

### VisionCard A1: ALL Student Learning Scorecard

	WT (%)	Measures	WT (%)	LEVEL 01 More Concern (1.0 – 1.9)	LEVEL 02 Concern (2.0 – 2.9)	LEVEL 03 Progress Needed (3.0 – 3.9)	LEVEL 04 Progress (4.0-4.9)	LEVEL 05 Vision (5.0)	Score	Trend line
<b>G R O W T H</b>	<b>40 %</b>	NWEA MAP Growth – Math by Grade and Student Group	40 %	Less than 40% of all grade levels meet/exceed expected growth (i.e. RIT target)	41 - 49% of all grade levels meet/exceed expected growth (i.e. RIT target)	50-60% of all grade levels meet/exceed expected growth (i.e. RIT target)	61-69% of all student groups meet/exceed expected growth (i.e. RIT target)	Greater than 70% of all student groups meet/exceed expected growth (i.e. RIT target)	TBD	
		NWEA MAP Growth Reading by Grade and Student Group	40 %	Less than 40% of all grade levels meet/exceed expected growth (i.e. RIT target)	41 - 49% of all grade levels meet/exceed expected growth (i.e. RIT target)	50-60% of all grade levels meet/exceed expected growth (i.e. RIT target)	61-69% of all student groups meet/exceed expected growth (i.e. RIT target)	Greater than 70% of all student groups meet/exceed expected growth (i.e. RIT target)	TBD	
		GOMs-AIMSWEB Curriculum-based measures	20 %	Less than 40% of all grade levels meet/exceed the national average rate of improvement	41 - 49% of all grade levels meet/exceed the national average rate of improvement	50 - 60% of all grade levels meet/exceed the national average rate of improvement	61 - 69% of all grade levels meet/exceed the national average rate of improvement	>70% of all grade levels meet/exceed the national average rate of improvement	TBD	
<b>P R O F I C I E N C Y</b>	<b>20 %</b>	MCA-II/MTAS Reading Scores by student group and grade level	34	< 40 % of all student groups meet/exceed expected proficiency	40 - 59% of all student groups meet/exceed expected proficiency	60 - 79% of all student groups meet/exceed expected proficiency	80 - 95% of all student groups meet/exceed expected proficiency	> 95% of all student groups meet/exceed expected proficiency	TBD	
		MCA-II/MTAS Math Scores by student group and grade level	33	< 40 % of all student groups meet/exceed expected proficiency	40 - 59% of all student groups meet/exceed expected proficiency	60 - 79% of all student groups meet/exceed expected proficiency	80 - 95% of all student groups meet/exceed expected proficiency	> 95% of all student groups meet/exceed expected proficiency	TBD	
		MCA-II/MTAS Science Scores by student group and grade level	33	< 40 % of all student groups meet/exceed expected proficiency	40 - 59% of all student groups meet/exceed expected proficiency	60 - 79% of all student groups meet/exceed expected proficiency	80 - 95% of all student groups meet/exceed expected proficiency	> 95% of all student groups meet/exceed expected proficiency	TBD	
<b>C A P S</b>	<b>20</b>	EXPLORE and PLAN Scores	40 %	The average composite score is in 1-24% of National quartile	The average composite score is in 25-49% of National quartile	The average composite score is in 50-74% of National quartile	The average composite score is in 75-90% of National quartile	The average composite score is in 90-100% of National quartile	TBD	
		ACT - Composite Score	10	The average composite score is in 1-24% of National quartile	The average composite score is in 25-49% of National quartile	The average composite score is in 50-74% of National quartile	The average composite score is in 75-90% of National quartile	The average composite score is in 90-100% of National quartile	TBD	

### VisionCard A1: ALL Student Learning Scorecard

	WT (%)	Measures	WT (%)	LEVEL 01 More Concern (1.0 – 1.9)	LEVEL 02 Concern (2.0 – 2.9)	LEVEL 03 Progress Needed (3.0 – 3.9)	LEVEL 04 Progress (4.0-4.9)	LEVEL 05 Vision (5.0)	Score	Trend line
<b>T O N E</b>	<b>%</b>	MN Grad Tests: GRAD Writing GRAD Reading GRAD Math	40	Less than 60 % passage on first attempt	60 – 69 % passage on first attempt	70 – 79 % passage on first attempt	80 – 89 % passage on first attempt	Greater than 90 % passage on first attempt	TBD	
		% of HS students on- track with credit requirements	10 %	Less than 75 % of each student groups	75 - 79 % of each student groups	80 - 84 % of each student groups	85 - 89 % of each student groups	90 + % of each student groups	TBD	
<b>A T T</b>	<b>20 %</b>	All day – every day K – 12 attendance	60 %	< 70 % all day – every day attendance rate	70 - 74 % all day – every day attendance rate	75 - 79 % all day – every day attendance rate	80 - 85 % all day – every day attendance rate	> 85 % all day – every day attendance rate	TBD	
<b>Weighted Score</b>									<b>TBD</b>	

## VisionCard A2: Equity & Integration

Measures	WT (%)	LEVEL 01 More Concern (1.0 – 1.9)	LEVEL 02 Concern (2.0 – 2.9)	LEVEL 03 Progress Needed (3.0 – 3.9)	LEVEL 04 Progress (4.0-4.9)	LEVEL 05 Vision (5.0)	Score	Trend line
<b>Experience / Perception of Welcoming, Safety and Belonging – Secondary Students: % under-representation of students of color</b>	<b>20 %</b>	Greater than 20 % under-representation of students of color	16-20 % under-representation of students of color	11-15 % under-representation of students of color	6-10 % under-representation of students of color	Less than 5 % under-representation of students of color	TBD	
<b>Discipline and Referrals: % over-representation of students of color</b>	<b>15 %</b>	Greater than 20 % over-representation of students of color	16-20 % over-representation of students of color	11-15 % over-representation of students of color	6-10 % over-representation of students of color	Less than 5 % over-representation of students of color	TBD	
<b>Participation in AP and Honor Classes: % under-representation of students of color</b>	<b>15 %</b>	Greater than 20 % under-representation of students of color	16-20 % under-representation of students of color	11-15 % under-representation of students of color	6-10 % under-representation of students of color	Less than 5 % under-representation of students of color	TBD	
<b>Special Education Referrals: % over-representation of students of color</b>	<b>10 %</b>	Greater than 20 % over-representation of students of color	16-20 % over-representation of students of color	11-15 % over-representation of students of color	6-10 % over-representation of students of color	Less than 5 % over-representation of students of color	TBD	
<b>Gifted and Talented Identification and Referral: % under-representation of students of color</b>	<b>10 %</b>	Greater than 20 % under-representation of students of color	16-20 % under-representation of students of color	11-15 % under-representation of students of color	6-10 % under-representation of students of color	Less than 5 % under-representation of students of color	TBD	
<b>Participation in Extracurricular Activities: % under-representation of students of color</b>	<b>10 %</b>	Greater than 20 % under-representation of students of color	16-20 % under-representation of students of color	11-15 % under-representation of students of color	6-10 % under-representation of students of color	Less than 5 % under-representation of students of color	TBD	
<b>Experience / Perception of Welcoming, Safety and Belonging – Parents: % under-representation of students of color</b>	<b>10 %</b>	Greater than 20 % under-representation of students of color	16-20 % under-representation of students of color	11-15 % under-representation of students of color	6-10 % under-representation of students of color	Less than 5 % under-representation of students of color	TBD	
<b>Staffing Diversity: % professional staff of color as a % of total professional staff</b>	<b>10 %</b>	Lowest Quartile of selected regional cohort	Lowest Half of selected regional cohort	Highest Half of selected regional cohort	Highest Quartile of selected regional cohort	Highest Quintile of selected regional cohort	TBD	
<b>Weighted Score TBD</b>								

### VisionCard A3: Curriculum & Instruction

Measures	WT (%)	LEVEL 01 More Concern (1.0 – 1.9)	LEVEL 02 Concern (2.0 – 2.9)	LEVEL 03 Progress Needed (3.0 – 3.9)	LEVEL 04 Progress (4.0-4.9)	LEVEL 05 Vision (5.0)	Score	Trend line
<b>Delivery of District Curriculum as Designed and Aligned to State Standards</b>	<b>20 %</b>	Less than 70 % of teachers deliver the curriculum as observed by a Learning Walk	70 - 79 % of teachers deliver the curriculum as observed by a Learning Walk	80 - 89 % of teachers deliver the curriculum as observed by a Learning Walk	90 - 99 % of teachers deliver the curriculum as observed by a Learning Walk	100 % of teachers deliver the curriculum as observed by a Learning Walk	TBD	
<b>E – 12 core curriculum mapping and pacing guides are utilized for all subject areas</b>	<b>15 %</b>	Less than 20 % of faculty utilize the curriculum maps and pacing guides	20 -39 % of faculty utilize the curriculum maps and pacing guides	40 - 69 % of faculty utilize the curriculum maps and pacing guides	70 - 99% of faculty utilize the curriculum maps and pacing guides	100 % of faculty utilize the curriculum maps and pacing guides	TBD	
<b>Rigor in Classroom</b> 1. Differentiation of learning 2. Vocabulary across content areas 3. Compare/Contrast 4. Summarizing/Note Taking	<b>30 %</b>	Less than 70 % of classrooms are assessed to employ the signs of rigor in the classroom	70 - 79 % of classrooms are assessed to employ the signs of rigor in the classroom	80 - 89 % of classrooms are assessed to employ the signs of rigor in the classroom	90 - 99 % of classrooms are assessed to employ the signs of rigor in the classroom	100 % of classrooms are assessed to employ the signs of rigor in the classroom	TBD	
<b>Learning Cohorts use data to monitor student progress and improve instruction</b> <i>(refined definition)</i>	<b>20 %</b>	< 70% of faculty use data to monitor and improve student learning	70-79% of faculty use data to monitor and improve student learning	80-89% of faculty use data to monitor and improve student learning	90-99% of faculty use data to monitor and improve student learning	100% of faculty use data to monitor and improve student learning	TBD	
<b>Professional learning at school level is observed in teacher practice via principal observations; formal or informal (Learning Walk)</b>	<b>15 %</b>	< 70 % of teachers engaging in professional learning skill and knowledge development are observed to be effectively applying learning	70 – 99 % of teachers engaging in professional learning skill and knowledge development are observed to be effectively applying learning	80 - 89 % of teachers engaging in professional learning skill and knowledge development are observed to be effectively applying learning	90 – 99 % of teachers engaging in professional learning skill and knowledge development are observed to be effectively applying learning	100% of teachers engaging in professional learning skill and knowledge development are observed to be effectively applying learning	TBD	
<b>Weighted Score</b>							<b>TBD</b>	

**VisionCard B: Responsible, efficient and effective management of our human, financial and physical resources**

<b>Measures</b>	<b>WT (%)</b>	<b>LEVEL 01 More Concern (1.0 – 1.9)</b>	<b>LEVEL 02 Concern (2.0 – 2.9)</b>	<b>LEVEL 03 Progress Needed (3.0 – 3.9)</b>	<b>LEVEL 04 Progress (4.0-4.9)</b>	<b>LEVEL 05 Vision (5.0)</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Trend line</b>
<b>Operating levy in comparison to identified districts as compared by the following:</b> Curriculum offerings, size, demographics, community makeup and programming (curricular/extra-curricular)	<b>15 %</b>	Lower quartile of comparable cohort group	Lower half of comparable cohort group	Top half of comparable cohort group	Top quartile of comparable cohort group	Top quintile of comparable cohort group		
<b>Annual Variation from established budgets: all schools and departments</b>	<b>20 %</b>	+ .1/- 1.0 % or greater budget totals and major categories	+ .1/- .8 % budget totals and major categories	+ .1/- .6 % budget totals and major categories	+ .1/- .4 % budget totals and major categories	+ .1/- .2 % budget totals and major categories		
<b>General Fund Balance</b>	<b>20 %</b>	Less than 2 % General Fund Balance	2 - 3% of General Fund	4 - 5% of General Fund	6 - 7 % of General Fund	8% + of General Fund		
<b>Overall Return on Spending Index (SchoolMatters.com)</b>	<b>20 %</b>	Lowest Quartile of selected regional cohort	Lowest Half of selected regional cohort	Highest Half of selected regional cohort	Highest Quartile of selected regional cohort	Highest Quintile of selected regional cohort		
<b>Adequacy of Space and Facilities</b>	<b>15 %</b>	Less than 60 % of surveyed administrators and staff are satisfied to highly satisfied	60 - 69 % of surveyed administrators and staff are satisfied to highly satisfied	70 - 79 % of surveyed administrators and staff are satisfied to highly satisfied	80 - 89 % of surveyed administrators and staff are satisfied to highly satisfied	90 % + of surveyed administrators and staff are satisfied to highly satisfied		
<b>Quality of Facilities and Grounds</b>	<b>10 %</b>	Lowest Quartile of selected regional cohort	Lowest Half of selected regional cohort	Highest Half of selected regional cohort	Highest Quartile of selected regional cohort	Highest Quintile of selected regional cohort		
<b>Weighted Score TBD</b>								

## VisionCard C: Aligning and improving systems & structures to move towards our vision

	Wt %	Measures	Wt (%)	LEVEL 01 More Concern (1.0 – 1.9)	LEVEL 02 Concern (2.0 – 2.9)	LEVEL 03 Progress Needed (3.0 – 3.9)	LEVEL 04 Progress (4.0-4.9)	LEVEL 05 Vision (5.0)	Score	Trend line
P R O C E S S	30 %	<b>Satisfaction of Staff regarding Decision Processes and Communications in either building or district</b>	60 %	Less the 55 % of staff surveyed are satisfied to highly satisfied	55 - 59 % of staff surveyed are satisfied to highly satisfied	60 - 64 % of staff surveyed are satisfied to highly satisfied	65 - 69 % of staff surveyed are satisfied to highly satisfied	70 + % of staff surveyed are satisfied to highly satisfied		
		<b>Interdisciplinary collaboration across subject and/or grade levels is occurring in reading and math - teachers</b>	40 %	Less the 40 % of staff surveyed are actively engaged	40 - 49 % of staff surveyed are actively engaged	50 - 59 % of staff surveyed are actively engaged	60 - 69 % of staff surveyed are actively engaged	70 + % of staff surveyed are actively engaged		
S Y S T E M S	30 %	<b>Consistent and effective use of Viewpoint data base in planning and prioritization - teachers</b>	20 %	Less the 10 % of staff surveyed use Viewpoint to plan instruction	10 - 23 % of staff surveyed use Viewpoint to plan instruction	24 - 37 % of staff surveyed use Viewpoint to plan instruction	38 - 50 % of staff surveyed use Viewpoint to plan instruction	50 + % of staff surveyed use Viewpoint to plan instruction		
		<b>Quantifiable SMART individual professional development goals for all teaching staff are met</b>	30 %	Less than 70 % of staff successfully complete professional development goals annually	70 - 74 % of staff successfully complete professional development goals annually	75 - 79 % of staff successfully complete professional development goals annually	80 - 84 % of staff successfully complete professional development goals annually	85 + % of staff successfully complete professional development goals annually		
		<b>PBIS Measure</b>	30 %	Less than 60% of all student groups meet/exceed expected targets	60-64% of all student groups meet/exceed expected targets.	65-69% of all student groups meet/exceed expected targets	70-75% of al student groups meet/exceed expected targets	Greater than 75% of all student groups meet/exceed expected targets		
		<b>Response to Instruction (RTI)</b>	20 %	Less than 75 % of teachers appraised to be effectively using RTI	75 - 79 % of teachers appraised to be effectively using RTI	80 - 85 % of teachers appraised to be effectively using RTI	85 - 89 % of teachers appraised to be effectively using RTI	90 + % of teachers appraised to be effectively using RTI		
S T R		<b>Consistent interventions for low professional performance in a clear, consistent and timely manner within policy and contractual agreements</b>	30 %	Less than 10 % of the time building administrators will successfully complete the disciplinary process	10 - 29 % of the time building administrators will successfully complete the disciplinary process	30 - 39 % of the time building administrators will successfully complete the disciplinary process	40 - 49 % of the time building administrators will successfully complete the disciplinary process	50 + % of the time building administrators will successfully complete the disciplinary process		

**VisionCard C: Aligning and improving systems & structures to move towards our vision**

	<b>W t %</b>	<b>Measures</b>	<b>Wt (%)</b>	<b>LEVEL 01 More Concern (1.0 – 1.9)</b>	<b>LEVEL 02 Concern (2.0 – 2.9)</b>	<b>LEVEL 03 Progress Needed (3.0 – 3.9)</b>	<b>LEVEL 04 Progress (4.0-4.9)</b>	<b>LEVEL 05 Vision (5.0)</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Trend line</b>
<b>U C T U R E</b>	<b>40 %</b>	<b>Alignment of School Improvement Plans to Scorecards and Strategic Roadmap</b>	40 %	Less than 75 % of SIP goals are directly aligned with Scorecards	75 - 79 % of SIP goals are directly aligned with Scorecards	80 - 84 % of SIP goals are directly aligned with Scorecards	85 - 89 % of SIP goals are directly aligned with Scorecards	90 + % of SIP goals are directly aligned with Scorecards		
		<b>Calendar and Schedules with optimal design for student learning</b> - Learning minutes - Grade level configurations with alignment to Scorecard A	30 %	Less the 40 % teachers and administrators surveyed rate high alignment	40 - 49 % of teachers and administrators surveyed rate high alignment	50 - 59 % of teachers and administrators surveyed rate high alignment	60 - 69 % of teachers and administrators surveyed rate high alignment	70 + % of teachers and administrators surveyed rate high alignment		
<b>Weighted Score TBD</b>										



