



MINNEAPOLIS
PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Urban Education. Global Citizens.

2010-11 Results on District Scorecard Metrics

November 2011

District Performance Goals

Goals

1. Prepare more students for Kindergarten
2. Increase elementary and middle school students on track and prepared for success in high school
3. Prepare more students for college/post-secondary education and career
4. Increase student achievement across all grades and close gap to state average
5. Reduce achievement gap by increasing achievement of students of color (close gap to state average of all students)
6. Increase student engagement
7. Increase student and family satisfaction
8. Increase financial sustainability through restructuring and revenue generation

Note: MCA metrics were changed in 2010 from absolute proficiency levels to reducing the gap to state average proficiency to account for impending changes to MCAIII exams

Metrics for evaluating progress on overall District Performance Goals

Goals	Performance metrics <i>(proficiency and growth using MCAII and III data)</i>
1. Prepare more students for Kindergarten	1. % of students ready for kindergarten that participated in MPS High 5 on beg. of kinder. literacy assessment
2. Increase elementary and middle school students on track and prepared for success in high school	2. % of students proficient or advanced in reading by end of 3 rd grade vs. state average 3. % of students proficient or advanced in math by end of 3 rd grade vs. state average 4. % of ELL 6 th grade students proficient or advanced in reading after 7 years 5. % of 8 th grade students who have taken and passed linear Algebra
3. Prepare more students for college/post-secondary education and career	6. AYP high school graduation rate 7. % of student scoring ≥ 17 on ACT PLAN 8. % of students who have taken and passed at least 1 advanced academic course (IB, AP, CIS) 9. % of students enrolled in CTE taking at least 1 advanced CTE course 10. % of AP and IB students earning 3 or above on AP test or 4 or above on IB subject tests
4. Increase student achievement across all grades and close gap to state average	11. % of students scoring proficient or advanced vs. state average in reading (all grades) 12. % of students scoring proficient or advanced vs. state average in math (all grades) 13. % of students scoring proficient or advanced vs. state average in science (all grades) 14. % of students achieving “High Growth” in reading (all grades) 15. % of students achieving “High Growth” in math (all grades) 16. # of High Priority Schools that exceeded district average % of students achieving high growth
5. Reduce achievement gap by increasing achievement of students of color	17. % of students of color proficient or advanced vs. state average in reading (state average of all students) 18. % of students of color proficient or advanced vs. state average in math 19. % of students of color achieving “High Growth” in reading 20. % of students of color achieving “High Growth” in math 21. Reduce disproportionality of students of color referred to Special Ed – risk ratio
6. Increase student engagement	22. % of students suspended at least once 23. % of students attending at least 95% of days
7. Increase student and family satisfaction	24. # of students enrolled (comparison to annual projection based on demographics and retention rates) 25. % of MPS parents surveyed who report their child’s school meets or exceeds their expectations
8. Increase financial sustainability through restructuring and revenue generation	26. Bond rating 27. Fund balance meets or exceeds Board target level (minimum 8% level) 28. Unqualified audit opinion 29. Operating and administrative cost per student

District Performance on Scorecard Metrics – 2010-11 Results

(awaiting 2010-11 MCA growth data from MDE)

Performance metrics	<i>(proficiency and growth using MCAII data)</i>	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	Target 2010-11	Target 2015
1.	% of students ready for kindergarten that participated in MPS High 5 on beg. of kinder. literacy assessment	69%	72%	75% <i>Fall 2010</i>	75%	87%
2.	% of students proficient or advanced in reading by end of 3 rd grade vs. state average (point gap)	20 pts.	22 pts.	21 pts.	18 pts.	10 pts.
3.	% of students proficient or advanced in math by end of 3 rd grade vs. state average (point gap)	19 pts.	20 pts.	21 pts.	19 pts.	11 pts.
4.	% of ELL 6 th grade students proficient or advanced in reading after 7 years	43%	40%	39%	43%	55%
5.	% of 8 th grade students who have taken and passed linear Algebra	n/a	31%	82%	62%	80%
6.	AYP high school graduation rate <i>(note one year lag in reporting)</i>	76% <i>(07-08)</i>	73% <i>(08-09)</i>	78% <i>(09-10)</i>	75%	85%
6.	% of student scoring ≥17 on ACT PLAN	40%	43%	40%	46%	58%
6.	% of students who have taken and passed at least 1 advanced academic course (IB, AP, CIS)		35%	38%	39%	55%
6.	% of students enrolled in CTE taking at least 1 advanced CTE course	34%	42%	63%	46%	62%
6.	% of AP and IB students earning 3 or above on AP test or 4 or above on IB subject tests		42%	50%	45%	57%
11.	% of students scoring proficient or advanced vs. state average in reading (all grades) (point gap)	21 pts.	20 pts.	19 pts.	18 pts.	10 pts.
12.	% of students scoring proficient or advanced vs. state average in math (all grades) (point gap)	19 pts.	20 pts.	19 pts.	19 pts.	11 pts.
13.	% of students scoring proficient or advanced vs. state average in science (all grades) (point gap)	19 pts.	19 pts.	19 pts.	16 pts.	9 pts.
14.	% of students achieving “High Growth” in reading (all grades)	32%	33%	Not avail.	35%	43%
15.	% of students achieving “High Growth” in math (all grades)	27%	32%	Not avail.	35%	45%
16.	# of High Priority Schools that exceeded district average % of students achieving high growth	n/a	1	Not avail.	2	7
17.	% of students of color proficient or advanced vs. state average in reading	37 pts.	36 pts.	34 pts.	33 pts.	19 pts.
18.	% of students of color proficient or advanced vs. state average in math	34 pts.	35 pts.	34 pts.	33 pts.	24 pts.
19.	% of students of color achieving “High Growth” in reading	26%	29%	Not avail.	32%	44%
20.	% of students of color achieving “High Growth” in math	23%	28%	Not avail.	32%	48%
21.	Reduce disproportionality of students of color referred to Special Ed (risk ratio)	n/a	1.41	1.42	1.38	1.23
22.	% of students suspended at least once	10%	9%	9%	8%	4%
22.	% of students attending at least 95% of days	59%	59%	59%	61%	70%
24.	# of students enrolled (vs. projection)	33,855	33,584	33,420	33,257	Tbd
24.	% of MPS parents surveyed who report their child’s school meets or exceeds their expectations	76%	79%	80%	81%	89%
26.	Bond rating		AA	AA	AA	AA
27.	Fund balance meets or exceeds Board target level (minimum 8% level)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
28.	Unqualified audit opinion	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
29.	Operating and administrative cost per student		\$1,758	Tbd	Tbd	Tbd