		1	mproved	d Studei	nt Out	comes	(1 of	2)				
	District Measures	Target Rationale	2013-14	2014-15			Performa	nce Target			2015 Target	Supporting information
			Baseline	Actual	SY14-15	SY15-16	SY16-17	SY17-18	SY18-19	SY19-20	Difference	
			(Actual)								Green = Target Met	
1	Reading proficiency	5% annual increase overall	42%	42%	47%	52%	57%	62%	67%	72%	-5%	Performance data by
		8% annual increase for Students of Color										race/ethnicity and program
	Reading proficiency- Students of	Eliminate achievement gap	24%	24%	32%	40%	48%	56%	64%	72%	-8%	(ELL, Sped, FRL)
	Color											
2	Math proficiency*	5% annual increase overall	44%	45%	48%	53%	58%	63%	68%	73%	-4%	Performance data by
		8% annual increase for Students of Color										race/ethnicity and program
	Math proficiency- Students of Color	Eliminate achievement gap	28%	28%	36%	44%	52%	60%	68%	76%	-8%	(ELL, Sped, FRL)
3	Four-year graduation rate*	10% annual increase overall, up to a	53.9%	64.3%	64%	74%	84%	85%	85%	85%	0%	•Performance data by
		plateau at 85% to reflect high										race/ethnicity, program
		performance district benchmarks										(ELL, Sped, FRL), and school
												•Drop out rate
												•College enrollment data
												•5 and 6 year grad rates
4	% of incoming MPS students that are	3% annual increases based on trend data	NA	40%	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD		Performance data by
	Kindergarten-ready (BKA literacy)											race/ethnicity
	NOTE: assessment will be realigned in											
	14-15, leading to new baseline and											
	taraet in 2015-2016	5% annual increase overall	41%	41%	46%	51%	56%	61%	66%	71%	F9/	Performance data by
э	Reading proficiency, 3rd grade*	3% annual increase overall	41%	41%	40%	51%	30%	01%	00%	/1%	-370	race/ethnicity and program
												(ELL, Sped, FRL)
		8% annual increase for Students of Color			25.1					=		(LLL, Spea, The)
	Reading proficiency, 3rd grade-	Eliminate achievement gap	24%	22%	32%	40%	48%	56%	64%	72%	-10%	
	students of color											

		ı	mprove	d Studer	nt Out	comes	(2 of	2)				
	District Measures	Target Rationale	2013-14	2014-15			Performa	nce Target			2015 Target	Supporting information
			Baseline	Actual	SY14-15	SY15-16	SY16-17	SY17-18	SY18-19	SY19-20	Difference Green = Target Met	0
6	Science proficiency	3% annual growth to follow associated	33%	36%	35%	38%	41%	44%	47%	50%	1%	Performance data by
	Science proficiency – Students of Color	TBD	15%	18%								race/ethnicity
7	% of students attending school 95% of the time	15% point increase overall	60%	60%	63%	65%	68%	70%	73%	75%	-3%	
	Native American	Elimination of disparities	29%	30%	37%	45%	52%	60%	68%	75%	-7%	
	African American		49%	51%	53%	58%	63%	68%	73%	75%	-2%	
	Asian		74%	71%	74%	74%	74%	74%	75%	75%	-3%	
	Hispanic		65%	63%	66%	68%	70%	71%	73%	75%	-3%	
	White		72%	69%	72%	73%	73%	74%	74%	75%	-3%	
	ELL		68%	67%	69%	70%	71%	72%	73%	75%	-2%	
	Special Education		44%	44%	50%	55%	60%	65%	70%	75%	-6%	
8	% of Advanced Placement (AP) and International Baccalaureate (IB) exams taken by MPS students for which a potential college-credit eligible score was earned	3% annual increases based on trend data	44%	48%	47%	50%	53%	56%	59%	64%	1%	NOTE: exploring addition of CTE into this metric
9		3% annual growth target	33%	33%	36%	39%	42%	45%	48%	51%	-3%	Performance data by race/ethnicity and program (ELL, Sped, FRL)
	Student 'persistence' rating TBD Spring 2015. % of students identified as persistent or school measure	******	** Measure und	er development	14-15 / Base	eline 15-16 de	etermined Sp	ring 16				TBD Spring 2016
	Global competency metric TBD Spring 2016			nder developmen ngualism, culturo				***				Performance data by student group and grade
12	% of priority and focus designated schools meeting or exceeding district targets in <u>reading and math</u> <u>proficiency</u> and <u>graduation rate</u> (if	100% by 2020 meeting 5/8/10 targets.		g zamon, cantare	- Simpotorio	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	,g)					
	Reading proficiency		n/a	6%	n/a	24%	48%	72%	100%	100%	n/a	
	Reading proficiency - Students of Color		n/a	6%	n/a	24%	48%	72%	100%	100%	n/a	
	Math proficiency		n/a	9%	n/a	23%	46%	68%	100%	100%	n/a	
	Math proficiency - Students of Color		n/a	13%	n/a	22%	44%	65%	100%	100%	n/a	
	Graduation Rates		n/a	6%	n/a	24%	48%	72%	100%	100%	n/a	

	Equity (1 of 3)											
	District Measures	Target Rationale	2013-14	2014-15			Performa	nce Target			2015 Target	Supporting information
			Baseline	Actual	SY14-15	SY15-16	SY16-17	SY17-18	SY18-19	SY19-20	Difference	
											Green = Target Met	
13	Students of color achievement gap in reading	Based on meeting 5/8/10	52 pts	53	43	35	26	17	9	0 pts		•Performance data by program (EL vs. non-EL,
	Native American	1	55 pts	57	46	37	28	18	9	0 pts		•Somali students
	African American	-		56	45	36	27	18	9	0 pts	-11	
	Asian	<u>-</u> !		37	31	25	19	12	6	0 pts	-6	
	Hispanic	/	53 pts	53	44	35	27	18	9	0 pts	-9	
14	Students of color achievement gap in math	Based on meeting 5/8/10	49 pts	50	41	33	25	16	8	0 pts	-9	•Performance data by program (EL vs. non-EL,
	Native American	/	53 pts	59	44	35	27	18	9	0 pts	-15	•Somali students
	African American			55	44	35	27	18	9	0 pts	-11	
	Asian	1	29 pts	28	24	19	15	10	5	0 pts	-4	
	Hispanic		45 pts	46	38	30	23	15	8	0 pts	-8	
	Disparity rate for students of color suspended once or more (risk ratio)	Eliminate disparities by 2020 (= 1.0 ratio)	4.5	7.3	3.9	3.3	2.8	2.2	1.6	1	-3.38	
	Native American	/	1.8	1.3	1.7	1.6	1.4	1.3	1.1	1	0.39	
	African American	/	4	5.2	3.5	3	2.5	2	1.5	1	-1.69	
	Asian	1	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.4	0.6	0.7	0.9	1	0.17	
	Hispanic	1	0.5	0.3	0.6	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.9	1	0.27	
	ELL	1		0.5	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.8	0.9	1	0.06	
	Special Education			3.3	2.4	2.1	1.8	1.6	1.3	1	-0.87	
ш	% of students meeting or exceeding expected growth targets in reading	Reflects the growth needed to achieve 5/8/10 on proficiency	69%	69%	70%	70%	70%	70%	70%	70%	-1%	
	Native American	/	58%	67%	59%	59%	59%	59%	59%	59%	8%	
	African American	<u>/</u>	63%	61%	59%	59%	59%	59%	59%	59%	2%	
	Asian	1	74%	71%	73%	73%	73%	73%	73%	73%	-2%	
	Hispanic	1		68%	65%	65%	65%	65%	65%	65%	3%	
	White			77%	78%	78%	78%	78%	78%	78%	-1%	
	ELL			64%	62%	62%	62%	62%	62%	62%	2%	
	Special Education		61%	57%	56%	56%	56%	56%	56%	56%	1%	

Equity (2 of 3)											
	District Measures	Target Rationale	2013-14	2014-15			Perform	ance Target			2015 Target
			Baseline	Actual	SY14-15	SY15-16	SY16-17	SY17-18	SY18-19	SY19-20	<b>Difference</b> Green = Target Met
17	% of students meeting or exceeding expected growth targets in math	Reflects the growth needed to achieve 5/8/10 on proficiency	69%	68%	70%	70%	70%	70%	70%	70%	-2%
	Native American		59%	60%	62%	62%	62%	62%	62%	62%	-2%
	African American		61%	61%	62%	62%	62%	62%	62%	62%	-1%
	Asian		73%	75%	75%	75%	75%	75%	75%	75%	0%
	Hispanic		69%	67%	67%	67%	67%	67%	67%	67%	0%
	White		80%	77%	77%	77%	77%	77%	77%	77%	0%
	ELL		66%	64%	65%	65%	65%	65%	65%	65%	-1%
	Special Education		57%	59%	58%	58%	58%	58%	58%	58%	1%
	% of students who enroll in at least one advanced course and receive a 'C' or above (AP, IB, CIS, Advanced CTE, PSEO)	Achieve proportional enrollment among student groups	53%	56%	57%	60%	63%	67%	70%	75%	-1%
	Native American		28%	33%	36%	44%	52%	59%	67%	75%	-3%
	African American		39%	40%	45%	51%	57%	63%	69%	75%	-5%
	Asian		60%	62%	63%	65%	68%	70%	73%	75%	-1%
	Hispanic		42%	41%	48%	53%	59%	65%	71%	75%	-7%
	White		73%	78%	74%	74%	74%	75%	75%	75%	4%
	ELL		30%	32%	37%	45%	52%	60%	67%	75%	-6%
	Special Education		26%	23%	34%	43%	51%	59%	67%	75%	-11%
19	% of English learners meeting language growth targets	8% annual increase to reach a maximum of 90% (as aspirational as research supports)	47% (SY12-13) / 52% (SY13- 14 projected)	51%	58%	65%	71%	77%	84%	90%	-7%
20	% of English learners meeting language proficiency targets	Match State targets (represents only 4 years in program to get to proficiency instead of standard of 5-7)	14% (SY12-13) / 15% (13-14 projected)	17%	17%	18%	20%	22%	23%	25%	0%

Equity (3 of 3)												
District Measures	Target Rationale	2013-14	2014-15		2015 Target							
		Baseline	Actual	SY14-15	SY15-16	SY16-17	SY17-18	SY18-19	SY19-20	Difference		
										Green = Target Met		
Disparity rate for the identification of	Eliminate disparities by 2020	1.49	1.50	1.41	1.33	1.25	1.16	1.08	1	0.09		
students of color for special												
education services (risk ratio)					A = 7							
Native American		1.39	1.40	1.33	1.26	1.2	1.13	1.07	1	0.07		
African American		1.44	1.42	1.37	1.29	1.22	1.15	1.07	1	0.05		
Asian		0.62	0.67	0.67	0.72	0.77	0.82	0.87	1	0.00		
Hispanic		1.03	1.04	1.03	1.02	1.02	1.01	1.01	1	0.01		
Diversity of school staff (teachers,	Increase	25%	************ increase annually*******									
educational assistants, school												
administrators)												
Teachers	(will not set numerical targets)	16%										
	Disparity rate for the identification of students of color for special education services (risk ratio)  Native American  African American  Asian  Hispanic  Diversity of school staff (teachers, educational assistants, school administrators)	Disparity rate for the identification of students of color for special education services (risk ratio)  Native American African American Asian  Hispanic  Diversity of school staff (teachers, educational assistants, school administrators)	District Measures  Target Rationale  2013-14 Baseline  Disparity rate for the identification of students of color for special education services (risk ratio)  Native American  African American  Asian  Hispanic  Diversity of school staff (teachers, educational assistants, school administrators)	District Measures  Target Rationale  2013-14 Baseline Actual  Disparity rate for the identification of students of color for special education services (risk ratio)  Native American African American Asian Hispanic Diversity of school staff (teachers, educational assistants, school administrators)  Target Rationale  2013-14 Baseline Actual  1.49 1.50  1.49 1.49 1.40 1.42 0.62 0.67 1.03 1.04	Disparity rate for the identification of students of color for special education services (risk ratio)  Native American Asian Hispanic  Disparity rate for the identification of students of color for special education services (risk ratio)  Native American Asian  Diversity of school staff (teachers, educational assistants, school administrators)  Target Rationale  2013-14 Baseline  1.49 1.50 1.41 1.33 1.40 1.33 1.44 1.42 1.37 0.62 0.67 1.03 1.04 1.03	Disparity rate for the identification of students of color for special education services (risk ratio)  Native American Asian  Asian  Disparity of school staff (teachers, educational assistants, school administrators)  Arget Rationale  2013-14 Baseline Actual  SY14-15 SY15-16  1.49 1.50 1.41 1.33 1.26 1.49 1.40 1.33 1.26 1.44 1.42 1.37 1.29 1.03 1.04 1.03 1.02	District Measures  Target Rationale  2013-14 Baseline  Actual  Disparity rate for the identification of students of color for special education services (risk ratio)  Native American  African American  Asian  Hispanic  Disparity rate for the identification of special education services (risk ratio)  1.49 1.50 1.41 1.33 1.25 1.25 1.40 1.33 1.26 1.2 1.44 1.42 1.37 1.29 1.22 1.37 1.29 1.22 1.03 1.04 1.03 1.04 1.03 1.02 1.02  Diversity of school staff (teachers, educational assistants, school administrators)	District Measures   Target Rationale   2013-14   2014-15   SY15-16   SY16-17   SY17-18	District Measures   Target Rationale   2013-14   2014-15   SY15-16   SY15-16   SY16-17   SY17-18   SY18-19	District Measures   Target Rationale   2013-14   Baseline   Actual   SY14-15   SY15-16   SY16-17   SY17-18   SY18-19   SY19-20		

42%

41%

Educational assistants

School administrators

Family & Community Partnership											
District Measures	Target Rationale	Current Performance	2014-15	Performa	nce Target	Supporting information					
		<b>SY13-14</b> (unless otherwise noted)	Actual	SY15-16 through SY18-19	SY19-20	provided annually					
% of parents reporting, "I feel welcome at my child's school."		Baseline setting 14-15	94%			Child's race/ethnicity and program (Sped, ELL, FRL)					
% of parents reporting, "I understand the different ways I can be involved in my child's school."		Baseline setting 14-15	93%			Child's race/ethnicity and program (Sped, ELL, FRL)					
% of community partnerships meeting identified goals (submitted roster, of those legally able to do so)		Baseline setting 15-16	29%								
% of parents reporting their child's school meets or exceeds their expectations.		Measure	ed on 2015-2016 S	Survey		Child's race/ethnicity and program (Sped, ELL, FRL)					
% of non-MPS-governed schools (contract alternatives and district authorized charters) meeting performance criteria	*:	******* Baseline setting 15-16******* 100%									
% of publicly educated Minneapolis-	Follow 5-Year	District: 67%	N/A	**Ta	analysis**						
· ·	enrollment plan	Zone 1: TBD	N/A								
(market share)	assumptions passed by the Board, Fall	Zone 2: TBD	N/A								
	2013	Zone 3: TBD	N/A								

<b>Effective Tea</b>	achers, Schoo	I Leaders, and Staff
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

	District Measures	Target Rationale	Current Performance	2014-15	2015 Target
				Actual	Performance
28	% of principals rated 'effective' overall		Baseline setting 14-15	75%	
29	% of teachers rated 'effective' overall		Baseline setting 14-15	N/A	
30	Rate of teachers hired early (early hire contract)		Baseline setting 14-15	33%	
31	Rate of teacher vacancies at start of school		Baseline setting 14-15	2%	
32	Employee retention - highly rated staff retained		Baseline setting 14-15	N/A	
	Teachers - highly rated staff retained			97%	
	Principals - highly rated staff retained			N/A	
	Other staff - highly rated staff retained		Baseline setting 13-14	N/A	
33	Diversity of school staff (teachers, educational assistants, school administrators)		25%	26%	Increase annually
	Teachers		16%	16%	Increase annually
	Eduational Assistants		42%	46%	Increase annually
	Principals		41%	39%	Increase annually
34	Employee engagement measure TBD		Baseline setting 2	16-17	

	Stewardship Stewardship											
	District Measures	Target Rationale	Current Performance	2014-15 Actual			2015 Target Performance Difference					
			<b>SY13-14</b> (unless		SY14-15	SY15-16	SY16-17	SY17-18	SY18-19	SY19-20		
35	Baldrige Criteria score (effectiveness of management systems)			N/A	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	N/A	
36	Unrestricted Fund balance	Board established range	13%	9%	8%-13%	8%-13%	8%-13%	8%-13%	8%-13%	8%-13%	Met	
	Budget-to-actual revenue (% variance)	Historical trend/ COO	-2%	2%	within 2%	within 2%	within 2%	within 2%	within 2%	within 2%	Met	
38	Budget-to-actual expenses (% variance)	recommendation	6%	2%	within 2%	within 2%	within 2%	within 2%	within 2%	within 2%	Met	
39	Bond rating		AA2	AA+	AA2	AA2	AA2	AA2	AA2	AA2	Met	
40	Audit opinion		Unqualified	Unqualified	Unqualified	Unqualified	Unqualified	Unqualified	Unqualified	Unqualified	Met	
41	Spending with diverse vendors*	coo	6%	TBD	10%	10%	12%	12%	12%	12%	N/A	
		recommendation; contingent on disparity study										

	Resources for Student and Schools											
	District Measures	Target Rationale	Current Performance	2014-15			Performar		''	2015 Target		
			<b>SY13-14</b> (unless	Actual			1					Performance
			otherwise noted)		SY14-15	SY15-16	SY16-17	SY17-18	SY18-19	SY19-20	provided annually	
42	Transportation on-time arrivals at	Historical trend/	<b>77%</b> (thru March)	83%	79%	81%	83%	85%	87%	89%		4%
	school	coo										
43	Breakfast participation rate	recommendation	<b>34%</b> (thru March)	37%	36%	38%	40%	42%	42%	42%	FR eligible and paid	1%
44	Lunch participation rate		62% (thru March)	65%	64%	66%	68%	70%	70%	70%	FR eligible and paid	1%
45	First request placements -		90%	TBD	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%		TBD
	kindergarten											
46	First request placements - high		83%	TBD	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%		TBD
	school											
47	% of funds allocated directly to	COO	<b>83.4%/ 16.6%</b> (FY15	N/A	81%/19%	83%/17%	85%/15%	85%/15%	85%/15%	85%/15%		N/A
	schools, compared to % allocated to	Recommendation;	Budget)									
	central office	dependent on										
		WSF										
		implementation										
		details										