Minnesota Department of

Educati🔴n

Achievement and Integration Plan
July 1, 2017 to June 30, 2020

This document reflects Achievement and Integration requirements included in Minnesota Statutes, sections 124D.861 and 124D.862 as well as Minnesota Rules 3535.0100-0180.

District ISD# and Name: Enter text here. District's Integration Status: Choose status.

Superintendent: John Dotson
Phone: 320-523-1031
E-mail: john.dotson@bold.k12.mn.us

Plan submitted by: James Menton
Title: High School Principal
Phone: 320-523-1031
E-mail: jim.menton@bold.k12.mn.us

School Board Approval (Minn. Stat. § 124D.861 Subd. 4)

We certify that we have formally approved and will implement the attached Achievement and Integration plan as part of our district's comprehensive World's Best Workforce plan and in compliance with applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations.

Superintendent: John Dotson
Signature: _____   Date Signed: _____

School Board Chair: Russ Lesniak
Signature: _____   Date Signed: _____

COVERSHEET

Submitting This Plan
Submit this completed plan template as a word document to MDE by March 15, 2017 for review and approval (Minn. Stat. § 124D.861 Subd. 4). Email it to MDE.integration@state.mn.us. Scan the signed coversheet and attach that to your email as a separate PDF.

Collaborating Districts Racially isolated districts must partner with adjoining districts on cross-district student integration activities (Minn. Rule 3535.0170). List your collaborating districts here, adding lines as needed. If your integration collaborative has a name, enter it here: West Central Achievement & Integration Collaborative**.**

1. ISD # 2534 BOLD A - Adjoining
2. ISD # 775 KMS A - Adjoining
3. ISD # 2180 MACCRAY A - Adjoining
4. ISD # 129 Montevideo V - Voluntary
5. ISD # 347 Willmar RI - Racially Isolated
6. ISD # 345 New London-Spicer A - Adjoining
7. ISD # 2396 ACGC A - Adjoining

Detailed directions and support for completing this plan are provided in the Achievement Integration Plan Guide available on the MDE Achievement and Integration page.

Plan Input Minnesota School Desegregation/Integration Rule 3535.0170 Subp. 2 requires racially isolated and adjoining districts to establish a multidistrict collaboration council (MDCC) to provide input on integration goals and to identify cross-district strategies to improve integration.

The rule also requires districts with a racially identifiable school (RIS) to convene a community collaboration council (CCC) to assist in developing integration goals and to identify ways of creating increased opportunities for integration at the RIS (Minn. Rules 3535.0160 Subp. 2).

List council members below and briefly describe the community planning process used for your district's plan and for your Racially Identifiable School (RIS), as applicable.

Multi-District Collaboration Council: Willmar: Carrie Thomas, Judi Sprung, Jon Konald, Lori Lockart, Kristin Dresler, Mark Miley, Paul Schmitz; ACGC: Sherri Broderius, Robin Wall, Kodi Goracke, Josh Wallestad; BOLD: John Dotson, Jim Menton, Megan Rettke; KMS: Martin Heidelberger, Ted Brown, Jeff Keil, Liz Hatfield; MACCRAY: Brian Koslofsky, Melissa Sparks; Montevideo: Dr. Luther Heller, Scott Hickey, Shawn Huntley, Bill Sprung; NLS: Paul Carlson, Kevin Acquard, Trish Perry

October, 2017: Superintendents, Principals, and Teachers gathered to review data and plan for next 3-year plan for 2017-2020. Decisions: maintain summer Gamma mathematics course as common collaborative activity; eliminate collaborative coordinator position so each district could direct local funds to best meet their needs, each district's leadership team would plan to include a mathematics goal which would incorporate Gamma as intervention while also deciding if they

wanted to include a reading goal.

November, 2017: Team of 7 Teachers and Principals, one representative from each district, met to discuss structure of Gamma summer program. Decisions: hire a team of teachers to serve as Gamma coordinators for next 3-year plan; offer course two times during summer: one hosted in NLS and one in Willmar, revisions would be made to content to connect more to field trip experience.

December, 2017: Superintendents met to finalize decisions about Gamma and discuss plans for moving district plans forward.

Post to District Website Prior to your district's annual AI and World's Best Workforce meeting, you must post this plan to the district website (Minn. Stat. § 124D.861 Subd. 3 (b)). Please provide the URL where your district's Achievement and Integration plan is posted. https://bold.k12.mn.us/our-schools/district/wbwf-worlds-best-work-force/

Plan Goals This plan must contain goals for reducing disparities in academic achievement among all students and specific categories of students (excluding the categories of gender, disability, and English learners), and for increasing racial and economic integration (Minn. Stat. § 124D.861 Subd.2 (c)).

GOAL # 1: The proficiency gap between the FRP and Non-FRP students enrolled the full academic year for all grades tested within BOLD ISD #2534 on all state reading accountability tests (MCA, MTAS) will **DECREASE** as follows within our District, by **INCREASING** the proficiency of FRP and Non-FRP student groups as follows within our District

Table A: Reading Achievement Proficiency Rate Gaps Between Non-FRP and FRP

BOLD	Baseline data, 2016	Year 1 2017-18	Year 2 2018-19	Year 3 2019-20	*Total Change*
Non-FRP	61.3%	65%	67%	69%	*8.7%*
FRP	44.0%	52%	56%	60%	*16.0%*
Gap	17.3%	13%	11%	9%	*8.3%*

Aligns with WBWF area: All racial and economic achievement gaps between students are closed.

Objective 1.1: To close the reading achievement gap, the elementary teaching staff will collaborate on the implementation of a balanced literacy approach to deepen student learning related to Minnesota Academic Standards for Reading

Objective 1.2: To close the reading achievement gap, the secondary teaching staff will

collaborate across content areas to explicitly teach effective reading strategies for informational text related to Minnesota Academic Standards for Reading.

GOAL # 2: The proficiency GAP between the FRP and Non-FRP students enrolled the full academic year for all grades tested within BOLD ISD # 2534 on all state Math accountability tests (MCA, MTAS) will ***DECREASE*** as follows within our District (see table B), by ***INCREASING*** the proficiency of FRP and Non-FRP student groups as follows within our District:

Table B: Mathematics Achievement Proficiency Rate Gaps Between Non-FRP and FRP

BOLD	Baseline data, 2016	Year 1 2017-18	Year 2 2018-19	Year 3 2019-20	*Total Change*
Non-FRP	66.5%	70%	72%	73%	*6.5%*
FRP	64.1%	69%	71.5%	73%	*8.9%*
Gap	2.4%	1%	.5%	0%	*2.4%*

Aligns with WBWF area: All racial and economic achievement gaps between students are closed.

Objective 2.1: To continue progress in closing the mathematics achievement gap, teachers will continue to eliminate tracking in mathematics classrooms and will develop more rigorous classroom assessments and activities to deepen student learning related to Minnesota Academic Standards for Mathematics.

INTERVENTIONS

Directions Eligible districts may use AI revenue to pursue racial and economic integration and student achievement through interventions listed in the *Type of Intervention* drop-down menus below (Minn. Stat. § 124D.861 Subd. 2). Provide the information requested for each intervention.

Requirement for this section: At least one intervention must be designed and implemented to bring together students from the racially isolated district and students from that district's adjoining AI districts (Minn. Rule 3535.0170).

Copy and paste the text below for each intervention. In your annual AI budget use the intervention names below in the budget narrative for expenditures supporting that intervention.

Intervention 1 Gamma, Summer Middle Grades Mathematics Course

Priority Area: Instruction and Assessment

Objective this intervention supports: 2.1

Type of Intervention: Career/college readiness and rigorous coursework for underserved

students, including students enrolled in ALC.

Narrative description of the critical features of the intervention. 1) Summer mathematics course open to all students in seven districts of the West Central A&I Collaborative (WCAIC); 2) Students receive learning experiences 4 hours per day for 8 days and 1 all day field trip to see mathematics applied and includes lunch and afternoon snack (NLS) or breakfast and lunch (Willmar); 3) Uses hands-on problem solving activities with emphasis on multiple and varied representations of concepts that encourages elaboration, questioning, and self-explanation: activities designed to be different from academic year mathematics learning experiences; 4) Focuses on a balance between surface, deep, and transfer learning to maximize student's ability to effectively apply learning to classroom mathematics learning during academic year; 5) Staff includes teachers from all seven WCAIC districts who plan and collaborate during academic year on delivery of activities to help strengthen mathematics benchmarks identified as areas of low performance across participating districts: half of student learning experiences reflect content which students struggled with in prior year grade and half reflect content which is new learning related to grade level following year; 6) Coordinated by a team of mathematics educators selected from the participating districts; 7) Students transported by individual districts to location of summer Gamma course.
Grade levels to be served: 6, 7, 8

Location of services: June, New London Spicer School District; August, Willmar School District

Assessment(s) used to inform instructional decision-making: State Accountability Benchmark Reports across districts

Evidence of research-base: Indicate the rigorous, objective research analysis that provides evidence this intervention is proven to improve student achievement. A) John Hattie's meta-analysis published in Visible Learning for Mathematics; What Works Best to Optimize Student Learning (2017) – Creativity Programs on achievement effect size .65, Problem solving teaching effect size .61, Cooperative versus individualistic learning effect size .59; B) Hattie & Donoghue. 2016. "Learning Strategies: a synthesis and conceptual model". npj Science of Learning 1, 16013; published online, 10 August 2016 – Skill learning effect size .75, Transfer learning effect size 1.09, Acquiring surface learning effect size .63; C) NCTM. 2014. Principles to Actions: Ensuring Mathematics Success For All – Focused on implementation of 8 evidence-based instructional practices (p. 10) to elicit student mathematics learning practices (p. 8)

Key Indicators of Progress (KIPS)

List the key indicators of progress for this intervention and how your district will measure the yearly target for each indicator.	Target 2018	Target 2019	Target 2020
Student pre- and post-attitude survey with change to growth and positive	25%	40%	60%

Intervention # 2 Elementary Reading Deep Learning
This intervention supports the following goal objective: Objective 1.1

Type of Intervention: Career/college readiness and rigorous coursework for underserved students, including students enrolled in ALC.

Narrative description of the critical features of the intervention. A) An external reading expert on balanced literacy will be hired to deliver professional development and coach implementation of critical characteristics for improving reading instruction as defined in balanced literacy. B) Through collaboration, teachers will refocus their core reading instruction to i) effectively incorporate Minnesota Academic Standards for Reading during whole class instruction that will help more clearly define the reading learning goal/objective each day and ii) teach reading comprehension strategies explicitly through direct instruction. This adjustment in reading instruction is expected to lead to deeper understanding of text read by all students. C) To address individual student needs, classroom reading materials will be added gradually over the three years of the plan to ensure sufficient student reading materials to cover all levels of small group instruction.

Grade levels to be served: K - 6   Location of services: BOLD Elementary

Assessment(s) used to inform instructional decision-making (Minn. Stat. § 124D.861 Subd. 2 (b)**:** Results of Minnesota state accountability tests including individual student performance on reported subscores and growth z-scores; ongoing results of classroom reading unit assessments

Evidence of research-base (Minn. Stat. § 124D.861 Subd. 2 (b)**:** Indicate the rigorous, objective research analysis that provides evidence this intervention is proven to improve student achievement. A) John Hattie's meta-analysis published in What Works Best to Optimize Student Learning (2017) and Visible Learning for Literacy; Implementing the Practices That Work Best to Accelerate Student Learning (2016).—Direct instruction effect size .59; small group learning .49. B) Marzano and Toth, (March 2014) - Teaching for Rigor: "A Call for Critical Instructional Shift." Increase the percentage of classroom instructional time spent on developing cognitively complex learning skills. C) Hattie & Donoghue. 2016. "Learning Strategies: a synthesis and conceptual model". npj Science of Learning 1, 16013; published online, 10 August 2016 – Success criteria effect size .55; Skill learning effect size .75, Transfer learning effect size 1.09, Acquiring surface learning effect size .63; Acquiring deep learning effect size is at .68. D) Massachusetts Turnaround Practices Research: Findings, Resources, and Implications for Incorporating Evidence-Based Practices Under ESSA (2017) 3-year Reading Performance effect size .41.

Key Indicators of Progress (KIPS)

List the key indicators of progress for this intervention and how your district will measure the yearly target for each indicator.	Target 2018	Target 2019	Target 2020
Percentage of students, grades 4 – 6, making expected reading growth z-score increases	45%	55%	65%
Percentage of students, grades K – 6, scoring on grade level on the AReading Assessment with consistent proportions in all grade levels (i.e., currently K = 80% and drops to 50% in upper elementary)	70%	75%	80%

This data will be used to support evaluation of your plan (Minn. Stat. § 124D.861 Subd. 5).

Intervention # 3 Secondary Reading Deep Learning
This intervention supports the following goal objective: Objective 1.1

Type of Intervention: Career/college readiness and rigorous coursework for underserved students, including students enrolled in ALC.

Narrative description of the critical features of the intervention. A) A reading expert will facilitate collaboration and coaching of secondary staff on effective research-based comprehension strategies across content areas. B) Some districtwide professional development will create a cohesive system approach to teaching reading and support the transition from the elementary to the secondary school buildings. C) Secondary teachers will work in small groups to develop specific activities within their content area that incorporates reading and reading strategies in their courses. Teachers will be working to help students take surface learning to deep learning and transfer of learning to new situations. D) To meet individual student needs, teachers will identify reading materials to be purchased that will assist students in becoming better independent readers.

Grade levels to be served: 7 - 12   Location of services: BOLD High School

Assessment(s) used to inform instructional decision-making (Minn. Stat. § 124D.861 Subd. 2 (b)**:** Results of Minnesota state accountability tests including individual student performance on reported subscores and growth z-scores; ongoing results of classroom reading unit assessments

Evidence of research-base (Minn. Stat. § 124D.861 Subd. 2 (b)**:** Indicate the rigorous, objective research analysis that provides evidence this intervention is proven to improve student achievement. A) John Hattie's meta-analysis published in What Works Best to Optimize Student Learning (2017) and Visible Learning for Literacy; Implementing the Practices That Work Best to Accelerate Student Learning (2016).—Direct instruction effect size .59. B) Marzano and Toth, (March 2014) - Teaching for Rigor: "A Call for Critical Instructional Shift." Increase the percentage of classroom instructional time spent on developing cognitively complex learning skills approaching 50%. C) Hattie & Donoghue. 2016. "Learning Strategies: a synthesis and conceptual model". npj Science of Learning 1, 16013; published online, 10 August 2016 – Skill learning effect size .75, Transfer learning effect size 1.09, Acquiring surface learning effect size .63; Acquiring deep learning effect size is at .68, Self-reported grades/student expectations effect size 1.44. D) Massachusetts Turnaround Practices Research: Findings, Resources, and Implications for Incorporating Evidence-Based Practices Under ESSA (2017) 3-year Reading Performance effect size .41.

Key Indicators of Progress (KIPS)

List the key indicators of progress for this intervention and how your district will measure the yearly target for each indicator.	Target 2018	Target 2019	Target 2020
Percentage of students, grades 7 – 8 & 10, making expected reading growth z-score increases	45%	55%	65%

This data will be used to support evaluation of your plan (Minn. Stat. § 124D.861 Subd. 5).

Intervention # 4 Mathematics Deep Learning
This intervention supports the following goal objective: Objective 2.1

Type of Intervention: Career/college readiness and rigorous coursework for underserved students, including students enrolled in ALC.

Narrative description of the critical features of the intervention. A) An external mathematics and data expert will be hired to: i) facilitate and coach implementation of mathematics instruction as outlined in the NCTM Principles to Actions in order to complete and sustain work started in previous A&I plan and ii) develop district capacity to analysis data for instructional decision making. B) Secondary teachers will continue to develop/implement rigorous assessments and activities to provide access to learning of Minnesota Academic Standards for Mathematics for all students as untracked mathematics courses evolve over the next three years. C) Elementary teachers will use their new understanding of the Minnesota Academic Standards for Mathematics to adjust their instruction to ensure all students are moving from surface learning to deep learning. D) Teachers will identify additional classroom mathematics manipulatives to be purchased that will allow students to model their mathematical problem solving experiences.
Grade levels to be served: K - 12   Location of services: Districtwide

Formative assessment(s) used to inform instructional decision-making (Minn. Stat. § 124D.861 Subd. 2 (b)**:** Results of Minnesota state accountability tests including individual student performance on reported subscores and growth z-scores; ongoing results of classroom mathematics unit assessments

Evidence of research-base (Minn. Stat. § 124D.861 Subd. 2 (b)**:** Indicate the rigorous, objective research analysis that provides evidence this intervention is proven to improve student achievement. A) John Hattie's meta-analysis published in Visible Learning for Mathematics; What Works Best to Optimize Student Learning (2017); Implementing the Practices That Work Best to Accelerate Student Learning (2016). B) Marzano and Toth, (March 2014) - Teaching for Rigor: "A Call for Critical Instructional Shift." Increase the percentage of classroom instructional time spent on developing cognitively complex learning skills. C) Hattie & Donoghue. 2016. "Learning Strategies: a synthesis and conceptual model". npj Science of Learning 1, 16013; published online, 10 August 2016 – Skill learning effect size .75, Transfer learning effect size 1.09, Acquiring surface learning effect size .63; Acquiring deep learning effect size is at .68. D) NCTM. 2014. Principles to Actions. E) Massachusetts Turnaround Practices Research: Findings, Resources, and Implications for Incorporating Evidence-Based Practices Under ESSA (2017) 3-year Mathematics Performance effect size .51.

Key Indicators of Progress (KIPS)

List the key indicators of progress for this intervention and how your district will measure the yearly target for each indicator.	Target 2018	Target 2019	Target 2020
Percentage of students, grades 7 – 8 & 10, making expected reading growth z-score increases	50%	60%	70%

This data will be used to support evaluation of your plan (Minn. Stat. § 124D.861 Subd. 5).

Creating Efficiencies and Eliminating Duplicative Programs
Briefly explain how this plan will create efficiencies and eliminate duplicative programs and services (Minn. Stat. § 124D.861, Subd. 2 (c)).

We will link to an existing reading specialist teacher and a Title 1 Math interventionist to support changes in instruction.