022	N/A 50	N/A	N/A	
	2021-2022	50	98	51.02%	
		98	175	E6 000/	
Analysis	2018-2023 The 2019-2023 perce	ent of students meeting	175 a or exceeding the	56.00% Sir NWFA	
7 maryolo	MAP Math growth tar		g or oxocoding the	,	
Performan				Point	Points
ce Rating		IAP- Reading (Grade		Value	Earned
Exemplary		t of students at or abo			
Satisfactor		expected growth targed dents at or above grad		4	
V	the NWEA expected		C IGVEL WIII IIIANE	2	
Not					
Satisfactor		t of students at or above			•
Results	will make the NVVEA	expected growth targe	et.	0 Percent	2
Results				At/Above Grade Level	
		Students At/Above Grade Level Meeting or Exceeding NWEA MAP Growth	Total Students At/Above Grade Level	Meeting or Exceeding NWEA MAP Growth	
	Year	Target	Tested	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			
	2018-2023	106	190	55.79%
Analysis	The 2019-2023 perce	ent of students meeting	g or exceeding the	eir NWEA
	MAP Reading growth target is 55.79%.			

These are the Climate Performance Indicators. They are 6.00% of the points possible.

V. The School Conditions Promote a Climate of Engagement			
V.A Attenda	nce Rates		
Performan ce Rating	Attendance Rate (Grades K-6)	Point Value	Points Earned
Exemplary	At least 95 percent attendance rate.	2	
Satisfactor			
у	90-94 percent attendance rate.	1	
Not			
Satisfactor			
у	Below 90 percent attendance rate.	0	2
Deculto			

Results	Year	Attendance Rate
	Baseline 2015-	
	2017	95.89%
	2019-2020	92.40%
	2020-2021	99.01%
	2021-2022	98.68%
	2022-2023	
	2023-2024	
	2017-2022	96.70%
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	

Analysis The 2019-2024 combined average attendance rate is 96.70%.

V.B Parent Satisfaction					
Performan ce Rating	5-Point Parent Satis	5-Point Parent Satisfaction Survey			Points Earned
Exemplary		At least 90 percent of parents agree (4) or strongly agree (5) that they are satisfied with the school.			
Satisfactor y	75-89 percent of pare that they are satisfied	ents agree (4) or stron d with the school.	gly agree (5)	1	
Not Satisfactor	Less than 75 percent of parents agree (4) or strongly agree (5) that they are satisfied with the school.			0	2
Results	Year	Number of Parents Agreeing or Strongly Agreeing	Total Number of Parents	Parent Satisfactio n Survey Percent	Percent Participatio n of Parent Responden ts
	Baseline 2016- 2018	257	281	91.46%	79.83%

		•	•		
	2018-2019	169	180	93.89%	94.24%
	2019-2020	197	215	91.63%	100.00%
	2020-2021	220	228	96.49%	76.51%
	2021-2022	163	175	93.14%	
	2022-2023				
	2018-2023	749	798	93.86%	113.35%
Analysis	The 2019-2024 comb	pined average parent	satisfaction rate is	94.06%.	
V.C Mobility		Ţ,			
Performan ce Rating	Mobility (Grades K-			Point Value	Points Earned
Exemplary	after October 1 based	Fewer than 10 percent of students transfer out of school after October 1 based on most recent MDE Mobility Report data available at the MDE Data and Analytics site.			
Satisfactor y		idents transfer out of s		1	
Not Satisfactor	More than 15 percent of students transfer out of school after October 1.			0	2
Results	Year	Number of Transfers Out	Total Number of Students	Percent Transferrin g Out	
	Baseline 2015- 2017	91	585	15.56%	
	2019-2020	20	417	4.80%	
	2020-2021	15	444	3.38%	
	2021-2022	13	340	3.82%	
	2022-2023				
	2023-2024				
ĺ	2017-2022	48	1201	4.00%	

These are the Operations Performance Indicators. They are 20.00% of the total Performance Framework points possible.

The 2019-2024 combined average mobility rate is 4.00%.

VI. School is	VI. School is Compliant with Contract and Statute				
VI.A Complia	ance				
Performan ce Rating	Compliance	Point Value	Points Earned		
Exemplary	No infractions.	20			
Satisfactor y	No more than three infractions AND any infraction is resolved by assigned deadline.	10			
Not Satisfactor y	More than three infractions or infractions not resolved by assigned deadline.	0	20		
Analysis	The school had no compliance infractions.				

Analysis

## These are the Finance Performance Indicators. They are 18.00% of the total Performance Framework points.

VII. School is	s Financially Solvent	/Sustainable			
VII.A Financ	e Awards				
Performan ce Rating	Awards			Point Value	Points Earned
Exemplary	NEO Stewardship Av	vard in Finance Recip	ient.	4	
Satisfactor	MDE Einenee Award	Desirient in EV 2024		•	
Not	MDE Finance Award	Recipient in FY 2024	•	2	
Satisfactor					
у	Not an MDE or NEO			0	4
	The school was a MD		cipient in FY22 and	d NEO Stewar	dship Award
Analysis	for FY21 for FY20 rep	oorting.			
VII.B Fund B	Salance				
Performan				Point	Points
ce Rating	Fund Balance	0 1 2	(000()	Value	Earned
Exemplary	Reserve is at least th measured by end of y	•	ures (20%) as	10	
Satisfactor	Reserve is enough to		l as measured by	10	
y	end of year reserves		rao moadarda by	5	
Not	•				
Satisfactor	Reserve is less than	one full payroll as me	asured by end of	_	
У	year reserves.		000	0	10
Results	Fund Balance	Expenditures	SOD Calculation		
	\$3,823,203	\$6,811,903	56.13%		
	The school has built a	a fund balance reserv	e of 56.13% in		
Analysis	2021-2022				
VII.C Financ	ial Audit				
Performan				Point	Points
ce Rating	Financial Audit			Value	Earned
Exemplary	No findings cited in the audit.			4	
Satisfactor y	No more than one finding (nonmaterial) cited in the audit in FY 2024.			2	
Not					
Satisfactor		9 11 0 12			_
У	More than one finding			0	4
Analysis	The school had no m	aterial audit findings i	n 2020-2021.		

#### **Contract Renewal and Intervention**

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.

#### **Summary and Analysis**

Based on information available to date, Urban Academy Charter School has earned 73 points out of a total of 100 points possible, 73.00%.

Based on information available to date, Urban Academy would be automatically recommended for a three-year or five-year contract renewal.

three year or hive year contract for lower.	
Academic Performance Points Earned	29
Academic Performance Total Points Possible	56
Academic Performance Percent of Points Earned	51.79%
Academic Performance Percent of Total Framework	
Points	56.00%
	1 _
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	0.000/
Points	6.00%
Occupies Defended Deist Freed	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	20.000/
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	73
Performance Framework Total Points Possible	100
Performance Framework Percent of Total Points	73.00%