# SCHOOL BOARD MEETING 

Minnetonka I.S.D. \#276
5621 County Road 101
Minnetonka, Minnesota
www.minnetonkaschools.org
September 1, 2022

> The mission of the Minnetonka School District, a community that transcends traditional definitions of excellence and where dreams set sail, is to ensure all students envision and pursue their highest aspirations while serving the greater good, through teaching and learning which
> - Value and nurture each individual,
> - Inspire in everyone a passion to excel with confidence and hope, and
> - Instill expectations that stimulate extraordinary achievement in the classroom and in life.
(All times are approximate)
6:30 Recognitions: Girls Track and Field State Qualifiers; Boys Track and Field State Qualifiers; Girls Golf State Qualifiers; Boys Golf State Qualifiers; Girls Synchronized Swimming State Qualifiers; Boys Tennis State Qualifiers; Destination Imagination State Qualifiers and Global Qualifiers; PhysTEC Local Teacher of the Year; and National School Public Relations Association Award Honorees

7:00 I. Call to Order
II. Pledge to the Flag
III. Adoption of the Agenda

7:00 IV. Community Comments Community Comments is an opportunity for the public to address the School Board on an item included in this agenda in accordance with the guidelines printed at the end of this agenda.

7:05 V. Report on ACT, IB, AP and SAT Results
7:35 VI. Acceptance of Bid for HVAC Replacement at SAIL Building
7:40 VII. Acceptance of Bid for Conversion of Space to Classroom at Scenic Heights
7:45 VIII. Acceptance of Bids for Paving at Scenic Heights, Minnetonka High School and District Service Center

# 7:50 IX. CONSENT AGENDA <br> a. Minutes of August 4 Regular Meeting <br> b. Study Session Summary of August 18, 2022 <br> c. Payment of Bills <br> d. Recommended Personnel Items <br> e. Gifts and Donations <br> f. Electronic Fund Transfers <br> g. Collective Bargaining Agreement with Paraprofessional Employees <br> h. Collective Bargaining Agreement with Nutrition Services Employees 

7:51 X. Board Reports
7:55 XI. Superintendent's Report
8:00 XII. Announcements
8:05 XIII. Adjournment

[^0]School Board meetings are rebroadcast via a local cable provider.
Please visit the "District/Leadership/School Board" page on our website for a current schedule.

School Board<br>Minnetonka I.S.D. \#276<br>5621 County Road 101<br>Minnetonka, Minnesota

Board Agenda Item V.
Title: ACT, IB, AP, and SAT 2022 Summary Report
Date: September 2, 2022

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The 2021-22 school year was a truly unique year of achievement for Minnetonka students. On several measures of success, the District is reporting high student performance levels. It is important to note that significantly fewer students took the ACT during the 2020-21 and 2021-22 school year than in previous years, which impacted the results. From 2017-2019, over 92 percent of the graduating class had taken the ACT at least one time. In 2021, 72.9 percent took the test, and in 2022, 76.5 percent completed the ACT. Because of this, the ACT Composite score no longer represents the graduating class as it had done historically. However, scores remain strong. Investments in the areas of professional development, use of technology, expanding academic rigor and increasing expectations, and especially the development of excellent teachers over the past 20 years have led to results that show a clear return on these investments. The ACT scores have increased over the past 20 years from 23.1 and reached the all-time high in 2018-2020 with a 27.7 Composite score and in 2016-17 a second highest Composite score of 27.5. In addition, within the table below, from 2001-02 through 2003-2004, original results could not be recalculated due to a changeover in data systems and are highlighted in yellow. There is further evidence that Minnetonka's academic program can support unlimited student potential, and the staff in Minnetonka are skilled in ensuring that our students meet the highest expectations in the classroom. This report contains five sections (ACT, IB, AP, SAT, and Ethnicity/Gender), with each addressing the 2021-22 results in detail.

The Top 100, 200, and 400 mean scores continue to be strong, while the Top 400 average yields an incredible mean score of 29.2 that competes with the top 100 scores for the elite private schools in the Twin Cities. Students are also ready for college and career posting a solid percentage of students meeting all four categories in this area ( 66 percent).

IB results remain competitive, and they increased compared to last year. Minnetonka IB scores surpassed world-wide averages in 17 of 31 areas. Last year, MHS students surpassed world-wide averages in 11 areas. IB averages were calculated differently, as scores were calculated using a combination of teacher input submitted to IB with IB's predicted student performance calculation, should students have been able to complete the IB exams.

## Impact of COVID on ACT Scores

As stated above, there was a decrease in the ACT Composite score, which dropped from a previous high the past three years of 27.7 to $\mathbf{2 6 . 1}$ for 2021-22. There are key factors that have impacted the results. Last year, there were 639 Minnetonka test takers, which was a significant drop compared to previous years (2020: 689, 2019: 726, 2018: 760). The decrease in the number of test takers is a result of cancelled test sessions due to COVID and colleges/universities communicating that they would not be requiring an ACT score. This effected the number of students taking the test as well as those taking the test multiple times, thus negatively impacting the super-score. There is some evidence to show that ACT participation and performance is beginning to rebound. Test participants have increased from 587 to 639 , increasing the percentage from 72.9 percent to 76.5 percent. In addition, the Top 100, 200, and 400 composite scores have improved compared to last year, with the top 100 increasing from an average composite score of 33.9 in 2021 to 34.3 in 2022. The top 200 increased from 32.2 to 32.6, and the top 400 increased from 29.2 to 29.6. The drop in overall composite is mainly due to the higher percentage of students scoring at lower levels, which has been a phenomenon since the state requirement for all juniors to be scheduled to take the ACT according to state legislation.

Of the 34 possible types of AP Tests reported, there is an increase in the participation of all students, moving from 1,589 to 1,667, and an increase in the number of exams taken, moving from 2,839 to 2,964 . Also, students included, based on the support and encouragement of staff members, are choosing more rigorous coursework. High school staff are very positive about the high number of students taking these courses and tests. Enrollment in AP has more than doubled since 2007. 85.0 percent of Minnetonka AP students scored a three or higher. College Board no longer provides the percentage of Minnesota students scoring three or higher. This average has continued to be very strong since 2005 and will most likely increase after all scores are released.

There are many IB students who take AP exams, as well as several students who selfstudy for an AP exam without taking the course, and those results are included in the overall averages listed in the tables below. Explanation is provided in the narratives of the AP section to add perspective to the results that have significant numbers of both IB and AP students taking the AP Exams.

## ACT RESULTS

## ACT Composite Results

Minnetonka students continue to show a strong performance on the ACT. The table below shows Minnetonka ACT Test and Composite Results for the past twenty years, detailing an increase from an ACT Composite score of 23.1 in 2001-12 to an historic high the 20182020. Although there was a decrease in the overall Composite and each of the four subtests, results remain strong.

As stated previously, there are key factors that have impacted the results. Last year, there were 639 Minnetonka test takers, which was a significant drop compared to previous years (2020: 689, 2019: 726, 2018: 760). The decrease in the number of test takers is a result of cancelled test sessions due to COVID and colleges/universities communicating that they would not be requiring an ACT score. This effected the number of students taking the test as well as those taking the test multiple times, thus negatively impacting the super-score. From 2017-2019, over 92 percent of the graduating class had taken the ACT at least one time. In 2021, 72.9 percent took the test, and in 2022, 76.5 percent completed the ACT. Because of this, the ACT Composite score no longer represents the graduating class as it had done historically.

Students in Minnetonka used to take the PLAN test in Grade Ten and the data were used to help students prepare for the ACT. The PLAN results were also used by teachers and administrators to identify strengths and weaknesses in the academic program. The last PLAN test was taken during the Fall of 2014.

With ACT no longer supporting the PLAN Test on a national level, and MDE no longer supporting the Test at a state level, Minnetonka no longer offers the PLAN. Instead, Minnetonka High School has offered the pre-ACT test along with review sessions to help prepare students for the ACT exams. The pre-ACT Test serves as a predictor of student performance. When students took the PLAN Test, they outpaced the predicted ACT high Composite score of the PLAN, and it is expected that Minnetonka students will continue to surpass the predicted high score of the pre-ACT.

Minnetonka ACT Test and Composite Results from 2001-02 to 2020-21 (Updated with highest ACT subtest and composite score calculation from 2004-05 through 2021-22)

| Year | English | Math | Reading | Science | Composite | PLAN High <br> Comp Est. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 1 - 0 2}$ | 22.4 | 23.0 | 23.6 | 23.0 | 23.1 | NA |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 2 - 0 3}$ | 23.6 | 23.8 | 24.4 | 23.6 | 24.0 | NA |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 3 - 0 4}$ | 23.7 | 24.5 | 24.6 | 23.8 | 24.3 | NA |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 4 - 0 5}$ | 23.2 | 23.0 | 23.2 | 23.0 | 23.1 | NA |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 5 - 0 6}$ | 23.9 | 24.5 | 25.0 | 24.1 | 24.4 | NA |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 6 - 0 7}$ | 24.7 | 25.2 | 25.8 | 24.8 | 25.1 | NA |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7 - 0 8}$ | 25.0 | 25.0 | 25.6 | 24.6 | 25.1 | 24.8 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 8 - 0 9}$ | 26.0 | 25.4 | 26.7 | 25.7 | 26.0 | 25.8 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 9 - 1 0}$ | 26.5 | 25.5 | 26.7 | 25.7 | 26.1 | 25.6 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 0 - 1 1}$ | 26.0 | 25.4 | 26.3 | 26.1 | 26.0 | 25.3 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 1 - 1 2}$ | 25.6 | 25.4 | 26.2 | 25.7 | 25.7 | 25.8 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 2 - 1 3}$ | 26.6 | 25.8 | 27.2 | 26.7 | 26.6 | 25.7 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 3 - 1 4}$ | 26.5 | 25.7 | 26.9 | 26.7 | 26.5 | 25.9 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 4 - 1 5}$ | 26.8 | 26.2 | 27.5 | 27.0 | 26.9 | 25.8 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 5 - 1 6}$ | 26.7 | 26.3 | 27.1 | 26.8 | 26.7 | 25.8 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 6 - 1 7}$ | 27.6 | 26.7 | 28.3 | 27.5 | 27.5 | $26.5^{*}$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7 - 1 8}$ | 27.3 | 26.9 | 28.4 | 27.5 | 27.7 | $26.3^{*}$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 8 - 1 9}$ | 27.6 | 26.7 | 28.6 | 27.6 | 27.7 | $26.6^{*}$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 9 - 2 0}$ | 27.4 | 26.7 | 28.6 | 27.6 | 27.7 | COVID-19 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 0 - 2 1}$ | 26.5 | 26.3 | 28.3 | 27.1 | 27.2 | $25.6^{*}$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 1 - 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 5 . 5}$ | 25.0 | 27.2 | 26.4 | 26.1 | $25.4^{*}$ |

[^1]
## ACT English Test

English results dropped by 1.0 points to a mean score of 25.5. Prior to 2010-11, the English Test results slipped only once (2005-06). However, in recent years, prior to the COVID Pandemic, the English Test trended upward to become 1.0 points higher than 2009-10. Although there was a decrease in the average score, it is important to understand that scores dropped across all sub-tests and many students did not take the test multiple times due to cancelled test dates and the lower importance placed on the ACT by many colleges and universities.

In addition to years of improvements at the Kindergarten through Grade Eight levels, with increases in academic rigor across the English/Language Arts content area, the MHS English Department has spent the last ten years focused on improving the academic rigor of its course offerings. In all areas, the MHS English Department has deepened its commitment to higher levels of rigor. In addition to the robust IB course offerings (Language and Literature, Literature and Performance, and HL Literature), in 2018-2019 the English department introduced AP Seminar to Vantage Global Business and AP Research at the high school in 2019-2020. In 2020-2021, two sections of AP Seminar were taught at the high school as a stand-alone option, and AP Language and Composition will become a year-long option for Tenth Grade students (seven sections of students). Last year the high school. had seven sections of IB Lang \& Lit and two each of IB Lit \& Performance, IB HL Literature Y1, \& IB HL Literature Y2 (13 sections total in Grades 11/12). They also had three sections of AP Literature and one section of AP Lang \& Comp, plus AP Seminar at Vantage and AP Research at the HS ( 10 sections of AP in Grades 11/12). Overall, the increase in the number of students taking IB and AP courses has enabled students to perform at higher levels.

In addition to the significant improvements to the academic program, the Department made ACT a priority since the 2012-13 school year setting annual achievable goals. The two-year decrease in sub-test scores prior to 2012-13 inspired a concerted Department effort to reanalyze the alignment between the established curriculum and to adjust as needed. The English Test is a 75 -question, 45 -minute test that covers both usage and mechanics of writing as well as rhetorical skills. The English Department's willingness to continually evaluate sequencing and course offerings and to respond to students' academic needs has proven to be a strength of the Department. More teachers in the department have been trained and are teaching IB and AP courses; this creates a "trickledown" effect on all courses, as teaching strategies and practices used in AP and IB are becoming standard in most English course offerings. This investment in professional learning has created a stronger and more united Departmental focus on alignment with the essential learnings reflected in the ACT English Test and valued by colleges and universities. Currently, the language arts program is in curriculum review, and it will be important for teachers to analyze the data over time and keep the focus on continuous improvement for the program.

## ACT Math Test

The ACT Math Test experienced a 1.3-point drop compared to last year making its lowest level since 2007-08. This drop could have been predicted considering NWEA's research on the impact of COVID on student Math performance nationwide.

District Math teachers will need to focus on the three areas critical for success on the ACT Math Test: Pre-Algebra/Elementary Algebra, Intermediate Algebra/Coordinate Geometry, and Plane Geometry/Trigonometry. With 40 percent of the test requiring students to demonstrate knowledge of Pre-Algebra and Elementary Algebra, Minnetonka students should be more prepared than most for this assessment. The focus for improvement starts with the fact that many students are tested on concepts that they have not worked with directly in two or more years in most cases, according to high school Math staff.

During the Math Department's efforts in recent years to increase academic rigor at the High School, many of the improvements were focused at the Ninth Grade and Tenth Grade levels. The Department's decision to introduce Honors Pre-Calculus has led to increased participation in AP Calculus A/B and B/C, and it has had a positive impact on the overall Math Test results as reported later in this report. As the Department analyzes these results, staff will need to develop strategies to reach a broader audience and will need to focus more deeply on the three elements of the Math Test noted above.

In recent years, high school Math teachers worked to develop curriculum and have commented that they are prepared more than ever with the creation of formative assessments. Higher Algebra teachers have reconfigured their curriculum in a way that they believe will make improvements for years to come. Staff are also working to ensure that students are placed in the courses appropriate for them to increase student success and engagement. In addition, Math staff at both the middle and high school have built a collaborative relationship in terms of curriculum development as they currently work together through the curriculum review implementation. The work performed with the most recent curriculum review will help to ensure that the 5-12 experience is more efficient and complete in terms of both introducing and developing a deeper understanding of concepts through authentic and performance-based assessments. The goal is to provide a seamless transition for students moving from one level to the next.

## ACT Reading Test

Minnetonka students performed at similar levels to the 2015-16 year on the Reading Test, and with an average score of 27.2, this subtest, like previous years is clearly the strongest area of student achievement.

The ACT Reading Test is comprised of four sections, each containing one long or two shorter prose passages that are representative of the level and type of reading required in first-year college courses. Passages on topics in social studies, natural sciences, prose fiction, and the humanities are included. Due to the cross-content nature of these
passages, all content areas can support student success in this area by focusing on rich content-specific vocabulary and by engaging students with challenging and complex texts.

The significant high achievement reported on the Reading Test shows the impact of a school-wide focus on academic rigor. The results of the Reading Test demonstrate the willingness of all departments to introduce more rigorous coursework and to challenge students daily to stretch academically.

In addition to critical teachers' role in this area, support staff and guidance staff have also contributed. The collective efforts of all staff members including building leadership contributed to the excellent results on the Reading Test and reflect outstanding work in Kindergarten through Tenth Grade over those eleven years.

## ACT Science Test

Minnetonka's Science Test scores made a significant jump of 0.3 points in 2014-15 and a slight decline of 0.2 points in 2015-16. Science scores remained steady between 2008 and 2012, with a slight decline in 2012. The most recent score of $\mathbf{2 6 . 4}$, despite dropping 0.7 points, is a solid score and reflects major improvement in our Science staff and program.

The Science Test includes an emphasis on the comprehension of scientific graphs and charts. On the test, students need to be able to interpret data to be successful. The Science Department will need to continue to look carefully at how problem-solving skills can be better integrated into the Science curriculum and continue to study course options for all students. With the implementation of the 2019 Minnesota Science Standards, Science teachers engage their students in real-world phenomena, crosscutting concepts, and principles of science and engineering that will enhance their problem-solving skills.

## ACT Mean For Top 100, 200, and 400 Graduates

Minnetonka maintains statistical comparisons of the Top 100, 200, and 400 test-taking students as a means of benchmarking against Metro private schools with carefully selected populations of about 100 Seniors. The comparison of the Top 400 has been an internal measure of the High School's progress over the years. It started with the total number of students taking the ACT in Minnetonka of slightly less than 400 in 2001-02 to the present where the Top 400 are still compared. As shown in the table below, analysis of each statistical group shows strong performances.

In the Top 100, an increase of 0.3 points in 2014-15 marked the third largest increase since 2007 (2009 increase of 1.4 points was the largest increase and reflects an incredible increase for such high performance). Once again, the Top 100 experienced a significant increase, improving by 0.4 points to 34.3. Such large increases in this group are challenging based on the exemplary performance that has already existed, because the maximum score is 36 . In 2014-15, Minnetonka had 15 students who missed a perfect
score by one point with two students earning a perfect score. These results are stellar, and they indicate a push toward higher levels of excellence for the top tier of students in Minnetonka. The Class of 2020 had 16 students with perfect scores and the Class of 2021 had 4 perfect scores. The Class of 2022 had 14 perfect scores.

The averages discussed in this section have historically been well above the elite private schools' carefully selected classes of about 100. The Class of 2022 saw another solid performance in the Top 100 with students averaging a score of 34.3 points, an increase from 33.9 points.

In the Top 200, an increase of $\mathbf{0 . 4}$ points was reported in 2014-15 and a decrease of 1.1 points last year. At a score of 32.6, the Top 200 in 2020-21 had surpassed the Top 100 in 2011-12 and are also well above the private schools' 100. A score of 32.6 in 2022 marks the fourth highest score in the Top 200 category.

The Top 400 have had steady progress toward higher averages over the years and reported a significant increase of 0.7 points in 2014-15 and another increase of 0.2 points in 2016-17 with a near historic increase in 2018 of 1.1 points to reach an average score of 30.9. There was a slight decrease of 0.3 points for the Class of 2019, however, the class reached their second highest results with a score of $\mathbf{3 0 . 6}$ points. The Class of 2020 surpassed that mark with a score of 30.8 for the second all-time highest average Composite score, and the Class of 2021 saw a drop of 1.6 points marking the sixth highest historical score in this category. The Class of 2022 rebounded after a decrease last year, improving by 0.4 points to an average score of 29.6. The impact of students not taking the ACT multiple times has had a negative impact on the overall composite score, but it is encouraging to see increased scores across all the levels shared in this table. With overall solid ACT scores, this test serves as a strong indicator of student success, showing that the positive impact of Minnetonka's rigorous academic program yields rewards for a large percentage of graduates. Minnetonka's Top 400 continues to outperform the private schools' 100 and has matched Minnetonka's Top 200 performance in 2007-08.

ACT Mean For Top 100, 200, and 400 Graduates

| ACT Mean for Top Grads |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Mean for Top 100 | Mean for Top 200 | Mean for Top 400 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{3 2 . 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 9 . 6}$ |
| 2021 | 33.9 | 32.2 | 29.2 |
| 2020 | 34.7 | 33.3 | 30.8 |
| 2019 | 34.3 | 32.9 | 30.6 |
| 2018 | 34.4 | 33.2 | 30.9 |
| 2017 | 33.8 | 32.4 | 29.8 |
| 2016 | 33.3 | 31.9 | 29.6 |
| 2015 | 33.2 | 31.8 | 29.6 |
| 2014 | 32.9 | 31.4 | 28.9 |
| 2013 | 32.7 | 31.3 | 29.0 |
| 2012 | 31.7 | 30.1 | 27.6 |
| 2011 | 31.9 | 30.3 | 27.8 |
| 2010 | 32.1 | 30.5 | 28.0 |
| 2009 | 32.0 | 30.4 | 27.9 |
| 2008 | 30.6 | 29.2 | 26.0 |
| 2007 | 31.1 | 29.2 | 26.2 |

## Minnetonka Students Ready for College Level Coursework

This table illustrates highly important and useful information for the staff, Board and community. In association with the ACT subtest and composite results, schools are able to calculate the percentage of students who are deemed ready for college level coursework. These results are broken out by four strands (English Composition, Algebra, Social Science, and Biology), and there is also a composite score based on the percentage of students who meet the readiness standard in all four strands. Minnetonka experienced decreases in Math (Algebra), Reading (Social Science) and Science (Biology). The meets all four category showed an atypically low performance with students performing at 63 percent. This percentage will be well out-pace the average state percentage once those become avaiable. Cut scores have not changed for several years for English (18), Math (22), Reading (22), or Science (23). With cut-scores remaining steady, Minnetonka students should continue to show that a high percentage are ready for college level coursework in future years.

According to Minnesota ACT representative April Hansen, the embargo date for state ACT results continues to be later compared to previous years, so the Minnesota state data will be available on their web site in late September or shortly thereafter. The Minnetonka ACT summary report will have state comparative data included at that time.

## Minnetonka and Minnesota Students Ready for College Level Coursework

| Students Ready for College Level Coursework <br> (Bold indicates an increase from the previous year and italics indicates a decrease) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grad | Eng. C | mp. | Algebra |  | Socia | Sci. | Biolog |  | Meets all |  |
| Year | Mtka (\%) | State (\%) | Mtka (\%) | State (\%) | Mtka (\%) | State (\%) | Mtka (\%) | State (\%) | Mtka (\%) | State (\%) |
| 2022 | 89 | - | 73 | - | 79 | - | 75 | - | 63 | - |
| 2021 | 87 | 61 | 77 | 48 | 81 | 52 | 77 | 45 | 66 | 32 |
| 2020 | 92 | 59 | 81 | 46 | 84 | 47 | 82 | 42 | 70 | 30 |
| 2019 | 93 | 61 | 83 | 48 | 86 | 47 | 84 | 42 | 73 | 30 |
| 2018 | 90 | 60 | 84 | 47 | 82 | 48 | 74 | 42 | 69 | 30 |
| 2017 | 91 | 63 | 79 | 48 | 83 | 50 | 80 | 42 | 70 | 31 |
| 2016 | 91 | 61 | 78 | 46 | 77 | 45 | 72 | 40 | 68 | 29 |
| 2015 | 90 | 74 | 77 | 58 | 78 | 57 | 76 | 53 | 76 | 39 |
| 2014 | 91 | 77 | 77 | 61 | 75 | 56 | 73 | 53 | 61 | 39 |
| 2013 | 95 | 78 | 82 | 62 | 84 | 57 | 80 | 52 | 80 | 39 |
| 2012 | 93 | 78 | 77 | 62 | 81 | 64 | 65 | 42 | 59 | 36 |
| 2011 | 94 | 78 | 77 | 62 | 80 | 64 | 65 | 43 | 58 | 36 |
| 2010 | 95 | 79 | 76 | 61 | 82 | 65 | 62 | 42 | 56 | 35 |
| 2009 | 95 | 78 | 77 | 57 | 84 | 65 | 60 | 39 | 54 | 32 |
| 2008 | 91 | 77 | 72 | 56 | 76 | 64 | 53 | 40 | 47 | 32 |
| 2007 | 94 | 78 | 74 | 56 | 79 | 62 | 54 | 38 | 48 | 31 |
| 2006 | 89 | 76 | 66 | 52 | 77 | 62 | 49 | 37 | 40 | 28 |

## ACT EXAM: ETHNICITY AND GENDER DATA

Ethnic student groups demonstrated solid results. In the ACT Composite, studying both male and female data, students increased their score in three out of ten measurable areas according to the table below. It needs to be kept in mind that the numbers of American Indian students, African-American students and Hispanic students are all small, and that can contribute to wide swings in the results. When one examines the factors involved in the Composite of 26.1, it is clear that students in the Top 400 drove the high performance levels, as they maintained solids performances for mutiple years. However, it is also clear from the table below that the entire increase was not due to Caucasian students. Male Caucasian students showed a decrease scoring 25.8, and females averaged 26.4, so the entire lofty Composite score could not have been driven by just those students.

According to the ACT Composite results, African-American Males decreased 7.9 points after and increase of 5.7 points the previous year. African-American Females increased by $\mathbf{1 . 5}$ points after a decrease 4.3 points last year. Asian Females decreased by 0.5 points
and Males decreased by 0.3 points. Among the Hispanic population, Hispanic Males decreased by 1.9 points, and Hispanic Females increased by 2.7 points. In English, African American Females increased from 17.8 points to 21.8 points and Males decreased from 26.7 points to 17.4 points. African American Females showed increases in English, Math, Reading, and Science, while African American Males experienced decreases in the four sub-tests. In addition, Hispanic Females improved on all four subtests, while Hispanic Males decreased on the four subtests. These results fluctuate greatly from one year to the next. For example, in 2021 African American Males improved on all four subtests, while in 2022 they experienced a decrease in all four areas. The High School staff was instrumental in helping all of these students prepare for the ACT.

| ACT Composite Comparison by Ethnicity and Gender (Bold indicates an increase from the previous year and italics indicates a decrease) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grad Yr | American Indian |  | Asian |  | African American |  | Hispanic |  | Caucasian |  |
|  | M | F | M | F | M | F | M | F | M | F |
| 2022 | 24.7 | 30.5 | 29.8 | 27.9 | 18.8 | 22.6 | 24.0 | 25.4 | 25.8 | 26.4 |
| 2021 | 25.0 | 31.0 | 27.3 | 29.2 | 26.7 | 20.1 | 25.9 | 22.7 | 26.2 | 26.4 |
| 2020 | NA | 26.0 | 28.4 | 28.5 | 21.0 | 24.4 | 29.0 | 24.3 | 27.6 | 27.0 |
| 2019 | 28.0 | NA | 30.4 | 28.7 | 20.2 | 21.6 | 26.7 | 27.0 | 27.2 | 27.0 |
| 2018 | 26.0 | NA | 28.7 | 27.2 | 24.8 | 21.7 | 23.0 | 25.2 | 26.9 | 27.0 |
| 2017 | 23.6 | 17.8 | 27.9 | 28.7 | 20.4 | 22.1 | 18.4 | 24.2 | 26.5 | 26.9 |
| 2016 | NA | 24.8 | 30.9 | 25.1 | 18.7 | 22.1 | 25.5 | 26.0 | 26.4 | 26.3 |
| 2015 | 21.0 | 20.0 | 27.9 | 27.1 | 19.8 | 19.2 | 22.9 | 25.5 | 26.1 | 26.3 |
| 2014 | NA | NA | 27.9 | 27.4 | 24.3 | 24.1 | 22.4 | 21.2 | 26.3 | 26.2 |
| 2013 | NA | 32.0 | 28.4 | 24.9 | 22.3 | 17.0 | 27.0 | 31.0 | 26.3 | 26.6 |
| 2012 | NA | 20.1 | NA | NA | 21.0 | 22.1 | 23.0 | 25.8 | 26.0 | 26.0 |
| 2011 | 27.0 | NA | 27.3 | 23.3 | 20.4 | 24.2 | 25.8 | 15.7 | 25.5 | 25.7 |
| 2010 | NA | NA | 29.3 | 25.1 | 21.5 | 20.5 | 25.5 | 21.3 | 25.6 | 25.7 |
| 2009 | 28.0 | 20.5 | 27.0 | 23.0 | 17.0 | 22.0 | 23.7 | 19.0 | 25.7 | 25.6 |
| 2008 | 15.0 | NA | 27.2 | 24.1 | 21.1 | 26.0 | 17.0 | 22.7 | 24.8 | 24.6 |
| 2007 | NA | 28.0 | 26.0 | 25.2 | 20.0 | 27.0 | 23.5 | 21.0 | 24.6 | 25.0 |


| ACT English Comparison by Ethnicity and Gender <br> (Bold indicates an increase from the previous year and italics indicates a decrease) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grad Yr | American <br> Indian | Asian |  | American |  | Hispanic |  | Caucasian |  |  |
|  | M | F | M | F | M | F | M | F | M | F |
|  | $\mathbf{2 3 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 3 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 8 . 6}$ | 27.3 | 17.4 | $\mathbf{2 1 . 8}$ | 21.4 | $\mathbf{2 5 . 8}$ | 24.5 | 26.5 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 1}$ | 20.7 | 30.0 | 26.1 | 30.1 | 26.7 | 17.8 | 24.2 | 21.8 | 24.5 | 26.6 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ | NA | 25.0 | 27.6 | 28.5 | 19.4 | 25.7 | 28.9 | 23.3 | 26.6 | 27.2 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 9}$ | 23.0 | NA | 2.6 | 29.6 | 18.4 | 20.8 | 27.0 | 27.6 | 26.1 | 27.5 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ | 24.5 | NA | 27.3 | 26.6 | 24.3 | 20.5 | 22.2 | 25.4 | 25.8 | 27.3 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | 23.0 | 18.0 | 27.4 | 29.7 | 18.7 | 22.3 | 18.3 | 24.3 | 25.8 | 27.5 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ | NA | 27.0 | 30.3 | 24.5 | 16.6 | 22.9 | 24.4 | 25.2 | 25.8 | 27.0 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | 17.0 | 20.7 | 27.8 | 28.2 | 18.3 | 19.5 | 22.9 | 27.3 | 25.4 | 26.6 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ | NA | NA | 27.3 | 26.9 | 20.5 | 21.5 | 21.8 | 22.6 | 25.0 | 26.4 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ | NA | 33.0 | 27.9 | 24.0 | 20.1 | 15.7 | 27.3 | 30.1 | 25.6 | 27.1 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ | NA | 23.0 | NA | NA | 20.0 | 23.1 | 23.4 | 24.2 | 25.0 | 26.0 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 1}$ | 30.0 | NA | 25.0 | 23.3 | 19.8 | 25.4 | 23.8 | 14.3 | 24.9 | 26.5 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | NA | NA | 29.4 | 24.9 | 21.0 | 20.0 | 26.3 | 21.0 | 25.3 | 26.6 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | 29.5 | 23.0 | 27.3 | 23.3 | 16.4 | 20.7 | 24.3 | 20.3 | 25.3 | 26.3 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | 15.0 | NA | 26.0 | 24.3 | 20.1 | 22.0 | 16.5 | 23.7 | 24.3 | 2.2 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | NA | 29.0 | 23.5 | 24.5 | 20.3 | 30.0 | 24.0 | 21.0 | 23.4 | 25.2 |


| ACT Math Comparison by Ethnicity and Gender (Bold indicates an increase from the previous year and italics indicates a decrease) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grad Yr | American Indian |  | Asian |  | African American |  | Hispanic |  | Caucasian |  |
|  | M | F | M | F | M | F | M | F | M | F |
| 2022 | 23.7 | 26.0 | 30.2 | 27.7 | 17.9 | 21.8 | 23.8 | 23.6 | 25.4 | 24.5 |
| 2021 | 25.3 | 27.0 | 27.0 | 27.6 | 25.0 | 20.2 | 25.6 | 21.8 | 26.4 | 24.7 |
| 2020 | NA | 31.0 | 28.5 | 27.7 | 21.5 | 23.5 | 26.9 | 23.9 | 27.2 | 25.4 |
| 2019 | 27.5 | NA | 30.1 | 27.4 | 19.8 | 20.7 | 25.3 | 24.6 | 26.8 | 25.4 |
| 2018 | 26.5 | NA | 29.3 | 25.8 | 24.1 | 21.3 | 23.7 | 23.6 | 26.8 | 25.7 |
| 2017 | 21.0 | 17.0 | 28.8 | 27.7 | 20.8 | 20.0 | 18.3 | 22.0 | 26.3 | 25.6 |
| 2016 | NA | 21.0 | 31.9 | 24.9 | 18.5 | 19.8 | 26.2 | 24.7 | 26.0 | 25.2 |
| 2015 | 23.0 | 20.3 | 29.0 | 26.6 | 17.6 | 19.3 | 24.3 | 24.0 | 26.0 | 25.2 |
| 2014 | NA | NA | 27.5 | 25.4 | 22.6 | 21.2 | 23.4 | 20.6 | 25.2 | 24.5 |
| 2013 | NA | 33.0 | 29.0 | 24.3 | 20.1 | 16.7 | 25.3 | 28.6 | 25.8 | 25.4 |
| 2012 | NA | 17.0 | NA | NA | 20.4 | 21.3 | 23.4 | 25.5 | 25.7 | 25.0 |
| 2011 | 28.0 | NA | 27.5 | 23.8 | 20.8 | 23.6 | 25.8 | 16.3 | 25.6 | 24.5 |
| 2010 | NA | NA | 28.6 | 25.2 | 20.2 | 19.5 | 25.3 | 20.8 | 25.5 | 24.6 |
| 2009 | 29.5 | 16.0 | 27.1 | 23.3 | 17.0 | 19.7 | 22.3 | 17.7 | 25.6 | 24.8 |
| 2008 | 14.0 | NA | 28.0 | 23.7 | 20.9 | 24.0 | 16.5 | 23.0 | 25.1 | 24.1 |
| 2007 | NA | 26.5 | 26.4 | 24.0 | 18.8 | 23.0 | 21.5 | 18.0 | 25.3 | 24.5 |


| ACT Reading Comparison by Ethnicity and Gender (Bold indicates an increase from the previous year and italics indicates a decrease) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grad Yr | American Indian |  | Asian |  | African American |  | Hispanic |  | Caucasian |  |
|  | M | F | M | F | M | F | M | F | M | F |
| 2022 | 25.0 | 33.0 | 29.7 | 28.4 | 20.8 | 24.2 | 25.4 | 28.2 | 26.5 | 27.9 |
| 2021 | 27.3 | 36.0 | 27.7 | 30.8 | 30.0 | 21.4 | 27.5 | 23.8 | 26.9 | 27.7 |
| 2020 | NA | 19.0 | 28.8 | 29.1 | 21.9 | 24.6 | 30.4 | 24.3 | 28.2 | 28.2 |
| 2019 | 30.0 | NA | 30.7 | 29.3 | 21.6 | 22.9 | 27.8 | 28.8 | 27.6 | 28.1 |
| 2018 | 26.0 | NA | 28.1 | 29.3 | 24.9 | 23.3 | 22.2 | 26.4 | 27.3 | 28.0 |
| 2017 | 26.3 | 14.0 | 26.9 | 29.4 | 20.4 | 23.3 | 17.9 | 26.1 | 26.9 | 28.0 |
| 2016 | NA | 29.0 | 31.3 | 25.8 | 18.8 | 23.8 | 25.5 | 27.5 | 27.0 | 27.0 |
| 2015 | 22.0 | 19.0 | 27.0 | 27.8 | 21.9 | 20.8 | 22.0 | 27.3 | 26.4 | 27.2 |
| 2014 | NA | NA | 27.9 | 27.7 | 21.0 | 22.9 | 20.7 | 21.2 | 25.6 | 26.4 |
| 2013 | N/A | 32.0 | 27.7 | 26.3 | 24.2 | 16.0 | 28.0 | 34.3 | 26.5 | 27.1 |
| 2012 | N/A | 19.0 | NA | NA | 22.1 | 25.3 | 24.4 | 28.0 | 25.0 | 27.0 |
| 2011 | 24.0 | NA | 27.4 | 22.5 | 19.5 | 23.2 | 27.0 | 14.3 | 24.8 | 26.0 |
| 2010 | NA | NA | 28.3 | 25.0 | 22.7 | 20.5 | 24.8 | 21.0 | 25.5 | 26.5 |
| 2009 | 26.5 | 23.5 | 26.8 | 22.7 | 15.8 | 25.0 | 26.3 | 18.7 | 26.0 | 26.2 |
| 2008 | 14.0 | NA | 27.8 | 25.1 | 21.1 | 30.0 | 18.0 | 22.7 | 24.8 | 25.1 |
| 2007 | NA | 27.0 | 27.5 | 26.8 | 19.5 | 27.0 | 24.5 | 28.0 | 24.4 | 25.6 |


| ACT Science Comparison by Ethnicity and Gender <br> (Bold indicates an increase from the previous year and italics indicates a decrease) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grad Yr | American Indian |  | Asian |  | African American |  | Hispanic |  | Caucasian |  |
|  | M | F | M | F | M | F | M | F | M | F |
| 2022 | 25.0 | 29.5 | 30.3 | 27.7 | 19.1 | 22.3 | 24.9 | 23.4 | 26.5 | 26.3 |
| 2021 | 26.0 | 31.0 | 28.0 | 28.3 | 25.7 | 20.4 | 25.7 | 23.1 | 26.6 | 26.1 |
| 2020 | NA | 27.0 | 28.4 | 28.2 | 21.3 | 23.6 | 29.0 | 25.6 | 28.1 | 26.5 |
| 2019 | 30.5 | NA | 30.7 | 27.9 | 20.9 | 21.8 | 26.6 | 26.4 | 27.6 | 26.4 |
| 2018 | 26.0 | NA | 29.5 | 26.4 | 25.3 | 21.5 | 23.3 | 24.8 | 27.2 | 26.5 |
| 2017 | 24.0 | 22.0 | 28.4 | 27.9 | 21.9 | 22.9 | 19.0 | 24.5 | 27.0 | 26.3 |
| 2016 | NA | 22.0 | 30.1 | 25.1 | 20.6 | 21.9 | 25.9 | 26.5 | 26.8 | 25.8 |
| 2015 | 23.0 | 21.0 | 29.0 | 26.8 | 21.8 | 19.0 | 23.0 | 25.8 | 26.6 | 26.2 |
| 2014 | NA | NA | 28.1 | 25.9 | 23.7 | 20.9 | 22.0 | 22.2 | 26.2 | 25.6 |
| 2013 | NA | 32.0 | 28.2 | 24.3 | 22.3 | 19.0 | 26.1 | 29.8 | 26.9 | 26.0 |
| 2012 | NA | 19.0 | N/A | N/A | 21.3 | 22.4 | 23.0 | 26.0 | 27.1 | 25.1 |
| 2011 | 25.0 | NA | 28.3 | 23.0 | 21.3 | 24.0 | 25.5 | 17.3 | 25.8 | 25.1 |
| 2010 | NA | NA | 29.8 | 24.4 | 21.5 | 20.0 | 25.8 | 20.5 | 25.6 | 24.6 |
| 2009 | 26.0 | 19.5 | 26.5 | 23.0 | 18.2 | 20.7 | 21.0 | 18.3 | 25.4 | 24.7 |
| 2008 | 15.0 | NA | 26.4 | 22.9 | 21.9 | 26.0 | 17.5 | 20.7 | 24.5 | 23.6 |
| 2007 | NA | 28.5 | 26.1 | 25.0 | 21.0 | 29.0 | 22.5 | 18.0 | 24.7 | 24.1 |

## SAT EXAM RESULTS

## SAT Composite Score Counts

Minnetonka student data in this section reflects results from the former version of the SAT taken prior to March 2016, and the current version of the SAT, taken after March 2016. There are now six years' worth of historical data with the new test, and the results are encouraging. Colleges and universities accept either the ACT or the SAT, so there is no need for students interested in East Coast or West Coast schools to take the SAT. There are important differences between the former SAT and the ACT Tests. For example, the SAT featured more extensive subject-area tests whereas the ACT combines all subtests into one exam. Also, the SAT was recognized as an exam that requires more abstract thinking and questions are phrased in ways that intentionally challenge students' vocabulary. Students who took the SAT before March 2016 took the former version of the test. Beginning after March 2016, the new test was administered and has a scoring scale of 1600. 101 Minnetonka students took the SAT last year, compared to 49 last year and 87 students two years ago. Two years ago, 93.9 percent of students scored within the 1300-1399 range and higher, while 52.4 percent scored within this range last year. However, two years ago, only 19.5 percent scored in this range. The lower number of students tested in previous years significantly impacts the fluctuation in percentages. It is important to note that most of the students scored within the 1200-1299 range and higher last year, while two years ago, most students scored within the 1300-1399 range and higher. This explains the significant decrease in overall scores for the Class of 2022, decreasing slightly from a mean score of 656 to 654 in Reading and Writing from 2021 to 2022. Additionally, there was a significant decrease in Math, declining from a mean score of 682 to a score of 643 last year, a trend observed on the ACT Math Test as well. The ACT and the current, newer version of the SAT structures questions in a more straightforward manner, yet still holds high expectations for problem solving and abstract thought. A key change with the current SAT, other than the total score and updated subtest names, is that the new test focuses on the knowledge, skills, and understandings that research has identified as most important for college and career readiness success. This measurement is what Minnetonka students and families have grown accustomed to with the ACT.

SAT scores will be continuing to be analyzed with multiple years of data, helping to bring context to the student scores. Subject areas measured on the current newer version of the SAT are Evidence-based Reading and Writing (EBRW) and Math, as seen in the table below. In 2018, there was a sharp increase of students scoring about 1300 ( 24 students or $1 / 4$ of the students). The next section will focus on the various subtest results.

## SAT Composite Score Counts



2019 SAT Composite Score Counts
Tests taken after March 2016


## 2020 SAT Composite Score Counts

Tests taken after March 2016




## SAT Test Scores for Reading, Math, and Writing

The SAT Composite mean increased from 1338 to 1297, which is similar to the average two years ago. Three years ago, Minnetonka students performed at similar levels to last when they earned a Composite of 1353 three years ago. Again, the decrease in Composite mean can be attributed to the lower number of students reaching the 13001399 range and the increased number and percentage of students scoring below this range. Typically, the Reading Test offers the types of problems that can be considered typical strengths for students in Minnetonka. It focuses on Reading Comprehension as well as Sentence Completion. The latter tests students' vocabulary knowledge. With the focus on vocabulary and comprehension, students in Minnetonka should perform at high levels on the section. The levels on the SAT are like those levels from six years ago when the new version of the test was administered. Historically, students have posted high scores on the NWEA and MCA Reading Tests that also measure these types of skills. The SAT Writing Test includes an Essay in which the students are given 25 minutes to respond to the question by writing an essay in longhand. The next section is multiple choice with questions focused on Improving Sentences, Identifying Sentence Errors and Improving Paragraphs. The current version of the SAT offers an optional essay section. Students saw a dramatic decrease in their Math performance by 39 points, dropping from 682 to 643, with a slight 2-point increase in Reading ( 656 to 654). The Math scores are at their lowest levels in six years, and the Reading scores are solid, but there is still work to be done.

SAT Test Scores for Reading, Math, and Writing


## SAT Critical Reading and Writing Results

With the focus on vocabulary and comprehension, students in Minnetonka should perform at high levels on the section. Historically, students have posted high scores on the NWEA and MCA reading tests that also measure these types of skills. With a mean score of 654, student results to this point appear to be rebounding, which will require additional analysis by school staff and building leadership.

## SAT Writing Results

Writing was a central focus of the English Language Arts Curriculum Review. As a result, new curriculum resources were introduced at the elementary level last year, and several revisions were made to the Writing curriculum at the secondary level. With the new SAT Writing Test, students are expected to provide substantive arguments and critically analyze passages, along with expressing ideas using proper conventions. This test is combined with the Evidence-based Reading Test. With the new curriculum review for language arts, this will be an area to be addressed.

## SAT Reading and Writing



## SAT Math Results

Math scores on the SAT decreased significantly after reaching all-time high levels in 2009-10 and 2010-11 and then increasing slightly the past few years after a sharp decline. The performance on the SAT has improved significantly compared to the years between 2001 and 2006, with a sharp decline in 2015-16. More students are taking higher level Math classes and are exposed to the type of problems the SAT poses which should prove to be beneficial for students. For example, students in Minnetonka are expected to answer questions related to word problems, percent, divisibility, graphing, and elementary number theory. Because students excel in these areas in Minnetonka, it is evident that students who take both the SAT and ACT should be predicted to have success on both Math assessments. The new SAT Math Test is designed to mirror the problem solving and modeling students will do in College Math, Science, and Social Sciences courses and in everyday life. The 39-point increase compared to last year is cause for deeper analysis by staff, however, with twice as many students taking the test compared to the previous years, the fluctuation in results should be noted.

## SAT Math Results



## SAT RESULTS

## Minnetonka College Bound Seniors Compared to Nation

It is very likely that the new direction of colleges that previously required an SAT score and are now accepting an ACT or SAT has changed the need for our top students to take the SAT.

Overall, Minnetonka SAT results are at higher levels and are typically stronger compared to the nation. Until this year, the former SAT had not seen improvement at the ACT level most likely because of the changing dynamics. Now that Minnetonka students have been taking the new version of the SAT for the past six years, it is necessary to analyze the results to make meaning from them and to put the results into perspective understanding the one year does not make a trend. National comparisons are not available at this time as seen in the table below, but one can conclude based on previous year's national scores, that Minnetonka students well out-paced their national counterparts.

## Minnetonka College Bound Seniors Compared to Nation

| College Bound Senior Comparisons <br> Tests taken after March 2017 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grad Yr | EBRW |  | Math |  | Composite |  |
|  | Mtka | Nation | Mtka | Nation | Mtka | Nation |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 2}$ | 654 | - | 643 | - | 1296 | - |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 1}$ | 656 | 533 | 682 | 528 | 1360 | 1060 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ | 645 | 528 | 648 | 523 | 1293 | 1051 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 9}$ | 671 | 531 | 682 | 528 | 1353 | 1059 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ | 681 | 536 | 693 | 531 | 1374 | 1068 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | 670 | 480 | 673 | 530 | 1343 | 1010 |

## INTERNATIONAL BACCALAUREATE (IB) EXAM RESULTS

## Students Tested in IB and IB Diploma Results

For May 2020 exams, IB averages were calculated with a combination of teacher input submitted to IB with IB's predicted student performance calculation, should students have been able to complete the IB exams. Since students were able to safely sit for exams in May 2021, IB used an adjusted calculation with a combination of teacher input submitted to IB, components externally assessed by IB, and exams in which students sat. As a result, it will be important to view the IB Exam results over time. IB extended this methodology for 2022 and will revert to previous scoring practices in 2023.

Below is an explanation from IB found in the IB Diploma Programme Provisional Statistical Bulletin from the May 2022 Assessment Session:

The IB understands that students globally continue to face disruption to their lives as a result of the pandemic. To address those challenges, the IB has made adaptations to learning, teaching, and assessment, which will be extended to the November 2022 examination session.

Furthermore, for the November 2022 Diploma Programme and Career-related Programme session, the IB believes that, where safe and possible to do so, students sitting examinations is the best method to assess student capability.
However, for those students in circumstances that prevent exams, the IB has developed a contingency measure that will allow for the awarding of grades without written examinations. This procedure was also deployed in the May 2022 examination session, with most students able to sit the examinations.

There was an increase in the number of students taking IB courses ( 744 to 817 ), and an increase in the number of exams ( 662 to 739). Minnetonka also saw a significant increase in students obtaining an IB Diploma (59), and the pass rate for earning the diploma increased to 100 percent. The international rate of diploma attainment varies, but it usually rests between 78 percent and 80 percent each year.

According to Laura Herbst, AP/IB Coordinator, typically, approximately 20 percent of students drop from the full diploma program over time, but Minnetonka staff have been able to stem that rate and saw 11 percent (15 percent for the Class of 2022) of students drop the diploma between their junior and senior years in recent years; some students dropped the diploma during their senior year, which is not common, citing stress and overall challenges of the school year as significant challenges. Last year there were 59 diploma candidates and 59 students who earned the diploma, which is a very encouraging rate of diploma attainment. The average score for students earning a diploma was 5.20 out of 7 . The 2016-2017 school year welcomed the largest class with 84 junior students beginning the year as anticipated IB Diploma Candidates, and 79 completed the full IB Diploma Program according to Laura Herbst. The 2018-2019 school year graduated the second largest class with 69 seniors. Of the 69 IB Diploma candidates, 30 of them were eligible for the Bilingual IB Diploma, 25 of those 30 obtained the Bilingual IB Diploma. Of the 482020 Diploma Candidates, 20 were eligible for the Bilingual IB Diploma and all 20 earned it. Of the 342021 Diploma Candidates, 12 were eligible for the Bilingual IB Diploma and all 12 earned it. Of the 592022 Diploma Candidates, 30 were eligible for the Bilingual IB Diploma and all 30 earned it.

The Theory of Knowledge course is now taught in the junior year, and it has provided a cohort experience that may be attractive for students to remain in the program. In addition, the Extended Essay (EE) is overseen by the Theory of Knowledge (ToK) teacher, and the consistent work with the students over the junior year and through the following Summer has meant that most diploma students do not see the Extended Essay as an insurmountable hurdle, as they complete it late in the Summer or early in the Fall. With the addition of the IB Core Support Team, there has been improvement in how students perform on both the EE and ToK essay, both of which impact how many bonus points students earn towards their diploma points, in addition to being a unique opportunity for diploma candidates. The percentage of students who earned a "D" on the EE decreased from 21 percent in 2017 to 8 percent in 2021 , and 10 percent in 2022 , while the percentage who earned an " $A$ " increased from 0 in 2017 to 8 percent in 2018, 11 percent in 2019, 10 percent in 2020, 5 percent in 2021, 8 percent in 2022. There was improvement in how students scored on the ToK essay, with the percentage of students earning a "D" decreasing from 13 percent in 2017 to 3 percent in 2018, increasing to 17 percent in 2019, decreasing to 10 percent in 2020, 8 percent in 2021, and 0 in 2022, while the percentage earning a " $B$ " improved from 33 percent in 2017 to 40 percent in 201842 percent in 2021, and 63 percent in 2022.

Last year, for the second year in a row, there were 31 possible IB Tests administered, and Minnetonka students surpassed or met the world-wide average on 17 out of the 31 (54 percent) compared to 16 out of 31 opportunities ( 52 percent) the previous year,
which was higher than the 45 percent pass rate from three years ago. The percentage of Minnetonka students surpassing world-wide averages has increased while the number of IB courses and enrollment continues to remain at high levels. With an increase in test takers, it is likely that scores will drop and rebound again once the enrollment begins to level off, along with the 2020 and 2021 assessment models being different than in typical exam years.

59 of 59 Diploma Programme (DP) candidates earned the full IB Diploma and 95 percent (which is up from 93 percent the previous year) of all the IB exams completed earned a four or higher, which means these students are eligible for college credit at most universities.

## Number of Students Who Reported an IB Score and Number of Students Earning IB Diploma

| IB Summary |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Students Tested in IB | IB Diploma |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{7 3 9}$ | 59 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 1}$ | 662 | 33 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ | 679 | 44 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 9}$ | 668 | 59 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ | 736 | 65 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | 660 | 23 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ | 587 | 24 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | 578 | 41 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ | 493 | 48 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ | 453 | 28 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ | 369 | 30 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 1}$ | 270 | 29 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | 234 | 32 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | 218 | 36 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | 144 | 27 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | 94 | 27 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | 48 | 6 |

## Number of Students Completing Multiple IB Courses

There was an increase of 73 students completing IB courses. The number of students who have taken multiple IB courses has increased as well from 292 top 345 reaching a second all-time high level, which could be explained by the many intriguing course options available to students, according to AP/IB Coordinator, Laura Herbst.

According to IB staff, more students view an SL course as something that is attainable and thus a viable option. The newer SL English classes have experienced fluctuating numbers of sections, increasing from zero to seven sections since 2016. Overall, the increase in SL classes, which are one year long, seem attainable for students to complete. Teachers have made a focused effort to encourage students to take SL courses as their entry into more rigorous upper-level courses.

Number of Students Completing Multiple IB Courses

| Students Completing IB Courses |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Number of <br> Students | Number of Students who took multiple <br> courses (subset of previous column) |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{8 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 5}$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 1}$ | 744 | 292 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ | 700 | 215 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 9}$ | 721 | 305 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ | 822 | 364 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | 714 | 269 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ | 571 | 198 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | 656 | 258 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ | 552 | 250 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ | 505 | 245 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ | 436 | 118 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 1}$ | 323 | 100 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | 269 | 73 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | 293 | 82 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | 218 | 43 |

## IB Science Results

Overall, IB Science test results have improved in three out of four areas. Biology SL had the highest number of scores reported of the four courses (129). The average score of 5.20 is significantly above the world-wide average of 4.56 and a slight decrease of 0.10 from a year ago. The IB Science teachers have adjusted and improved their internal assessments. They are more aligned to the IB standards. For the last ten years in the IB Sciences, the teachers have focused their efforts on internal assessments: the lab work that students complete that makes up part of the students' IB grade. Their focus has been on standardizing their grading with respect to the IB rubric so that students receive accurate formative and summative feedback. This work has helped to improve Biology HL scores as well as assist teachers in Biology SL and Physics SL to encourage strong performance throughout the year's course. Specific staffing assignments have helped to
strengthen the SL program in these areas. The Biology HL average is strong given the overall lower enrollment compared to a course the size of Biology SL. Students in 2022 scored beyond than the world-wide average of 4.72 with an average score of 5.30 . Physics SL scores fluctuate each year due to the dramatic change in number of students taking the test with a score 4.46, which is below the world-wide average of 4.64. However, with 67 students taking the Physics SL Exam, it is encouraging to see the number of students challenging themselves in this area, which also explains the lower mean scores. Overall, world-wide averages have decreased in Science by approximately .3 points, so it is encouraging to see Minnetonka students improving their average scores in three of four areas during a time when world-wide averages are experience a decrease in average scores.

Eight years ago, the high school added the new IB course-Sports, Exercise, and Health Science (SEHS) SL, and first year scores were very strong and the second- and thirdyear score of 4.27 eclipsed the world-wide average of 3.92 for the second year in a row. With an average score of 4.90 in 2018, the students well surpassed the world-wide average of 3.95 matching the highest average score from 2015. In 2020, there was a slight increase in the average score (4.67), and Minnetonka students continued to outpace the world-wide average of 3.89. In 2021, Minnetonka students' strong performance continued with an average score of 5.28 , compared to the world-wide average of 4.18. The average world-wide score in this area last year was 4.48. Enrollment in IB Biology HL has fluctuated over time, which may be a result of more students seeing Biology SL as a preferred, less time-intensive course as well as IB Diploma students having more options for their third or fourth HL course. As in previous years, IB Biology teachers have consistently focused on the internal assessments in order to give students accurate formative and summative feedback, and the scores on those exams remained steady this year. The IB Physics SL scores increased, most likely due to the teacher spending time during the summer adjusting the course to align more closely to the IB outcomes. IB Biology and Physics courses had new exams beginning in May 2016, and staff has continued the teacher re-training process.

## IB Science Results



IB Science Number of Scores Reported

| IB Science Number of Tests Taken |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Bio HL | Bio SL | Physics SL | SEHS SL |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 9}$ | 129 | 67 | $\mathbf{4 3}$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 1}$ | 10 | 138 | 104 | 26 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ | 9 | 121 | 66 | 19 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 9}$ | 18 | 135 | 35 | 16 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ | 20 | 138 | 57 | 40 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | 13 | 117 | 33 | 26 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ | 11 | 89 | 12 | 28 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | 20 | 92 | 14 | 39 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ | 27 | 77 | 19 | 23 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ | 44 | 64 | 15 | N/A |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ | 34 | 100 | 10 | N/A |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 1}$ | 33 | 80 | 12 | N/A |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | 36 | 58 | 11 | N/A |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | 47 | 29 | 14 | N/A |

## IB Math Results

The table below shows Math results for exams taken through 2020. The next table in this section reflects the new exams taken in 2021. The Math Analysis and Approaches SL
and HL exams were new in 2021, so there is limited trend data available. The Math Analysis and Approaches SL scores show that Minnetonka students earned an average score of 5.21 , compared to the world-wide average of 4.99 , dropping from 5.19 a year ago. The HL scores show that Minnetonka students also earned an average score of 4.71, and the world-wide average score was 5.21 , which also dropped from an average score of 5.44 .

IB Math and Computer Science Results


IB Math Number of Scores Reported (Subjects Administered through 2020)

| Year | Math <br> Studies SL | Math HL | Math SL | Further <br> Math HL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ | 5 | 35 | 19 | 11 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 9}$ | 10 | 61 | 38 | 18 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ | 2 | 88 | 52 | 29 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | 13 | 61 | 23 | 8 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ | 40 | 38 | 19 | 22 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | 14 | 42 | 23 | 24 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ | 20 | 28 | 32 | 11 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ | 12 | 42 | 18 | 11 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ | 8 | 43 | 19 | 14 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 1}$ | 16 | 37 | 19 | N/A |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | 19 | 45 | 19 | N/A |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | 19 | 23 | 20 | N/A |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | 31 | 19 | 23 | N/A |

IB Math \& Computer Science
■ 2017 ■ 2018 ■ 2019 ■ $2020 ■ 2021$ ■ 2022


IB Math and Computer Science Number of Scores Reported

| Year | Math <br>  <br> Approaches <br> HL | Math <br>  <br> Approaches <br> SL | Math <br>  <br> Interpretations <br> HL | Math <br>  <br> Interpretations <br> SL | Computer <br> Science HL | Computer <br> Science <br> SL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 4}$ | 27 | 6 | $\mathbf{3 2}$ | NA | NA |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 1}$ | 14 | 28 | 9 | 22 | 1 | NA |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ | NA | NA | NA | NA | 7 | 2 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 9}$ | NA | NA | NA | NA | 4 | NA |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ | NA | NA | NA | NA | 4 | NA |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | NA | NA | NA | NA | 3 | NA |

## IB Languages Results

The next two sections highlight IB Languages. This sections displays results for students in the World Language program and the next section highlights student results within the Immersion program. IB World Languages continue to show solid results with two exams experiences increases compared to last year with two exceptions. Both French HL and German SL experienced significant decreases, however the fluctuations in scores have been predictable over the years. Fore example, French HL results show that average scores eclipse the 5.0 mark every other year with average scores remaining in the 4-point range every other year. With a drop from 5.0 the prior year to 4.4 last year, one might predict a significant change in score for next year. The fluctuating scores observed in German SL and French HL can be attributed to the large swings in enrollment each year. With a score of 5.56 , the French AB SL mean surpassed the world-wide average of 5.00 . In addition, the French SL mean of 5.14 also surpassed the world-wide average of 5.12 .

The French HL mean of 4.37, decreased by .6 points, and fell behind the world-wide average of 5.38. The German SL course (4.05) fell short of the the world-wide average (5.31), with German HL (3.86) declining by 0.4 points falling behind the world-wide average of 5.80 points. Like previous world-wide averages reported, scores internationally dropped an average of 0.3-0.4 points.

The second table shows 2022 scores for Spanish AB SL, Spanish HL, and Spanish SL. Mandarin tests scores were not reported last year. Overall, scores remain steady compared to previous years among the Spanish languages, surpassing the world-wide averages on the Spanish SL and HL exams, while falling behind the world-wide average of 5.05 with Minnetonka's first year taking the Spanish AB SL exam.

IB Languages Results



IB Languages Number of Scores Reported
IB Languages Number of Tests Taken

| Year | French <br> AB SL | French <br> SL | French <br> HL | German <br> SL | German <br> HL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 2}$ | 9 | 19 | $\mathbf{2 7}$ | 17 | $\mathbf{1 4}$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 1}$ | 13 | 40 | 9 | 22 | 6 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ | 7 | 35 | 21 | 17 | 3 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 9}$ | N/A | 26 | 18 | 21 | 11 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ | N/A | 33 | 22 | 22 | N/A |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | N/A | 33 | 13 | 23 | N/A |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ | N/A | 20 | 17 | 0 | 6 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | N/A | 28 | 10 | 16 | 2 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ | N/A | 30 | 22 | 14 | 2 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ | N/A | 40 | 10 | 9 | 4 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ | N/A | 17 | 5 | 18 | 3 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 1}$ | N/A | 13 | 14 | 9 | 3 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | N/A | 13 | 13 | 10 | 5 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | N/A | 40 | N/A | $\mathbf{2 5}$ | N/A |


| IB Languages Number of Tests Taken |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Mandarin <br> SL | Mandarin <br> HL | Spanish <br> AB SL | Spanish <br> SL | Spanish <br> HL |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 2}$ | N/A | N/A | 3 | $\mathbf{5 2}$ | 12 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 1}$ | N/A | 1 | NA | 41 | 17 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ | N/A | 1 | NA | 38 | 34 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 9}$ | 5 | $\mathbf{2}$ | N/A | 52 | 25 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ | 8 | N/A | N/A | 82 | 32 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | 6 | 4 | N/A | 81 | 54 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ | 7 | 1 | N/A | 83 | 44 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | 2 | 1 | N/A | 95 | 47 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ | 10 | 2 | N/A | 96 | 44 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ | 12 | N/A | N/A | 74 | 47 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ | 6 | N/A | N/A | 57 | 21 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 1}$ | 15 | N/A | N/A | 35 | 13 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | 3 | 2 | N/A | 23 | 15 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | 7 | N/A | N/A | 40 | N/A |

## IB Language Immersion Results

Results in this section indicate how Immersion students performed in IB Language and Literature compared to students internationally. These scores are mainly results of students world-wide whose primarily language is being assessed compared to Immersion students who are mainly assessed in their second language in Language and Literature. Students matched or improved their average scores from last year on all three tests. First, Mandarin SL improved by 0.2 points with an average score of 4.4 points. This fell short of the world-wide average of 5.73 . The previous world-wide average was 6.43 . Spanish HL students improved their mean score from 4.6 to 5.00 and surpassed the world-wide average of 4.95. Lastly, Spanish SL scores remain the same as last year with an average score of 4.44 falling shy of the world-wide average of 5.15 points. Again, it is important to note the fluctuation in average test scores over time correlates with the fluctuation in numbers of students taking the test each year.

IB Language Immersion Results


IB Language Immersion Number of Scores Reported

| Year | Mandarin <br>  <br> Literature SL | Spanish <br>  <br> Literature SL | Spanish Language <br> \& Literature HL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 2}$ | 13 | $\mathbf{4 5}$ | 13 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 1}$ | 17 | 23 | 13 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ | 11 | N/A | 14 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 9}$ | 13 | 56 | 16 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ | N/A | 50 | N/A |

## IB Visual Arts Results

IB Visual Arts has experienced a decrease in the number of students participating, dropping by 3 students among the HL class and 11 students among the SL class. In addition, the SL enrollment has fluctuated over the years, and the average score of 4.44 increased slightly beyond the world-wide average of 4.11. IB Visual Arts HL scores were slightly below the world-wide average of $4 . .44$ with an average score of 4.20 . Overall, Minnetonka continues to close or eliminate the gap on the IB Visual Arts Exams.

IB Visual Arts Results


IB Visual Arts Number of Scores Reported

| Year | Vis Art HL | Vis Art SL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 1}$ | 5 | 9 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 1}$ | 8 | 20 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ | 2 | 5 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 9}$ | 9 | 18 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ | 6 | 13 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | 1 | 7 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ | 0 | 5 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | 10 | 17 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ | 17 | 7 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ | 4 | 16 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ | 12 | 6 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 1}$ | 10 | 18 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | 9 | 9 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | 15 | 11 |

## IB History Results

The IB History HL (since the redesign it's less Europe-centric so they are removing the "Europe" in the name) course experienced a significant increase in the number of scores reported, and the average score continues to remain strong. After years of improving
results between 2013 and 2015, the trend had leveled off, although the scores remained strong. The world-wide average is 4.99 with Minnetonka surpassing the average with an average score of 5.37 , reaching a second all-time high average score.

IB History HL Results


IB History Europe HL Number of Scores Reported

| Year | Hist Europe HL |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{6 3}$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 1}$ | 38 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ | 60 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 9}$ | 90 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ | 86 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | 39 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ | 37 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | 67 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ | 78 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ | 69 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ | 58 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 1}$ | 51 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | 57 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | 60 |

## IB English Results

As has been the case for several years, the English Literature HL students scored above the world-wide average by 0.56 points even with the fluctuation in enrollment. The worldwide average was 4.73 . With a score of 5.40 , Language and Literature SL scored slightly above the world-wide average of 5.26 , with Literature and Performance average scores missing the world-wide average by 0.5 points with a score of 4.32 . The world-wide average for this course was 4.82 points. IB advises that both courses should be taught over two years as opposed to over just one year. Overall, IB English results are strong, and the English Department should be commended for their efforts. These results mean that our students are scoring comparable to students who have more than twice the amount of time to master the material.

## IB English HL Results



## IB English Number of Scores Reported

| Year | Literature HL | Language \& Literature SL | Literature \& Performance SL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{6 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 4}$ | $\mathbf{3 8}$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 1}$ | 40 | 107 | 20 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ | 55 | 158 | 66 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 9}$ | 86 | 137 | 54 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ | 96 | 209 | 63 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | 47 | 196 | 69 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ | 34 | 187 | 27 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | 67 | 189 | 52 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ | 70 | 66 | 54 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ | 63 | 83 | 28 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ | 59 | N/A | N/A |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 1}$ | 57 | N/A | N/A |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | 63 | N/A | N/A |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | 71 | N/A | N/A |

## IB Business Results

Each of the business exams offered last year decreased in the average results for Minnetonka students with a fluctuation in the number of students taking the courses. The number of students for SL increased by 49 students and HL saw an increase of 12 students. The Business Management SL course results (5.09) fell slightly behind the world-wide average of 5.10. In addition, the Business Management HL results (5.04) also were below the world-wide average of 5.24 . With only 51 students taking Business Management HL, it is difficult to draw conclusions about the data, however it is encouraging to see the averages for both courses continue to eclipse the 5-point mark. With an average score of 4.10, Minnetonka's Economics SL average scores were a full point behind the world-wide average of 5.10 points.

IB Business Results


IB Business Number of Scores Reported

| Year | Economics <br> SL | Business <br> Management SL | Business <br> Management HL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 8}$ | $\mathbf{5 1}$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 1}$ | N/A | 99 | 39 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ | N/A | 120 | 30 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 9}$ | N/A | 94 | 7 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ | 7 | 63 | 6 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | N/A | 47 | 2 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ | 8 | 82 | 11 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | 18 | 55 | 5 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ | 29 | 46 | 3 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ | 42 | 34 | N/A |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ | 20 | 46 | N/A |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 1}$ | N/A | 12 | N/A |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | 9 | 8 | N/A |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | 15 | N/A | N/A |

## IB Social Studies Results

There has been a lot of internal assessment work done within the Psychology SL course causing an implementation dip in 2012 but an increase in 2013. The change in internal assessments is necessary to ensure alignment with the IB standards. The Psychology SL course experienced increased results in 2013 and again in 2018. IB Psychology students continue to score well, with the average score of 5.3, this surpasses the world-wide average of 4.79. This is a very strong score, despite teachers noticing a cultural shift in the student body of the Psych classes and a significant fluctuation in the number of students tested, increasing from 9 students in 2021 to 22 students in 2022.

The Global Politics SL exam was new in 2019, and the Spanish Immersion students who took this test performed slightly beyond the world-wide average of 5.08 with an average score of $\mathbf{5 . 4 1}$.

IB Social Studies Results


IB Social Studies Number of Scores Reported

| Year | Psychology SL | IB Global Politics SL <br> (Spanish Immersion) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 2}$ | $\mathbf{4 3}$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 1}$ | 9 | 24 |
| 2020 | 13 | 44 |
| 2019 | 22 | 22 |
| 2018 | 36 | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| 2017 | 22 | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| 2016 | 20 | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| 2015 | 13 | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| 2014 | 12 | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| 2013 | 14 | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| 2012 | 14 | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| 2011 | 24 | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| 2010 | 13 | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| 2009 | 20 | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ |

## ADVANCED PLACEMENT (AP) TEST RESULTS

## AP Testing Summary District and State

The College Board no longer reports the Global Mean score to allow comparison to students around the world taking AP exams. This section will highlight important trend data among Minnetonka students who took AP exams last Spring. There were 34 different types of AP tests taken, and although some scores have been delayed, the data in the report reflects the performance of most test takers. There is an increase in the AP Exam participation of all students, moving from 1,589 to 1,667 , and an increase in the number of exams taken, improving from 2,839 to 2,964 . This is likely due to the increase in number of tests taken, moving from 31 to 34 exams. Students included, based on the support and encouragement of staff members, are choosing more rigorous coursework. High school staff are very positive about the high number of students taking these courses and tests. Enrollment in AP has more than doubled since 2007. 85.0 percent of Minnetonka AP students scored a three or higher, which is up from 77 percent in 2021. College Board no longer provides the percentage of Minnesota students scoring three or higher. This average has continued to be very strong since 2005 and will most likely increase after all scores are released.

There are many IB students who take AP exams, as well as several students who selfstudy for an AP exam without taking the course, and those results are included in the overall averages listed in the tables below. Explanation is provided in the narratives of the AP section to add perspective to the results that have significant numbers of both IB and AP students taking the AP Exams.

In addition, it is encouraging to see another high number of students taking the courses and the exams, and although this may cause scores to decrease slightly, overall, these courses and exams offer opportunities for all students pursuing a post-secondary education.

These data reflect the 5-year AP Summary Report which includes students physically in Minnetonka taking the AP exams. However, the AP summary does not include students enrolled in Tonka Online from other school districts. With this number increasing over the years, the data are impacted negatively. If those data were included in the 2022 total, the percent scoring a 3 or higher would even higher than the already strong percentage of 85 percent.

## AP Percentage Scoring 3 or Higher in District and State

| AP Testing Summary |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | MTKA \% scoring <br> 3 or higher | MN \% scoring <br> 3 or higher | MTKA \# <br> tests | MTKA\# <br> students |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{8 5 . 0}$ | - | $\mathbf{2 9 6 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 6 7}$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 1}$ | 79.0 | - | 2947 | 1609 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ | 84.9 | - | 2876 | 1657 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 9}$ | 83.2 | - | 2595 | 1475 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ | 84.0 | 66.7 | 2779 | 1554 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | 84.9 | 66.4 | 2538 | 1418 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ | 86.2 | 66.3 | 2390 | 1324 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | 84.4 | 66.6 | 2565 | 1285 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ | 82.9 | 65.9 | 2378 | 1174 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ | 83.9 | 65.4 | 2163 | 1097 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ | 87.7 | 66.3 | 1793 | 835 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 1}$ | 88.2 | 65.8 | 1431 | 718 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | 86.1 | 64.7 | 1398 | 693 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | 85.8 | 64.5 | 1359 | 691 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | 83.0 | 64.2 | 1041 | 568 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | 84.9 | 63.3 | 1034 | 518 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | 80.1 | NA | 965 | 505 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | 83.8 | NA | 917 | 467 |

## AP Sciences Test Results

Of the seven AP science tests, Minnetonka means remained the same or improved on six of them with Physics 2 having its fifth results this year (5.0) matching its highest score in five years. The number of students scoring at least a three or higher was 147 (99.3 percent) in Biology, an important statistic to note, as the College Board modified grading guidelines beginning with new exams in May 2020, along with students taking modified exams online due to COVID. This is up from 92.4 percent a year ago. The mean score for AP Biology was 4.34 in 2022, up significantly from 2021 (3.88). In fact, this is the highest average score on the AP Biology Exam for Minnetonka students and the first time eclipsing the four-point mark.

AP Chemistry scores increased in the face of the change five years ago and and have reached their highest historical mark with an average score of 3.52, up from 3.29 a year ago. AP Chemistry teachers attended AP training several summers ago and instituted changes in the course for the 2014-2015 school year.

The AP Physics C Electricity and Magnetism Exam dropped signficantly from 2020 to 2021 and rebounded slightly in 2022 with an average score of 3.33 , up from 3.25 from a year ago. Over the last five years the most exams taken for this course was 16, with the least amount totalling 8. Due to the limited number of exams taken, the scores will continue to fluctuate significantly from one year to the next.

AP Environmental Science has been an exam that a small number of students take through Tonka Online. Enrollment decreased to 24 students as the course only ran through the Vantage Global Food Sustainability strand in 2021 with an average score of 3.04. In 2022, with 49 students testing, the average score rebounded significantly, reaching an all-time high average score of 3.88.

## AP Sciences Test Results



AP Sciences Number of Tests Taken

| AP Sciences Number of Tests Taken |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Biology | Chemistry | Physics 1 | Physics 2 | Physics C <br> E \& M | Physics C <br> Mech | Envir <br> Sci |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 9}$ | 97 | 94 | 1 | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | $\mathbf{5 6}$ | $\mathbf{5 1}$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 1}$ | 145 | 107 | 157 | 1 | 12 | 13 | 24 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ | 115 | 128 | 168 | 3 | 17 | 13 | 57 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 9}$ | 110 | 98 | 164 | 1 | 8 | 13 | 43 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ | 93 | 106 | 167 | 1 | 15 | 11 | 42 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | 123 | 62 | 167 | N/A | 3 | 21 | 21 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ | 98 | 80 | 146 | N/A | 2 | 16 | 22 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | 92 | 69 | 167 | N/A | 75 | 90 | 36 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ | 121 | 57 | 106 | N/A | 36 | 43 | 15 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ | 94 | 68 | 99 | N/A | 48 | 47 | 7 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ | 78 | 46 | 80 | N/A | 39 | 41 | 9 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 1}$ | 63 | 43 | 76 | N/A | 23 | 22 | 2 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | 62 | 36 | 47 | N/A | 34 | 40 | 2 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | 87 | 12 | 29 | N/A | 12 | 19 | N/A |

## AP Math Test Results

Minnetonka mean scores rebounded compared to previous years, with mean scores increasing in four of the five tested areas. Calc $A B$ and $B C$ scores have risen to their highest all-time levels.

With an overall mean of 3.90, Calc AB scores surpassed the 2021 average score of 3.58 and surpassed the second highest average score by 0.2 points. Calc $B C$ with an average score of 3.94 eclipsed the average score from the 2021 exam by 0.16 points. The previous all-time high average score was 3.82 from 2020.

With an average score of $\mathbf{3 . 4 0}$, Computer Science A mean scores surpassed last year's average score of 2.95 and the average score from two years ago (3.26). Although Global Means are no longer calculated, two years ago, the Global Mean was 3.11. With a score of 3.40, Minnetonka students had a solid performance $n$ the 2022 exams.

The current IB Math curriculum continues to be closely aligned with the Calculus AB and $B C$ exams, so students are likely to continue to take these exams in the future.

AP Math and Computer Science Test Results


AP Math and Computer Science Number of Tests Taken

| AP Math and Computer Science Number of Tests Taken |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Calc AB | Calc BC | Stats | Comp Sci A | Comp Sci Prin |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 2}$ | 211 | $\mathbf{1 3 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 2}$ | 30 | $\mathbf{4 8}$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 1}$ | 250 | 134 | 134 | 39 | 37 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ | 234 | 149 | 243 | 47 | 62 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 9}$ | 225 | 162 | 235 | 49 | 18 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ | 261 | 161 | 235 | 37 | 24 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | 265 | 163 | 243 | 24 | 12 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ | 254 | 156 | 214 | 23 | N/A |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | 257 | 206 | 217 | 2 | N/A |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ | 312 | 155 | 235 | 5 | N/A |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ | 263 | 138 | 238 | N/A | N/A |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ | 229 | 95 | 197 | N/A | N/A |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 1}$ | 157 | 77 | 104 | N/A | N/A |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | 162 | 67 | 91 | N/A | N/A |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | 128 | 58 | 144 | N/A | N/A |

## AP Languages Test Results

The table below reflects scores for five AP exams offered. Minnetonka students maintained or improved average language scores on four of the five exams. According to the results below, there was a decrease in the number of students tested on the AP English Language Exam, decreasing from 215 students in 2021 to 178 students in 2022. Over the past several years, there have been fewer than 100 students taking this exam. As a result, the average score on this exam was negatively impacted, dropping from an average score of 3.9 in 2020 to 3.5 in 2021. Scores dropped slightly in 2022 from 3.49 to 3.40. For comparison purposes, the previously reported Global mean decreased as well over the years and the last reported score two years ago was 2.86. There was a previously reported two-year decline in scores on the AP Spanish Exam. With an average score of 3.87 , scores rebounded slightly from the 2021 average score of 3.84 . For comparison purposes, the Global mean for the AP Spanish Exam was in 2020 was 3.39, dropping from 3.86 the previous year. Lastly, The Chinese Language Exam mean score was 3.5 has remained steady the past three years.

Overall, AP teachers are pleased with the performances, and they continue to focus on studying the exams carefully to ensure student success each year. Teachers attend AP training regularly in order to maintain their focus on the end result. Teachers work backward from what they learn to plan lessons and assessments accordingly. A reason for the drops was most likely because students can take these tests in a variety of years and may have chosen not to test in 2020-21. This explains the drop in number of students testing displayed in the table below. .

The Chinese and Spanish Immersion students moved to the high school six years ago and had an opportunity to take the AP Chinese Language and Culture Exam or Spanish Language and Culture Exam. On the Chinese Exam, among the 67 Chinese Immersion students, 24 students scored a 3, 27 students scored a 4, and 8 students scored a 5 . The Chinese Immersion mean was 3.48 , which is up from 3.46 in 2021. 54 of the Chinese Immersion students were Ninth Graders with an average score of 3.67 points, and 13 were Tenth Graders averaging 2.77 points. The remaining students were labeled as Miscellaneous.

On the Spanish Exam among the Spanish Immersion population, 60 students scored a 3, 80 students scored a 4, and 47 students scored a 5 (up from 45). The Spanish Immersion mean was 3.86 , like 3.88 for all students tested.

Ninth Grade Spanish Immersion students averaged a score of 3.99 points, and Tenth Graders averaged 3.35 points. English or non-Immersion students (13 students) averaged 4.15 points.

## AP Languages Test Results



## AP Languages Number of Tests Taken

| AP Languages Number of Tests Taken |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Eng Lang | Eng Lit | French | Spanish | Chinese |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 2}$ | 178 | 94 | 1 | 207 | $\mathbf{6 6}$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 1}$ | 215 | 103 | N/A | 210 | 62 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ | 32 | 61 | 7 | 235 | 89 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 9}$ | 37 | 89 | 5 | 155 | 53 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ | 58 | 71 | 8 | 226 | 58 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | 36 | 95 | 15 | 132 | 45 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ | 56 | 112 | 12 | 101 | 31 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | 98 | 86 | 12 | 30 | 5 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ | 102 | 134 | 1 | 35 | 6 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ | 106 | 131 | 8 | 36 | N/A |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ | 141 | 129 | 10 | 32 | N/A |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 1}$ | 109 | 117 | 15 | 36 | N/A |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | 95 | 103 | 11 | 58 | N/A |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | 87 | 190 | 6 | 3 | N/A |

## AP Government and History Test Results

The five tests listed were taken by AP students last year. Of the five tests taken, the mean scores showed an increase on all five tests. After dropping to their lowest levels in recent years, scores have begun to rebound. After a significant decrease was observed on the Comparative Government Test two years ago, with average scores dropping from 4.1 to 3.6 points, scores rebounded with an increase to 3.7 points in 2021 and 3.8 in 2022. There was a small number of Comparative Government Tests taken over the years with the lowest number of testers totally 14 in 2019. However, there continues to be an increase in the number of students taking this exam, now at a second all-time high of 31 students tested.

AP US History enrollment has decreased in recent years, with a significant decrease in 2020 year of 22 students. After dropping to an all-time low level in 2021 on this exam, scores rebounded slightly, improving from 3.24 to 3.32. The number of students taking AP Euro in their junior year fluctuates based on the number of students who choose IB instead or choose to take upper level Science and Math coursework. Three of the five courses experienced an increase in enrollment with World History increasing to its highest levels in 2021 and dropping by 40 students in 2022. With the decrease in World History, average scores increased from 3.48 in 2021 to 3.78 in 2022.

With an average score of 3.7 on the European History exam, Minnetonka average score trends continue to maintain high levels. Minnetonka improved on all government and history tests, and in the most recently reported year, the Global mean dropped on all tests with Minnetonka increasing mean scores in all five areas.

## AP Government and History Test Results



## AP Government and History Number of Tests Taken

## AP Government and History Number of Tests Taken

| Year | Gov: Comp | Gov: US | US History | European <br> History | World <br> History |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{3 1}$ | $\mathbf{3 6}$ | 153 | 75 | 87 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 1}$ | 21 | 31 | 162 | 68 | 127 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ | 23 | 16 | 161 | 88 | 86 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 9}$ | 14 | 29 | 183 | 101 | 79 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ | 18 | 53 | 152 | 119 | 37 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | 47 | 159 | 144 | 26 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ | 23 | 31 | 167 | 121 | 1 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | 19 | 15 | 102 | 116 | N/A |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ | 16 | 22 | 137 | 152 | 2 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ | 18 | 26 | 128 | 136 | N/A |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ | 32 | 17 | 154 | 171 | N/A |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 1}$ | 29 | 33 | 140 | 136 | N/A |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | 23 | 20 | 132 | 131 | N/A |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | 24 | 22 | 126 | 167 | N/A |

## AP Geography, Economics, and Psychology Test Results

Out of the six tests listed in this section, Minnetonka mean were solid. Minnetonka average scores increased in four areas with a significant increase in Microeconomics of 0.6 points, improving to $\mathbf{3 . 2 7}$. AP Seminar experienced a slight decrease and has been trending steadily for the past few years. They experienced an average score drop from 3.49 to 3.43 , which is a second all-time high average score. For the third year in a row, enrollment increased significantly from 151 students in 2021 to 202 students in 2022. With an average score of 4.03 points on the AP Human Geography Test, Minnetonka students performed at their second all-time high level, and for the second time, average scores surpassed the 4-point mark. The Minnetonka mean for Macroeconomics was 3.57, which was consistent with the score from 2021 of 3.56. For Microeconomics, the Minnetonka mean improved significantly from 2.7 to 3.27 , which is a new all-time high average score. Lastly, Psychology rebounded from an all-time low score of 2.88 in 2021 to a competitive score of 3.29. This average score more closely aligns with previous Minnetonka student performances for Psychology. Comparatively speaking, Minnetonka students experienced a strong performance on the exams discussed in this section.

## AP Geography, Economics, and Psychology Test Results



AP Geography, Economics, Psychology, and Seminar Number of Tests Taken

| AP Geography, Economics, Psychology, Research and Seminar Number of Tests Taken |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Human Geography | Macroeconomics | Microeconomics | Psychology | Research | Seminar |
| 2022 | 262 | 66 | 125 | 231 | 40 | 202 |
| 2021 | 274 | 61 | 94 | 254 | 16 | 151 |
| 2020 | 280 | 61 | 90 | 286 | 13 | 89 |
| 2019 | 268 | 39 | 68 | 251 | N/A | 68 |
| 2018 | 327 | 111 | 55 | 300 | N/A | N/A |
| 2017 | 296 | 89 | 44 | 294 | N/A | N/A |
| 2016 | 306 | 98 | 62 | 244 | N/A | N/A |
| 2015 | 367 | 92 | 68 | 326 | N/A | N/A |
| 2014 | 283 | 83 | 66 | 245 | N/A | N/A |
| 2013 | 258 | 82 | 48 | 182 | N/A | N/A |
| 2012 | 44 | 43 | 21 | 159 | N/A | N/A |
| 2011 | 40 | 42 | 12 | 153 | N/A | N/A |
| 2010 | 59 | 47 | 12 | 123 | N/A | N/A |
| 2009 | 45 | 54 | 18 | 98 | N/A | N/A |

## Number of AP Scholars

2020 was the last year the National AP Scholar award was recognized. Students achieving this level earned a mean score of 4.0 or higher on all exams and grades of 4 or higher on 8 or more exams. The table below reflects the levels awarded. The number of students earning various AP honors has continued to maintain high levels each year despite the impact of COVID. All of this reflects the commitment and knowledge of students and quality of teachers. The AP Scholar with Distinction level has more than quadrupled since 2009. It is challenging to have more AP scholars while simultaneously trying to increase the number of students earning an IB Diploma. The table below shows the number of students reaching each level of AP Scholar distinction. Students are only counted once for each category. For example, although an AP Scholar with Distinction meets the AP Scholar criteria, he or she is only counted once in the AP Scholar with Distinction category. Regarding the number of students taking AP exams, in Eleventh and Twelfth Grades, students need to take IB courses that do not align with AP coursework, so the students are not naturally able to take as many AP exams. Consequently, students have self-studied for the AP exams. This demonstrates the hard work and perseverance that is apparent with so many Minnetonka students. College Board has made and is making changes to the various AP Scholar designations, most notably is that May 2020 exams is the last that will be included in any National AP Scholar awards, moving forward that will no longer be a designation. There will also no longer be International AP Scholar awards. Minnetonka experienced increases in all three areas, which provides more evidence that students are beginning to rebound post COVID. In fact, in both the AP

Scholar with Distinction and AP Scholar categories, Minnetonka students have reached all-time high levels.

## Number of AP Scholars

| AP Scholars |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | National AP <br> Scholar | AP Scholar with <br> Distinction | AP Scholar with <br> Honor | AP Scholar |  |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 2}$ | n/a | $\mathbf{2 8 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 5 2}$ |  |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 1}$ | n/a | 247 | 123 | 205 |  |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ | 66 | 278 | 128 | 207 |  |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 9}$ | 62 | 231 | 127 | 188 |  |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ | 73 | 269 | 119 | 212 |  |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | 58 | 227 | 85 | 201 |  |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ | 37 | 212 | 94 | 144 |  |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | 43 | 192 | 99 | 169 |  |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ | $\mathbf{4 2}$ | 133 | 64 | 165 |  |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ | 36 | 145 | 78 | 137 |  |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ | 37 | 76 | 67 | 125 |  |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 1}$ | 27 | 76 | 51 | 86 |  |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 5}$ | 81 | 55 | 98 |  |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 3}$ | 60 | 49 | 90 |  |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | 51 | 41 | 65 |  |

## AP Scholar Key

National AP Scholar-Mean of 4.0 on all exams and grades of 4 or higher on 8 or more exams. $\underline{2020}$ was the last year this award was given.
AP Scholar with Distinction-Mean of 3.5 on all exams and grades of 3 or higher on 5 or more exams
AP scholar with Honor-mean of 3.25 on all exams and grades of 3 or higher on 4 or more AP exams
AP Scholar-3 or higher on 3 or more exams

## Total Number of Students Taking IB/AP Exams

The total number of students taking both IB and AP exams has remained strong over the years with a slight drop-off in 2019 and 2021 and rebounding in 2020. In 2021, there was a slight drop-off of $\mathbf{6 7}$ students, although the overall trend over the past 5 years had remained at levels over $\mathbf{2 , 1 0 0}$ students. The number of IB students taking exams is more than five times higher since 2008, while the number of students taking AP exams has more than doubled since 2008 to $\mathbf{1 , 6 8 9}$. The number of students taking both AP and IB
exams has increase to 2,405, marking an all-time high level for this measure. The increase in exams taken can be attributed to the Ninth Grade Human Geography course and the general trend of students taking more rigorous courses, including IB and AP courses. The trend increase comes from students challenging themselves and the fact that both students and parents have become more educated about the benefits of taking these higher-level courses as they plan for college. It can be hypothesized that the high enrollment in IB and AP courses will lead to strong ACT and SAT scores because of the increased academic preparation.

## Total Number of Students Taking IB/AP Exams

| Total Number of Students Taking IB/AP Exams |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Number of IB <br> Students | Number of AP <br> Students | Total Number of <br> Students |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 2}$ | 716 | 1689 | 2405 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 1}$ | 662 | 1589 | 2251 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ | 679 | 1639 | 2318 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 9}$ | 668 | 1475 | 2143 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ | 736 | 1554 | 2290 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | 714 | 1418 | 2132 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ | 587 | 1324 | 1911 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | 578 | 1285 | 1863 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ | 493 | 1174 | 1726 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ | 453 | 1093 | 1546 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ | 359 | 813 | 1172 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 1}$ | 257 | 793 | 1050 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | 232 | 684 | 916 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | 282 | 688 | 970 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | 135 | 568 | 703 |

## Total Number of IB and AP Courses Offered

The number of IB courses offered continues to remain at high levels. The number of AP courses is at 34 for the second year in a row, and overall has trended upward during the past eight years. This increases along with the high number of IB courses, has dramatically increased the total course offerings by 21 since 2015. In conjunction with the District's emphasis on academic rigor, staff members continue to research adding courses as deemed appropriate. For example, for the 2013 school year, the additional two IB English classes were offered to deepen the coursework possibilities for Eleventh and Twelfth Grade students. The IB Literature and Performance course was created to meet this need for Twelfth Grade students as well as the Language and Literature course offered to Eleventh and Twelfth Grade students. In addition, IB Sports Exercise and Health Science courses were added for the 2013-14 school year.

Total Number of IB and AP Courses Offered

| Total Number of IB/AP Courses Offered |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Number of IB <br> Courses | Number of AP <br> Courses | Total Number of <br> Courses |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 2}$ | 49 | 34 | 83 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 1}$ | 49 | 34 | 83 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ | 56 | 31 | 87 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 9}$ | 51 | 31 | 82 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ | 50 | 30 | 80 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | 49 | 31 | 80 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ | 49 | 31 | 80 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | 37 | 25 | 62 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ | 37 | 24 | 61 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ | 32 | 20 | 52 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ | 28 | 25 | 53 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 1}$ | 29 | 23 | 52 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | 26 | 22 | 48 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | 21 | 21 | 42 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | 22 | 19 | 41 |

## VANTAGE Program

## Total Number of VANTAGE and Non-VANTAGE Students taking IB and AP Tests with ACT and Grade Point Average (GPA) by Gender

The analysis in this section is designed to provide historical perspective for the VANTAGE program with discussion beginning from the 2013-14 school year and ending with the 2021-22 school year. In 2019, some VANTAGE offerings changed, such as AP Macroeconomics and IB Sports Exercise Science. In addition, AP Environmental Science was added as a VANTAGE strand. In order to illustrate more clear and meaningful data, the 2019 tables displayed one test per table, and the other data points only reflect students tested, as opposed to students who were both enrolled in the course and not tested. In addition, some courses are now only offered in the VANTAGE program, and the tables display historical data for VANTAGE students only, while others have some years in which VANTAGE and non-VANTAGE student data are available, and in other years those data are not available for those courses. Data not reflected in the tables below are reflected earlier in the AP or IB sections of this report.

## 2013-14 Summary

VANTAGE was in its first year of existence in 2013-14, and test results for VANTAGE and non-VANTAGE students were as expected considering the profile of the students. The academic profile of a student in the VANTAGE Program in 2013-14 was significantly different than the profile of a student not enrolled in the VANTAGE Program taking IB and AP coursework. The average VANTAGE students' Grade Point Average (GPA) was 3.32 compared to the average non-VANTAGE student GPA of 3.81. The average ACT Composite for VANTAGE students in 2013-14 was 25.8, and for non-VANTAGE students, the average ACT Composite was 29.4, which was closer to the top 400 level of ACT scores. Again, this shows a significant difference in the profile of students. Of the 21 VANTAGE students in 2013-14, 15 were Male and 6 were Female. The average scores for Male VANTAGE students on the AP Macro and Microeconomics Test were higher than Females, with Female VANTAGE students out-performing Males on the IB Business SL Test. For non-VANTAGE students, the Male versus Female IB and AP Test performance was much less disparate.

For non-VANTAGE students taking IB and AP coursework, there was a significant difference in the number of Males compared to Females. 44 Males took the AP Macroeconomics Test compared to 9 Females. 26 Males took the AP Microeconomics Test compared to 7 Females and 11 Males took the IB Business SL Test compared to 6 Females. Regardless, all metrics in 2014 indicated higher achievement among nonVANTAGE students compared to VANTAGE students.

As stated previously, the VANTAGE instructors have modified their curriculum and assignments for students in order to support students and address the difference in results, because the AP Economics Exam does not accurately align with the Economics work that VANTAGE students have done in their projects. Last year Macroeconomics was dropped from the VANTAGE Business Analytics strand. The course is now comprised of AP Stats and IB Business SL

## 2014-15 Summary

2015 results show similar results to 2014 regarding the profile of the VANTAGE student. The VANTAGE and non-VANTAGE results for mean overall GPA, mean ACT Composite, and mean exam results for AP Macroeconomics and AP Microeconomics. There were no non-VANTAGE students enrolled in the IB Business SL course. The overall mean GPA for a VANTAGE student taking the two AP course listed in the table below was a 3.48 versus a 3.91 GPA for non-VANTAGE students. The mean AP exam scores were slightly lower for the VANTAGE students, which comes as no surprise, in addition to the lower mean ACT Composite score of $\mathbf{2 7 . 7}$ versus $\mathbf{3 0 . 9}$ for non-VANTAGE students. Clearly, the profile of the VANTAGE student in the first two years of program implementation is different than the profile of the non-VANTAGE student taking the same courses. With a mean score of 27.7 on the ACT, the VANTAGE student surpassed the overall ACT Composite by 0.8 points, and the non-VANTAGE also surpassed the overall Composite of 26.9 with a 30.9 mean score.

## 2015-16 Summary

The tables below show the additional VANTAGE course in which students were enrolled in 2016; AP Psychology, AP Statistics, and IB Sports Exercise Science. The gap between the overall GPA and between the ACT Composite score was not as great compared to students who were enrolled in the AP Macro and Microeconomics courses originally. In 2015, The ACT Composite score difference between these students was only 0.8 with VANTAGE students reaching a mean ACT score of 27.2 and non-VANTAGE students earning a mean score of $\mathbf{2 8 . 0}$, while the mean GPA difference was .25 points with VANTAGE students earning an overall mean GPA of 3.39 and non-VANTAGE students averaging a 3.64 GPA.

In 2016, the performance for VANTAGE students in AP Macro, AP Micro, and IB Business SL continued an upward trend. This is the first time mean scores reached at least three for the Economics courses, and the IB Business SL course saw scores soar to an average of 4.75 , which is .65 points higher than 2014. ACT levels have risen from 25.8 on average in 2014 to 28.6 in 2016, and GPA increased from 3.24 in 2014 to 3.48 in 2016. This evidence of the changing profile of the VANTAGE business student. The gap between AP/IB scores, GPA, and ACT has continued to shrink between the VANTAGE and nonVANTAGE students among the students taking business courses.

2016 results showed a slight increase in GPA among VANTAGE students moving from a mean score of 3.39 to 3.51 , with a slight decrease in mean AP Psych score of .10 points and an increase in the mean AP Stats score moving from 2.85 to 3.08 . Non-VANTAGE students also saw a decrease in the mean for AP Psych, dropping from 3.69 to 3.54 , mirroring the decrease VANTAGE students experienced. Non-VANTAGE students saw an increase in AP Stats, like the increase VANTAGE students saw moving from 3.05 to
3.36. Lastly, the IB Sports Exercise Science mean for VANTAGE students in 2015 was 4.84, and the score declined in 2016 to 4.25 .

## 2016-17 Summary

In 2017, The VANTAGE students continued to close the gap between their nonVANTAGE counterparts. The average ACT score for VANTAGE students was 28.7 compared to the ACT average for non-VANTAGE students of 29.3. The non-VANTAGE students are still outpacing the VANTAGE students in AP Macro and AP Micro, however, the gap in performance within the AP Macro class has become smaller with just a 0.9point difference in average score compared to a . 35-point difference a year ago. The IB Business SL course saw an overall decline in average score from a year ago, however the gap between the non-VANTAGE and VANTAGE students decreased from .45 points to .08 points.

According to the combined tables below, the GPAs of VANTAGE and non- VANTAGE students taking AP Psych, AP Stats, and IB Sports Exercise Science were virtually the same. The average scores on the AP Psych test were within .07 points of each other compared to a .06-point difference a year ago. AP Stats saw an overall decrease in average score on the exam and non- VANTAGE students out-performed VANTAGE
students by .20 points in 2017 and in 2016. This difference in performance mirrors the results from a year ago, and it should be noted that the difference in ACT and GPA is comparable to the differences from a year ago, thus making the AP Exam scores somewhat predictable.

## 2017-18 Summary

The results show the comparisons from 2017 to 2018 among VANTAGE and nonVANTAGE students in the areas of AP Macroeconomics, with only comparisons for VANTAGE students in AP Microeconomics and IB Business SL. According to the tables below, 82 VANTAGE students had an average GPA of 3.54 compared to the 63 nonVANTAGE students with an average GPA of 3.77. The VANTAGE students' average AP Macroeconomics score is lower ( 2.69 points) than the non-VANTAGE students' average score (3.55). This was a decrease for VANTAGE compared to the previous year dropping from 3.23 points. In addition, compared to 2017, the VANTAGE average dropped in AP Microeconomics from 3.05 to 2.78 and in IB Business SL, VANTAGE student performance increased from 4.25 points to 4.60 points. The areas where there were drops in performance are like the results in 2015 and like the average GPA of a VANTAGE student from 2015 as well. It appears that the profile of the VANTAGE business student in 2018 is like the profile of the VANTAGE business student from 2015 for students taking business courses.

According to the 2017-2018 results, there was a wider gap in average GPA between VANTAGE and non- VANTAGE students taking AP Psychology and AP Stats Exams. The average GPA for VANTAGE students in 2017 was 3.45 compared to non- VANTAGE students with a 3.50 GPA. In 2018, the VANTAGE student average GPA was 3.23 compared to the non- VANTAGE student GPA of $\mathbf{3 . 4 0}$. However, VANTAGE students out-performed non- VANTAGE students in AP Psychology with an average exam score of 3.6 compared to 3.37 . VANTAGE students also out-performed non- VANTAGE students on the AP Stats Exam with an average score of 3.37 compared to an average score of 3.18 for non- VANTAGE students. The difference in average GPA appears to be an indicator of the differences in ACT scores with VANTAGE students earning an average ACT score of 25.9 compared to non- VANTAGE students earning an average ACT score of 27.8. Lastly, VANTAGE students in 2018 outperformed their counterparts on the IB Sports Exercise Science Exam, improving from an average score of 4.27 to and average score of 4.56. With a lower GPA and a lower average ACT score, 2018 VANTAGE students out-paced 2017 VANTAGE students on all three AP Exams listed on the tables below.

## 2018-19 Summary

In order to enhance the reporting of VANTAGE results for staff, the 2019 tables indicate one test per table. The GPA and ACT results reflect the performance of students only taking the IB or AP exams, rather than students who took the courses and did not take the exams. In addition, in 2019 the IB Sports Exercise Science and AP Macroeconomics
courses were dropped from VANTAGE, and AP Environmental Science was added. The data in the 2019 tables below are updated accordingly.

In 2019, the average score on the AP Stats Test for VANTAGE students was 2.70, which was a drop in performance compared to 2018, when the mean score for this test was 3.37. With only 23 students tested, scores are expected to fluctuate. Two years ago, VANTAGE students taking the AP Stats Test earned an average score of 2.91, and a 3.09 mean score three years ago. The Global mean for the AP Stats Test in 2019 was 2.87. Non-VANTAGE ( $\mathbf{N}=\mathbf{2 1 2}$ ) also scored below the Global mean on the AP Stats Exam, earning an average score of 2.78. An important note regarding the VANTAGE student taking the AP Stats Test compared to the non-VANTAGE student taking the same test, is that the average GPA for the VANTAGE student was 3.27 compared to 3.52 for the non-VANTAGE student. In addition, the average ACT Composite for the VANTAGE student was 27.5 compared to 28.2 for the non-VANTAGE student. One can conclude that the VANTAGE student compared favorably to the non-VANTAGE student on the AP Stats Exam due to the differing nature of the academic profile of the two student groups. However, it will be important for Math teachers to study the results in order to understand the drop in performance on the AP Stats Test when compared to the Global mean.
In 2019, the IB Business SL VANTAGE strand showed that students earned an average IB test score of 4.76. Non-VANTAGE students earned an average score of 4.64. The profile of the VANTAGE student last year taking this exam indicates that they earned an average ACT Composite score of $\mathbf{2 6 . 8}$ and an average GPA of 3.32. The non-VANTAGE student earned an average ACT Composite score of 27.8 and had an average GPA of 3.38. VANTAGE students $(\mathbf{N}=\mathbf{8 0})$ earned a higher average score despite the lower GPA and ACT Composite. It is also important to note that there were only 14 non-VANTAGE students who took this exam, which could have also impacted the overall averages.

The VANTAGE and non-VANTAGE student profile regarding the AP Psychology Exam results are similar. The VANTAGE student taking this test had an average GPA slightly higher than the non-VANTAGE student (3.53 vs 3.44), yet the average ACT Composite score for the VANTAGE student was slightly lower compared to the non-VANTAGE student ( 27.3 vs 27.8). Lastly, the VANTAGE student earned an average score of $\mathbf{3 . 5 6}$ on the AP Psych Exam, while the non-VANTAGE student earned a 3.32.

Overall, VANTAGE students are making great strides on important metrics while gaining an experience that will prove to be valuable for them as them move to the next level beyond high school.

## 2019-20 Summary

Over the years, the profile of the VANTAGE student has evolved. For example, by 201920 the profile of the VANTAGE versus non-VANTAGE student was virtually the same when comparing the GPA of students taking IB Business SL. However, during that year, students who took the IB Business SL class in a VANTAGE setting had higher average AP Exam scores yet lower average ACT test scores. By 2020, the AP exam scores for
this course increased for VANTAGE students from 4.78 to 5.20 , the highest score on record for VANTAGE students taking the IB Business SL exam. This was the first time the average AP Exam score eclipsed the 5-point mark. Interestingly, this group of students had a lower average ACT score and a higher GPA. The GPA has fluctuated for students taking this exam over the years, and it has been lower for Males specifically compared to Females.

Regarding AP Psych and AP Stats, the AP exam scores for the AP Psych student is relatively predictable, in that students who take this course in the VANTAGE setting typically have a lower average GPA and lower average ACT Composite score. As a result, one could have predicted that the AP exam scores for this course would be lower for VANTAGE students compared to non-VANTAGE students. In 2020, VANTAGE students earned higher AP Stats Exam scores compared to non-VANTAGE students. However, VANTAGE students in this cohort had a lower average ACT score and a lower GPA as well. One could conclude that the VANTAGE experience for this cohort is a success for these students.

Although, there are only data for the VANTAGE versus non-VANTAGE students taking Environmental Science Exams in 2019 and 2020, it is interesting to note that the two groups of students had similar profiles in 2019 and 2020 making their average exam scores predictable. In 2019, the lower ACT Composite mean and the lower the average GPA, indicated that students would score slightly lower on the AP exam. With similar GPAs in 2020, so too were the average AP exam scores for the AP Environmental Science exam for the two student groups.

The AP Computer Science Principles Exam indicated that VANTAGE students out-paced non-VANTAGE students, despite the profile of the VANTAGE student showing them having a lower GPA. However, the VANTAGE students had a higher ACT Composite. It will be interesting to note the trend in future years.

## 2020-21 Summary

The IB Business SL and AP Microeconomics courses were available to VANTAGE only students in 2020-21, and the tables below reflect the past six year's student performances for each of the courses. The increases in student results for IB Business SL can be attributed to both Male and Female performance, both combining for an all-time high mean score of 5.34. The World-wide average increased to 5.65 from 4.77 the previous year. As stated previously, there was an increase among almost all World-wide averages mostly likely due to the two ways in which student scores are tabulated due to COVID. Some school districts only had student test scores used for the calculation, like in previous years, while other school districts saw student scores calculated by a combination of teacher input and performance with historical student work. VANTAGE student scores on the IB Business SL Exam have increased each year since 2017.

On the AP Microeconomics exam, there was a drop in average score for both Males and Females in the VANTAGE program, dropping to their all-time lowest levels. Although
there was a decrease of .44 points among VANTAGE students, there was also a drop in the Global average, which was 0.32 points. Again, most of the Global averages experienced a drop, most likely since the AP Exams in 2020 were modified to open-book 45-minute exams.

For AP Psychology, VANTAGE students earned a mean score of 3.03 points with both Males and Females surpassing the Global average of 2.71. Non-VANTAGE students fell behind the Global average with a score of 2.83 points. However, Males earned an average score of 3.01 , surpassing the Global average, while Females fell behind the Global average with a score of $\mathbf{2 . 7 0}$. There is not enough AP Stats scores to report currently.

In 2021, AP Environment Science was only offered in the VANTAGE program, and there was a drop in mean scores both globally and among Minnetonka students. Minnetonka student averages dropped from 3.47 to 3.04 , while the Global average decreased from 2.84 to 2.67. In addition to the different AP Exams in 2021, the score fluctuation among VANTAGE students was most likely due to the low number of students tested, 7 Males and 16 Females, respectively.

In 2021, AP Seminar was offered to both VANTAGE and non-VANTAGE students. Although VANTAGE students were outperformed by non-VANTAGE students on this exam, the profile of the VANTAGE student enrolled in AP Seminar was significantly different than that of the non-VANTAGE students. According to average ACT scores, the VANTAGE student earned an average score of $\mathbf{2 5 . 2}$ compared to the average ACT score of the non-VANTAGE student of 29.6. In addition, there was a difference in GPA, with the VANTAGE student average GPA reaching 3.32 compared to a mean GPA of 3.57 for the non-VANTAGE student. The difference in average AP Seminar Exam scores was predictable based on the different profile of student in each of the programs.

Lastly, 2021 was the first year for Minnetonka students taking the AP Computer Science Principals Exam, and VANTAGE students averaged a score of 2.73 points and nonVANTAGE students earned an average score of 3.62 points. The Global average was 2.99 points. Like with AP Seminar, there is a different profile between the non-VANTAGE and VANTAGE student. The non-VANTAGE student average ACT score was 30.0, with an average GPA of 3.51. The VANTAGE student average ACT score was 26.0, with an average GPA of $\mathbf{2 . 9 7}$. One can conclude it is logical that exam scores would be different among the two student groups.

## 2021-22 Summary

The tables below represent average scores for Males and Females as well as all students from 2017-22. Since 2017, the mean scores have increased among students enrolled in the VANTAGE IB Business SL course. In 2017, the overall mean score was 4.25, and in 2022, the overall mean score was 5.09. this was the third year in a row in which the IB average score for this course eclipsed the 5-point mark. Female performance has continued to improve over the years, with a slight drop-off of 0.17 points from 2021 to
2022. Males showed a sharper decline from 2021, dropping from 5.25 to 4.96 points. This drop impacted the overall mean scores for the course. However, students continue to perform at a high level on the IB Business SL Exam.

According to VANTAGE AP Microeconomics Exam results, after a drop-off in performance among both Males and Females in 2021, but student groups rebounded, eclipsing the 3-point mark on the exam in 2022. Males and Females earned virtually the same average score, with only a 0.3 point difference between the two groups. With an average score of 3.27, this marks the highest all-time score among Females on this exam, and with a score of 3.30 , this is the second highest score among Males on the AP Microeconomics Exam.

Although the profiles of the VANTAGE and non-VANTAGE students taking the AP Psychology Exam are different in that non-VANTAGE students have a higher GPA and ACT Composite Score, the VANTAGE students out-paced the non-VANTAGE student by 0.10 points in the exam. The AP Stats Exam results show a more predictive performance between the two student groups in that the non-VANTAGE students earned higher average scores on the AP Stats Exam, out pacing the VANTAGE students by 0.75 points. Other than Male non-VANTAGE students, scores fell short of the 3-point range on AP Stats Exam.

This last section will discuss student results for AP Environmental Science, AP Seminar, and AP Computer Science Principles. Some scores could not be compared from one year to the next, because there was no comparison available between non-VANTAGE and VANTAGE students. However, the results for those exams were discussed previously in this report within the AP section. AP Environment Science results show that the profile of the VANTAGE student includes a lower average ACT score and GPA. It can be predicted that the VANTAGE student was out-paced by the non-VANTAGE student on this exam. However, both student groups yielded strong performances, with the non-VANTAGE student approaching the 4-point average score mark. Among VANTAGE students, Females out-performed males by 0.18 points, and among non-VANTAGE students, Males out-paced Females by 0.78 points. This is worth nothing for staff among both programs to understand that performances among both students in each classroom setting.

AP Seminar results from 2021 and 2022 show non-VANTAGE students surpassing VANTAGE students with Females out-pacing Males in 2021 in both programs. In 2022, Females earned higher average scores in the VANTAGE program and were out-paced by Males in the non-VANTAGE setting. Overall, non-VANTAGE students out-paced VANTAGE students the past two years predictably, as the non-VANTAGE students on average had higher average GPAs and mean ACT scores. However, both student group profiles are strong as were their performances on the AP Seminar Exams.

Lastly, AP Computer Science Principles Exam results have yielded the highest all-time average scores for both programs. In fact, VANTAGE students have now reached the 4point mark on this exam overall with Female non-VANTAGE and VANTAGE students
surpassing this threshold for the first time. Females out-paced Males on this exam in 2022, while the roles were reversed in 2021 for these student groups. Overall, the VANTAGE student taking this exam has a stronger academic profile than the nonVANTAGE student, and the results were predictably strong for the VANTAGE student. Both student groups reached high levels on this exam.

VANTAGE IB Business SL 2017-2022

|  | 2017 |  | 2018 |  | 2019 |  | 2020 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\boldsymbol{N}$ | Mean | $\boldsymbol{N}$ | Mean | $\boldsymbol{N}$ | Mean | $\boldsymbol{N}$ | Mean |
| VANTAGE | 46 | 4.25 | 68 | 4.60 | 80 | 4.78 | 120 | 5.20 |
| MALE | 28 | 4.18 | 50 | 4.60 | 60 | 4.70 | 70 | 5.01 |
| FEMALE | 18 | 4.32 | 18 | 4.63 | 20 | 5.00 | 50 | 5.46 |


|  | 2021 |  | 2022 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\boldsymbol{N}$ | Mean | $\boldsymbol{N}$ | Mean |
| VANTAGE | 99 | 5.34 | 150 | 5.09 |
| MALE | 69 | 5.25 | 104 | 4.96 |
| FEMALE | 30 | 5.57 | 46 | 5.40 |

## VANTAGE AP Microeconomics 2017-2021

|  | 2017 |  | 2018 |  | 2019 |  | 2020 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\boldsymbol{N}$ | Mean | $\boldsymbol{N}$ | Mean | $\boldsymbol{N}$ | Mean | $\boldsymbol{N}$ | Mean |
| VANTAGE | 46 | 3.05 | 46 | 2.78 | 67 | 3.25 | 87 | 3.10 |
| MALE | 27 | 3.15 | 35 | 2.91 | 51 | 3.37 | 50 | 3.18 |
| FEMALE | 19 | 2.96 | 11 | 2.36 | 16 | 2.88 | 37 | 3.00 |


|  | 2021 |  | 2022 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\boldsymbol{N}$ | Mean | $\boldsymbol{N}$ | Mean |
| VANTAGE | 93 | 2.68 | 124 | 3.29 |
| MALE | 64 | 2.70 | 87 | 3.30 |
| FEMALE | 29 | 2.62 | 37 | 3.27 |

2015 Total Number of VANTAGE and Non-VANTAGE Students taking IB and AP Tests with ACT and Grade Point Average (GPA) by Gender

|  | 2015 GPA (weighted) |  | AP PSYCH |  | AP STATS |  | HIGHEST ACT |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\boldsymbol{N}$ | Mean | Median | $\boldsymbol{N}$ | Mean | $\boldsymbol{N}$ | Mean | Mean | Median |
| VANTAGE | 58 | 3.39 | 3.41 | 31 | 3.58 | 33 | 2.85 | 27.2 | 27 |
| MALE | 29 | 3.26 | 3.15 | 9 | 3.56 | 20 | 2.85 | 26.8 | 27 |
| FEMALE | 29 | 3.53 | 3.63 | 22 | 3.59 | 13 | 2.85 | 27.6 | 28 |
| NON- <br> VANTAGE | 423 | 3.64 | 3.71 | 295 | 3.69 | 180 | 3.05 | 28.0 | 28 |
| MALE | 179 | 3.55 | 3.63 | 110 | 3.59 | 89 | 3.09 | 28.0 | 28 |
| FEMALE | 244 | 3.70 | 3.75 | 185 | 3.75 | 91 | 3.01 | 28.0 | 28 |

2016 Total Number of VANTAGE and Non-VANTAGE Students taking IB and AP Tests with ACT and Grade Point Average (GPA) by Gender (Including new courses)

|  | 2016 GPA (weighted) |  | AP PSYCH |  | AP STATS |  | HIGHEST ACT |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\boldsymbol{N}$ | Mean | Median | $\boldsymbol{N}$ | Mean | $\boldsymbol{N}$ | Mean | Mean | Median |
| VANTAGE | 104 | 3.51 | 3.55 | 62 | 3.48 | 49 | 3.08 | 27.3 | 27.9 |
| MALE | 47 | 3.32 | 3.41 | 22 | 3.18 | 28 | 2.79 | 27.8 | 28.3 |
| FEMALE | 57 | 3.66 | 3.76 | 40 | 3.65 | 21 | 3.48 | 27.0 | 27.3 |
| NON- <br> VANTAGE | 282 | 3.55 | 3.63 | 181 | 3.54 | 108 | 3.36 | 28.0 | 28.0 |
| MALE | 134 | 3.43 | 3.45 | 74 | 3.62 | 63 | 3.27 | 28.6 | 28.8 |
| FEMALE | 148 | 3.66 | 3.74 | 108 | 3.50 | 47 | 3.48 | 27.4 | 27.5 |

2017 Total Number of VANTAGE and Non-VANTAGE Students taking IB and AP Tests with ACT and Grade Point Average (GPA) by Gender

|  | 2017 GPA (weighted) |  | AP PSYCH |  | AP STATS |  | HIGHEST ACT |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\boldsymbol{N}$ | Mean | Median | $\boldsymbol{N}$ | Mean | $\boldsymbol{N}$ | Mean | Mean | Median |
| VANTAGE | 68 | 3.45 | 3.54 | 32 | 3.49 | 19 | 2.91 | 27.6 | 27.5 |
| MALE | 32 | 3.33 | 3.38 | 15 | 3.26 | 12 | 2.76 | 27.7 | 27.8 |
| FEMALE | 36 | 3.57 | 3.69 | 17 | 3.72 | 7 | 3.06 | 27.5 | 27.3 |
| NON- <br> VANTAGE | 302 | 3.50 | 3.53 | 153 | 3.56 | 159 | 3.09 | 28.4 | 28.0 |
| MALE | 145 | 3.41 | 3.39 | 60 | 3.64 | 95 | 3.01 | 28.8 | 28.6 |
| FEMALE | 157 | 3.59 | 3.66 | 93 | 3.48 | 64 | 3.17 | 28.0 | 27.4 |

2018 Total Number of VANTAGE and Non-VANTAGE Students taking IB and AP Tests with ACT and Grade Point Average (GPA) by Gender (Including new courses)

|  | 2018 GPA (weighted) |  | AP PSYCH |  | AP STATS |  | HIGHEST ACT |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\boldsymbol{N}$ | Mean | $\boldsymbol{N}$ | Mean | Median | $\boldsymbol{N}$ | Mean | Mean | Median |
| VANTAGE | 88 | 3.23 | 19 | 3.37 | 3.21 | 15 | 3.60 | 25.9 | 26.0 |
| MALE | 59 | 3.19 | 15 | 3.33 | 3.18 | 4 | 3.50 | 26.2 | 26.0 |
| FEMALE | 29 | 3.33 | 4 | 3.5 | 3.41 | 11 | 3.64 | 25.1 | 24.0 |
| NON- <br> VANTAGE | 439 | 3.40 | 215 | 3.18 | 3.48 | 278 | 3.37 | 27.8 | 28.0 |
| MALE | 216 | 3.31 | 122 | 3.17 | 3.34 | 120 | 3.26 | 28.1 | 28.0 |
| FEMALE | 223 | 3.49 | 93 | 3.18 | 3.59 | 158 | 3.46 | 27.6 | 28.0 |

2019 Total Number of VANTAGE and Non-VANTAGE Students taking IB and AP Tests with ACT and Grade Point Average (GPA) by Gender

|  | 2019 GPA (weighted) |  |  | AP PSYCH |  | AP STATS |  | HIGHEST ACT |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\boldsymbol{N}$ | Mean | $\boldsymbol{N}$ | Mean | Median | $\boldsymbol{N}$ | Mean | Mean | Median |
| VANTAGE | 77 | 3.53 | 23 | 2.70 | 3.62 | 77 | 3.56 | 27.3 | 27.0 |
| MALE | 14 | 3.42 | 17 | 2.65 | 3.46 | 14 | 3.50 | 27.3 | 26.5 |
| FEMALE | 63 | 3.55 | 6 | 2.83 | 3.65 | 63 | 3.57 | 27.3 | 27.0 |
| NON- <br> VANTAGE | 171 | 3.44 | 212 | 2.78 | 3.52 | 171 | 3.32 | 27.8 | 28.0 |
| MALE | 77 | 3.32 | 104 | 2.84 | 3.40 | 77 | 3.30 | 28.5 | 29.0 |
| FEMALE | 94 | 3.54 | 108 | 2.72 | 3.62 | 94 | 3.34 | 27.8 | 27.0 |

2020 Total Number of VANTAGE and Non-VANTAGE Students taking IB and AP Tests with ACT and Grade Point Average (GPA) by Gender (Including new courses)

|  | 2020 GPA (weighted) |  |  | AP PSYCH |  | AP STATS |  | HIGHEST ACT |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\boldsymbol{N}$ | Mean | $\boldsymbol{N}$ | Mean | Median | $\boldsymbol{N}$ | Mean | Mean | Median |
| VANTAGE | 80 | 3.36 | 59 | 2.66 | 3.52 | 71 | 3.77 | 26.8 | 27.0 |
| MALE | 20 | 3.13 | 41 | 2.76 | 3.20 | 17 | 3.94 | 28.3 | 29.5 |
| FEMALE | 60 | 3.43 | 18 | 2.44 | 3.57 | 54 | 3.72 | 26.3 | 26.0 |
| NON- <br> VANTAGE | 222 | 3.45 | 165 | 2.97 | 3.55 | 202 | 3.51 | 28.6 | 29.0 |
| MALE | 96 | 3.32 | 72 | 3.13 | 3.36 | 86 | 3.47 | 29.4 | 30.0 |
| FEMALE | 126 | 3.54 | 93 | 2.85 | 3.68 | 116 | 3.55 | 27.9 | 28.0 |

2021 Total Number of VANTAGE and Non-VANTAGE Students taking IB and AP Tests with ACT and Grade Point Average (GPA) by Gender (Including new courses)

|  | 2021 GPA (weighted) |  | AP PSYCH |  | AP STATS |  | HIGHEST ACT |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\boldsymbol{N}$ | Mean | Median | $\boldsymbol{N}$ | Mean | $\boldsymbol{N}$ | Mean | Mean | Median |
| VANTAGE | 124 | 3.47 | 3.66 | 61 | 3.03 | - | - | 26.8 | 27.0 |
| MALE | 40 | 3.49 | 3.58 | 10 | 2.90 | - | - | 26.7 | 26.0 |
| FEMALE | 84 | 3.46 | 3.72 | 51 | 3.06 | - | - | 26.9 | 27.0 |
| NON- <br> VANTAGE | 371 | 3.47 | 3.65 | 189 | 2.83 | - | - | 28.3 | 29.0 |
| MALE | 169 | 3.40 | 3.56 | 76 | 3.01 | - | - | 29.0 | 30.0 |
| FEMALE | 202 | 3.52 | 3.70 | 113 | 2.70 | - | - | 27.6 | 29.0 |

2022 Total Number of VANTAGE and Non-VANTAGE Students taking IB and AP Tests with ACT and Grade Point Average (GPA) by Gender (Including new courses)

|  | 2022 GPA (weighted) |  | AP PSYCH |  | AP STATS |  | HIGHEST ACT |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\boldsymbol{N}$ | Mean | Median | $\boldsymbol{N}$ | Mean | $\boldsymbol{N}$ | Mean | Mean | Median |
| VANTAGE | 146 | 3.47 | 3.53 | 63 | 3.35 | 75 | 2.21 | 26.0 | 25.0 |
| MALE | 69 | 3.36 | 3.46 | 14 | 3.86 | 51 | 2.18 | 26.3 | 25.0 |
| FEMALE | 77 | 3.57 | 3.67 | 49 | 3.20 | 24 | 2.29 | 25.7 | 24.0 |
| NON- | 312 | 3.53 | 3.62 | 160 | 3.25 | 131 | 2.96 | 27.9 | 28.0 |
| VANTAGE | 121 | 3.45 | 3.53 | 64 | 3.16 | 52 | 3.21 | 28.7 | 29.0 |
| MALE | 121 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FEMALE | 191 | 3.58 | 3.71 | 96 | 3.31 | 79 | 2.80 | 27.3 | 27.0 |

2019 Total Number of VANTAGE and Non-VANTAGE Students taking IB and AP Tests with ACT and Grade Point Average (GPA) by Gender (Including new courses)

|  | 2019 GPA (weighted) |  |  | AP ENV SCI |  | HIGHEST ACT |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\boldsymbol{N}$ | $\boldsymbol{M e a n}$ | Median | $\boldsymbol{N}$ | Mean | Mean | Median |
| VANTAGE | 11 | 3.41 | 3.41 | 11 | 3.00 | 28.0 | 27.0 |
| MALE | 5 | 3.33 | 3.24 | 5 | 3.20 | 26.6 | 25.0 |
| FEMALE | 6 | 3.48 | 3.76 | 6 | 2.83 | 29.2 | 28.5 |
| NON-VANTAGE | 28 | 3.51 | 3.56 | 28 | 3.04 | 30.1 | 30.0 |
| MALE | 16 | 3.45 | 3.54 | 16 | 3.31 | 30.8 | 31.0 |
| FEMALE | 12 | 3.59 | 3.61 | 12 | 2.67 | 29.3 | 28.5 |

2020 Total Number of VANTAGE and Non-VANTAGE Students taking IB and AP Tests with ACT and Grade Point Average (GPA) by Gender (Including new courses)

|  | 2020 GPA (weighted) |  |  | AP ENV SCI |  | HIGHEST ACT |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\boldsymbol{N}$ | Mean | Median | $\boldsymbol{N}$ | Mean | Mean | Median |
| VANTAGE | 30 | 3.53 | 3.59 | 30 | 3.47 | 28.5 | 29.5 |
| MALE | 8 | 3.30 | 3.34 | 8 | 3.00 | 29.8 | 30.5 |
| FEMALE | 22 | 3.62 | 3.74 | 22 | 3.64 | 28.1 | 28.0 |
| NON-VANTAGE | 31 | 3.53 | 3.60 | 24 | 3.46 | 29.4 | 30.0 |
| MALE | 8 | 3.31 | 3.34 | 6 | 3.83 | 30.4 | 33.0 |
| FEMALE | 23 | 3.61 | 3.64 | 18 | 3.33 | 29.0 | 29.5 |

2021 Total Number of VANTAGE and Non-VANTAGE Students taking IB and AP Tests with ACT and Grade Point Average (GPA) by Gender (Including new courses)

|  | 2021 GPA (weighted) |  | AP ENV SCI |  | HIGHEST ACT |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\boldsymbol{N}$ | Mean | Median | $\boldsymbol{N}$ | Mean | Mean | Median |
| VANTAGE | 26 | 3.47 | 3.42 | 23 | 3.04 | 24.5 | 24.0 |
| MALE | 8 | 3.18 | 3.29 | 7 | 2.29 | 22.0 | 22.0 |
| FEMALE | 18 | 3.60 | 3.61 | 16 | 3.38 | 26.0 | 24.0 |
| NON-VANTAGE | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| MALE | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| FEMALE | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

2022 Total Number of VANTAGE and Non-VANTAGE Students taking IB and AP Tests with ACT and Grade Point Average (GPA) by Gender (Including new courses)

|  | 2022 GPA (weighted) |  |  | AP ENV SCI |  | HIGHEST ACT |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\boldsymbol{N}$ | Mean | Median | $\boldsymbol{N}$ | Mean | Mean | Median |
| VANTAGE | 26 | 3.55 | 3.64 | 26 | 3.81 | 27.6 | 27.0 |
| MALE | 10 | 3.39 | 3.35 | 10 | 3.70 | 26.6 | 25.5 |
| FEMALE | 16 | 3.65 | 3.77 | 16 | 3.88 | 28.1 | 27.0 |
| NON-VANTAGE | 23 | 3.60 | 3.69 | 23 | 3.96 | 31.0 | 33.5 |
| MALE | 10 | 3.55 | 3.68 | 10 | 4.40 | 32.0 | 34.0 |
| FEMALE | 13 | 3.64 | 3.73 | 13 | 3.62 | 30.1 | 28.5 |

2019 Total Number of VANTAGE and Non-VANTAGE Students taking IB and AP Tests with ACT and Grade Point Average (GPA) by Gender (Including new courses)

|  | 2019 GPA (weighted) |  |  | AP SEMINAR |  | HIGHEST ACT |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\boldsymbol{N}$ | $\boldsymbol{M e a n}$ | Median | $\boldsymbol{N}$ | Mean | Mean | Median |
| VANTAGE | 69 | 3.55 | 3.79 | 68 | 2.90 | 27.4 | 27.0 |
| MALE | 52 | 3.50 | 3.73 | 51 | 2.82 | 27.4 | 27.0 |
| FEMALE | 17 | 3.72 | 3.79 | 17 | 3.12 | 27.5 | 28.0 |
| NON-VANTAGE | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| MALE | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| FEMALE | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

2020 Total Number of VANTAGE and Non-VANTAGE Students taking IB and AP Tests with ACT and Grade Point Average (GPA) by Gender (Including new courses)

|  | 2020 GPA (weighted) |  | AP SEMINAR |  | HIGHEST ACT |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\boldsymbol{N}$ | Mean | Median | $\boldsymbol{N}$ | Mean | Mean | Median |
| VANTAGE | 90 | 3.48 | 3.60 | 89 | 3.29 | 26.3 | 26.0 |
| MALE | 52 | 3.39 | 3.48 | 51 | 3.20 | 26.4 | 26.0 |
| FEMALE | 38 | 3.60 | 3.74 | 38 | 3.42 | 26.2 | 27.0 |
| NON-VANTAGE | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| MALE | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| FEMALE | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

2021 Total Number of VANTAGE and Non-VANTAGE Students taking IB and AP Tests with ACT and Grade Point Average (GPA) by Gender (Including new courses)

|  | 2021 GPA (weighted) |  |  | AP SEMINAR |  | HIGHEST ACT |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\boldsymbol{N}$ | Mean | Median | $\boldsymbol{N}$ | Mean | Mean | Median |
| VANTAGE | 98 | 3.32 | 3.49 | 93 | 3.31 | 25.2 | 25.0 |
| MALE | 67 | 3.21 | 3.35 | 65 | 3.09 | 25.5 | 25.0 |
| FEMALE | 31 | 3.54 | 3.68 | 28 | 3.82 | 24.6 | 24.0 |
| NON-VANTAGE | 61 | 3.57 | 3.63 | 58 | 3.78 | 29.6 | 31.0 |
| MALE | 33 | 3.51 | 3.58 | 32 | 3.66 | 30.7 | 32.0 |
| FEMALE | 28 | 3.65 | 3.73 | 26 | 3.92 | 28.2 | 29.0 |

2022 Total Number of VANTAGE and Non-VANTAGE Students taking IB and AP Tests with ACT and Grade Point Average (GPA) by Gender (Including new courses)

|  | 2022 GPA (weighted) |  |  | AP SEMINAR |  | HIGHEST ACT |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\boldsymbol{N}$ | Mean | Median | $\boldsymbol{N}$ | Mean | Mean | Median |
| VANTAGE | 160 | 3.52 | 3.66 | 160 | 3.39 | 27.0 | 27.0 |
| MALE | 96 | 3.46 | 3.57 | 96 | 3.30 | 26.4 | 26.5 |
| FEMALE | 64 | 3.62 | 3.71 | 64 | 3.52 | 28.0 | 28.0 |
| NON-VANTAGE | 45 | 3.64 | 3.77 | 41 | 3.61 | 28.3 | 29.0 |
| MALE | 19 | 3.58 | 3.59 | 18 | 3.67 | 30.9 | 32.0 |
| FEMALE | 26 | 3.68 | 3.82 | 23 | 3.57 | 26.1 | 25.0 |

2020 Total Number of VANTAGE and Non-VANTAGE Students taking IB and AP Tests with ACT and Grade Point Average (GPA) by Gender (Including new courses)

|  | 2020 GPA (weighted) |  |  | AP COMP SCI <br> PRIN |  | HIGHEST ACT |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\boldsymbol{N}$ | Mean | Median | $\boldsymbol{N}$ | Mean | Mean | Median |
| VANTAGE | 12 | 3.10 | 3.04 | 11 | 3.82 | 30.2 | 31.0 |
| MALE | 9 | 3.11 | 3.08 | 8 | 4.0 | 30.2 | 31.0 |
| FEMALE | 3 | 3.07 | 3.00 | 3 | 3.33 | - | - |
| NON-VANTAGE | 55 | 3.45 | 3.52 | 49 | 3.39 | 28.1 | 27.0 |
| MALE | 41 | 3.46 | 3.52 | 36 | 3.28 | 28.1 | 27.0 |
| FEMALE | 14 | 3.44 | 3.59 | 13 | 3.69 | 27.7 | 25.0 |

2021 Total Number of VANTAGE and Non-VANTAGE Students taking IB and AP Tests with ACT and Grade Point Average (GPA) by Gender (Including new courses)

|  | 2021 GPA (weighted) |  |  | AP COMP SCI <br> PRIN |  | HIGHEST ACT |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\boldsymbol{N}$ | Mean | Median | $\boldsymbol{N}$ | Mean | Mean | Median |
| VANTAGE | 11 | 2.97 | 3.39 | 11 | 2.73 | 26.0 | 26.0 |
| MALE | 8 | 3.00 | 3.45 | 8 | 2.75 | 26.0 | 26.0 |
| FEMALE | 3 | 2.89 | 2.64 | 3 | 2.67 | - | - |
| NON-VANTAGE | 26 | 3.51 | 3.66 | 25 | 3.62 | 30.0 | 33.0 |
| MALE | 21 | 3.46 | 3.63 | 21 | 3.67 | 30.0 | 33.5 |
| FEMALE | 5 | 3.74 | 3.85 | 5 | 3.40 | 29.0 | 31.0 |

## 2022 Total Number of VANTAGE and Non-VANTAGE Students taking IB and AP Tests with ACT and Grade Point Average (GPA) by Gender (Including new courses)

|  | 2022 GPA (weighted) |  |  | AP COMP SCI <br> PRIN |  | HIGHEST ACT |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\boldsymbol{N}$ | Mean | Median | $\boldsymbol{N}$ | Mean | Mean | Median |
| VANTAGE | 17 | 3.59 | 3.79 | 16 | 4.00 | 29.0 | 27.0 |
| MALE | 10 | 3.53 | 3.71 | 10 | 3.90 | 28.2 | 26.0 |
| FEMALE | 7 | 3.68 | 3.88 | 6 | 4.17 | 31.0 | 31.0 |
| NON-VANTAGE | 30 | 3.56 | 3.77 | 30 | 3.63 | 28.2 | 29.0 |
| MALE | 26 | 3.54 | 3.74 | 26 | 3.54 | 29.0 | 30.0 |
| FEMALE | 4 | 3.70 | 3.82 | 4 | 4.25 | 25.0 | 25.0 |

## SUMMARY

Student performance was strong on the ACT Test despite not having as many students retake the assessment as in past years either due to COVID or because many colleges/universities made the test optional for admissions. Students will continue to perform at high levels due to the increased rigor of the academic program at earlier grade levels and the ongoing work to improve rigor at the Junior and Senior levels. More students are coming to the High School prepared to take more challenging coursework, thus preparing them for national exams such as the ACT and SAT.

AP and IB exam results were impacted by COVID in recent years, and Minnetonka students rebounded in both areas with all-time high average scores in some areas. As both the IB and AP programs grow, more students with varying academic performance may be taking those courses. This may result in dips in performance in some areas. As more students become accustomed to the rigor required in these courses, the effect should be mitigated.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

## English and Reading

It will be important for staff to continue to invest in staff development to create a stronger and more united Departmental focus on alignment with the essential learnings reflected in the ACT, IB, and AP Tests valued by colleges and universities.

Student performance declined on the SAT Test compared to last year. Teachers will need to study the new SAT Test as the changes are more aligned with the Career and College Readiness Standards.

The entire English and Math Departments will need to continue to stay committed to introducing more rigorous coursework and to challenge students daily to stretch academically.

## Math

ACT Math subtest scores indicate that District Math teachers will need to focus on the three areas critical for success on the ACT Math Test: Pre-Algebra/Elementary Algebra, Intermediate Algebra/Coordinate Geometry, and Plane Geometry/Trigonometry.

As the Department analyzes ACT Practice Test results, staff will need to develop strategies to reach a broader audience and will need to focus more deeply on the three elements of the Math Test noted above.

In addition, IB Math scores rebounded last year on all IB Math tests. Overall, Math teachers will need to continue work with school leadership in order to identify important areas for growth to ensure students are able to perform at their highest levels on these exams.

## Science

The Science Department will need to continue to look carefully at how problem-solving skills can be better integrated into the Science curriculum and continue to study course options for all students.

Six out of seven AP Science exams increased or remained the same, while three out of four IB exams showed an increase in average score. IB teachers have spent time in the past five years adjusting the course to align more closely to the IB outcomes. This will continue to be monitored, and IB Biology and Physics courses had new exams that began in May 2016, in which staff will need to continue the teacher re-training process.

## World Language

IB World Language teachers will need to continue to focus energy and resources on the written assessments, and continue to set a goal for the school average to match or exceed the World-wide average in their course.

World Language teachers will continue to focus on studying the AP Exams carefully to ensure student success each year. Teachers plan to attend AP training regularly in order to maintain their focus on the end result. Teachers will need to work backward from what they learn to plan lessons and assessments accordingly, especially as more Language Immersion students enter the program in the coming years. Staff have been trained on the Integrated Performance Assessment (IPA) model, and this form of common assessment should help to pay positive dividends for years to come for students.

## VANTAGE

Overall, VANTAGE students are making great strides on important metrics while gaining an experience that will prove to be valuable for them as them move to the next level beyond high school. The profile of the VANTAGE student shows in most cases that with a lower overall GPA or lower all ACT Composite score, VANTAGE students continue to score highly on AP and IB exams relative to their non-VANTAGE counterparts. It will be important for VANTAGE instructors to continue to ensure alignment among the courses in which they teach and the IB and AP exams.

## CONCLUSIONS

Minnetonka students are performing at high levels of achievement on a nationally or internationally competitive level and are well prepared to be successful on standardized assessments. Multiple measures of student achievement using different assessments are essential. It is important to measure IB, AP, and classroom performance to obtain a valid picture of overall achievement. Preparing students for the rigor of IB is critical as the program continues to grow. With the addition of more rigorous math courses at earlier grades, academic expectations are already raised. Continual training will be critical to helping teachers prepare for the demands of the IB and AP classrooms. Clearly, the academic program in Minnetonka is rigorous, and members of the community should expect this culture of academic rigor and excellence to grow in the coming years.

## RECOMMENDATION/FUTURE DIRECTION:

This report is submitted for the School Board's information.

## Submitted by:



Director of Assessment ahd Evaluation

## Concurrence:



David Law, Superintendent

# School Board <br> Minnetonka I.S.D. 276 <br> 5621 County Road 101 <br> Minnetonka, Minnesota 

## Board Agenda Item VI.

Title: Acceptance of Bid for HVAC Replacement at SAIL Building

Date: September 1, 2022

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

As part of the rolling Long Term Facility Maintenance 10 Year Plan, replacement of the 1997-installed R-22 HVAC system at the SAIL Building is scheduled for summer 2023.

The budget estimate for the project is $\$ 200,000$.
Bids were opened at 11:00 AM on Thursday, August 25, 2022. Six (6) bids were received as follows:

| Cool Air Mechanical . | $\$ 119,550.00$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Major Mechanical | $\$ 124,575.00$ |
| Northland Mechanical Contractors | $\$ 127,900.00$ |
| Kraft Mechanical | $\$ 130,000.00$ |
| Alliance Mechanical | $\$ 134,644.00$ |
| Modern Piping, Inc. | $\$ 135,300.00$ |

## RECOMMENDATION/FUTURE DIRECTION:

It is recommended that the School Board accept the low bid of Cool Air Mechanical in the amount of $\$ 119,550.00$ for replacement of the HVAC system at the SAIL Building in summer 2023.

## RECOMMENDED MOTION

BE IT RESOLVED that the School Board of Minnetonka Independent School District 276 does hereby accept the low bid of Cool Air Mechanical in the amount of \$119,550.00 for replacement of the HVAC system at the SAIL Building in summer 2023.

Submitted by:


Paul Bourgeois, Executive Director of Finance \& Operations

Concurrence:


David Law, Superintendent

# School Board <br> Minnetonka I.S.D. 276 <br> 5621 County Road 101 <br> Minnetonka, Minnesota 

Board Agenda Item VII.
Title: Acceptance of Bid for Conversion of Space
Date: September 1, 2022

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

As part of the FY23 Operating Capital Budget, \$300,000 has been allocated for conversion of the remaining space of the original 1967 multipurpose room at Scenic Heights to a classroom space. The 1967 multipurpose room became surplus to the physical education program with the construction of the large gymnasium at Scenic Heights in 2018.

In 2019, approximately half of the original 1967 multipurpose room was converted to house the Art Room, leaving the remaining half available for future repurposing.

The budget estimate for the project is $\$ 300,000$.
Bids were opened at 2:00 PM on Thursday, August 25, 2022. Six (6) bids were received for the project as follows:

Morcon Construction
\$255,610.00
CM Construction Company, Inc.
Versacon, Inc.
Construction Results Corporation
\$259,800.00
\$282,000.00
Met-Con Construction
\$298,397.00
Dering Pierson Group \$327,250.00

## RECOMMENDATION/FUTURE DIRECTION:

It is recommended that the School Board accept the low bid of Morcon Construction in the amount of $\$ 255,610.00$ for conversion of the remaining original 1967 multipurpose room to a classroom space in summer 2023.

## RECOMMENDED MOTION

BE IT RESOLVED that the School Board of Minnetonka Independent School District 276 does hereby accept the low bid of Morcon Construction in the amount of $\$ 255,610.00$ for conversion of the remaining original 1967 multipurpose room to a classroom space in summer 2023.


David Law, Superintendent

School Board<br>Minnetonka I.S.D. 276<br>5621 County Road 101<br>Minnetonka, Minnesota

## Board Agenda Item VIII.

Title: Acceptance of Bids for Paving at Scenic Heights Elementary School, Minnetonka High School and the District Service Center

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

As part of the rolling Long Term Facility Maintenance 10 Year Plan, paving of the parking lot at Scenic Heights Elementary School the East Parking Lot at Minnetonka High School, and the lower parking lot at the District Service Center is scheduled for summer 2023.

The budget for the Scenic Heights Elementary parking lot paving is $\$ 210,000$.
The budget for the Minnetonka High School east lot paving is $\$ 240,000$.
The budget for the District Service Center lower lot paving is $\$ 120,000$.
Bids were opened at 1:00 PM on Monday, August 22, 2022. Four (4) bids were received for each of the three projects as follows:

Scenic Heights Elementary School
Park Construction Company \$158,246.00
Northwest Asphalt, Inc. $\$ 158,900.00$
Bituminous Roadways, Inc. \$168,900.00
Allied Blacktop Company \$190,835.00
Minnetonka High School
Park Construction Company \$219,901.00
Northwest Asphalt, Inc.
Bituminous Roadways, Inc.
Allied Blacktop Company
\$240,100.00
\$258,900.00

District Service Center
Bituminous Roadways, Inc. \$ 51,800.00
Park Construction Company \$ 71,755.00
Northwest Asphalt, Inc.
\$ 72,900.00
Allied Blacktop Company
\$ 97,804.00

## RECOMMENDATION/FUTURE DIRECTION:

It is recommended that the School Board accept the low bid of Park Construction Company in the amount of $\$ 158,246.00$ for paving at Scenic Heights Elementary School in summer 2023.

It is recommended that the School Board accept the low bid of Park Construction Company in the amount of $\$ 219,901.00$ for paving at Minnetonka High School in summer 2023.

It is recommended that the School Board accept the low bid of Bituminous Roadways, Inc., in the amount of $\$ 51,800.00$ for paving at the District Service Center in summer 2023.

## RECOMMENDED MOTION

BE IT RESOLVED that the School Board of Minnetonka Independent School District 276 does hereby accept the low bid of Park Construction Company in the amount of $\$ 158,246.00$ for paving at Scenic Heights Elementary School in summer 2023, and;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the School Board of Minnetonka Independent School District 276 does hereby accept the low bid of Park Construction Company in the amount of $\$ 219,901.00$ for paving at Minnetonka High School in summer 2023, and;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the School Board of Minnetonka Independent School District 276 does hereby accept the low bid of Bituminous Roadways, Inc., in the amount of $\$ 51,800.00$ for paving at the District Service Center in summer 2023.

## Submitted by:



Paul Bourgeois, Executive Director of Finance \& Operations

## Concurrence:



[^2]
# School Board <br> Minnetonka I.S.D. \#276 <br> 5621 County Road 101 <br> Minnetonka, Minnesota 

Board Agenda Item IX.
Title: Resolution Pertaining to Consent Agenda
Date: September 1, 2022

## OVERVIEW:

The School Board formally adopted the Consent Agenda concept on March 1, 1979. For the Consent Agenda to work efficiently, Board members should call staff prior to the meeting regarding any questions they may have on the following items. If a member wishes to discuss any matter on the Consent Agenda, he/she should request, at the beginning of the meeting, that the item be placed on the regular agenda (during Agenda Item III: Adoption of the Agenda).

The following are the recommendations included within the Consent Agenda for September 1, 2022:
a. Minutes of August 4 Regular Meeting
b. Study Session Summary of August 18
c. Payment of Bills
d. Recommended Personnel Items
e. Gifts and Donations
f. Electronic Fund Transfers
g. Collective Bargaining Agreement with Paraprofessional Employees
h. Collective Bargaining Agreement with Nutrition Services Employees

## RECOMMENDATION/FUTURE DIRECTION:

It is recommended that the School Board approve all recommendations included within the Consent Agenda items.

Submitted by:


## CONSENT

School Board<br>Minnetonka I.S.D. \#276<br>5621 County Road 101<br>Minnetonka, Minnesota<br>Board Agenda Item IX. a

Title: Meeting Minutes
Date: September 1, 2022

## OVERVIEW:

The minutes of the proceedings of the Minnetonka School Board's following meeting are attached:

1. August 4 Regular Meeting

## RECOMMENDATION/FUTURE DIRECTION:

It is recommended that the School Board approve these minutes, as presented.

Submitted by:


Carrie Voeltz, Executive Assistant to the Superintendent and School Board

# MINNETONKA INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT \#276 <br> District Service Center <br> 5621 County Road 101 <br> Minnetonka, Minnesota 

## Minutes of August 4, 2022 Regular School Board Meeting

The School Board of Minnetonka Independent School District \#276 met in regular session at 7:00 p.m. on Thursday, August 4, 2022 in the Community Room at the District Service Center, 5621 County Road 101, Minnetonka, Minnesota. Chairperson Chris Vitale presided. Other Board members present were: Mark Ambrosen, Katie Becker, Patrick Lee-O’Halloran, Meghan Selinger, Lisa Wagner and Superintendent David Law, ex officio. Absent: John Odom. The meeting was also livestreamed on the District's YouTube channel.

Chairperson Vitale called the regular meeting to order and asked that everyone stand and recite the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

## 1. AGENDA

Wagner moved, Becker seconded, that the School Board approve the agenda as presented. Upon vote being taken thereon, the motion carried unanimously.

## 2. APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION CALLING THE SCHOOL BOARD SPECIAL ELECTION

Executive Director of Finance and Operations Paul Bourgeois presented this item to the Board. He explained that in accordance with Minnesota Statutes 205A. 07 Subd. 3, the school board of a school district must adopt a resolution to call a school district special election. As he explained, the district must give written notice of the special election to the county auditor of each county in which the school district is located in whole or in part no later than 74 days before the election. In 2022, Election Day is Tuesday, November 8, resulting in the final day to notify the county auditor being August 26, 2022. The filing period is August 2, 2022 - August 16, 2022. The deadline for a candidate to withdraw is 5:00 PM on August 18, 2022.

Wagner moved, Lee-O'Halloran seconded, that the Board approve the resolution calling for a School Board Special Election. Upon vote being taken thereon, the motion carried unanimously.

## 3. COMMUNITY COMMENTS

Chairperson Vitale noted that this opportunity for comment was available to community members who wished to address the Board on any item on that night's agenda. No one responded to this invitation to speak.

## 4. APPROVAL OF AP, IB, SUPPLEMENTAL AND NEW COURSE MATERIALS

Minnetonka Public Schools Policy \#606 states that all instructional materials, whether core or supplemental, must align with and advance the district's vision and mission. This policy requires that all instructional materials challenge each student and prepare them to thrive in American society and the world at-large. As in past years, departments and programs have identified instructional material needs for the upcoming school year. As the English Language Arts, Health, and Science departments continue with the curriculum review and standards implementation process during the 2022-23 school year, additional resources will be reviewed, piloted, and brought to the Board for future implementation.

Ambrosen moved, Selinger seconded, that the Board approve the instructional materials that have been evaluated by departments over the past year, were available for public review this summer, and were recommended for full implementation at the start of the 2022-23 school year. Board member Wagner asked whether parents who reviewed the materials had any comments or questions. Superintendent Law responded that the District did receive some requests to review the materials, and there were no questions or comments following that review. Dr. Amy LaDue, Associate Superintendent for Instruction, added that the District can also provide the materials digitally for parents who would like to review them at home.

Upon vote being taken on the foregoing motion, the motion carried unanimously.

## 5. PRESENTATION ON PARENT SURVEY

Each year, Minnetonka Public Schools surveys parents about their family's educational experience in our schools. The 2022 Parent Survey was administered from mid-May to mid-June of 2022 and captured more than 2,800 completed responses. All parents were invited to participate in the online survey, and multiple reminders were sent to increase participation. Although this is not a random sample survey, the district is confident in the results. Demographic questions indicated that respondents were consistent with the distribution of our student population. As Executive Director of Communications Dr. JacQui Getty shared, results of the survey were again outstanding, showing high confidence in our programs, schools, teachers and leadership.

- $96 \%$ of respondents rate the education provided by the Minnetonka School District as excellent or good, up 2\% over last year.
- $95 \%$ of parents believe the community receives a good value from its investment in Minnetonka's local public schools.
- $95 \%$ of elementary school parents, $92 \%$ of middle school parents and $89 \%$ of high school parents would recommend their school to friends or neighbors.
- $92 \%$ of parents, on average, believe their school principal is accessible to them when they have questions or concerns.
- $93 \%$ of parents, on average, believe their child's school provides a safe learning environment.

New in this year's survey, the district asked parents about student well-being and belonging and about the successes and challenges families had with the COVID-19 Safe Learning Plan.

- $93 \%$ of elementary parents, $90 \%$ of middle school parents and $85 \%$ of high school parents said their student's school provides an environment that supports their student's sense of well-being.
- $93 \%$ of elementary parents, $87 \%$ of middle school parents and $82 \%$ of high school parents said their student's school provides an environment that supports their student's sense of belonging.
- Elementary school parents said the top successes of the District's Safe Learning Plan were accessible, reliable technology; communication from teachers; and connection with teachers. They said the top challenges were student self-motivation and connection with classmates.
- Middle school parents said the top successes of the District's Safe Learning Plan were accessible, reliable technology and communication from the principal and District. They said the top challenges were student self-motivation and engagement with learning.
- High school parents said the top successes of the District's Safe Learning Plan were accessible, reliable technology; communication from the principal and District; and communication from teachers. They said the top challenges were connection with classmates and engagement with learning.

While the overall survey results are very positive, a segment of the parent population expressed their advice and suggestions to the district regarding a variety of topics, including but not limited to: the desire for the district to avoid political and social agendas, to limit or adjust iPad use for students, to address an academic/curriculum or teacher/staff issue, to provide a stronger focus and support for diversity, equity and inclusion and to consider what protocols to have in place, should COVID continue to be an issue to manage in the upcoming 2022-23 school year. Additionally, each school principal and district leader will be provided with school-specific or programspecific results for goal setting for the coming year. Board member Wagner thanked Dr. Getty and her team for all the work on the parent survey to process the results and to code the more than 9,000 comments for themes. She also thanked the parents who took time to take the survey. Chairperson Vitale reiterated those points
6. APPROVAL OF SALE OF 2022B GENERAL OBLIGATION LONG-TERM FACILITIES MAINTENANCE BONDS

At the School Board Meeting of May 5, 2022, the School Board authorized the sale of the $\$ 8,985,000$ 2022B General Obligation Long-Term Facilities Maintenance Bonds to pay for the design and completion of long-term facilities maintenance projects
scheduled to be completed in summer 2023 as part of the District's 10-Year LongTerm Facilities Maintenance Plan.

As Executive Director of Finance and Operations Paul Bourgeois shared, the sale of the $\$ 8,985,000$ 2022B General Obligation Long-Term Facilities Maintenance Bonds took place on July 21, 2022. The 2022B Bonds were sold at a total interest cost of 3.66\%.

Becker moved, Ambrosen seconded, that the Board approve the resolution approving the sale of the 2022B General Obligation Long-Term Facilities Maintenance Bonds, as prepared by the district's bond counsel Dorsey \& Whitney. Upon vote being taken thereon, the motion carried unanimously.

## 7. CONSENT AGENDA

Wagner moved, Becker seconded, that the School Board approve the recommendations included within the following Consent Agenda items:

- Minutes of June 16 Closed Session and Special Meeting
- Study Session Summary of June 16, 2022
- Payment of Bills—in the amount of $\$ 7,920,361.82$ for May and $\$ 12,323,720.74$ for June
- Recommended Personnel Items
- Gifts and Donations for July 2022: $\$ 450.00$ from the Blackbaud Giving Fund and $\$ 40.00$ from Target c/o Cyber Grants, LLC, both to be placed in the Deephaven Elementary School Principal Discretionary Account. \$23,198.00 from the Deephaven PTA and $\$ 2,000.00$ from the Deephaven PTA, both to be placed in the Deephaven Elementary School PTA Enrichment Account. \$8,094.00 from the Groveland Elementary School PTO to be placed in the Groveland Elementary School Field Trip Account. $\$ 33.32$ from FrontStream to be placed in the Groveland Elementary Principal Discretionary Account. $\$ 8.40$ from the Blackbaud Giving Fund to be placed in the Excelsior Elementary School Principal Discretionary Account. \$61,269.00 from the Minnetonka Skippers Booster Club to be placed in the MHS Athletic Clubs and Teams Accounts. \$14,419.85 from the MMW PTO to be placed in the MMW Field Trip and Classroom Supplies Accounts. \$10,000.00 from the City of Deephaven, \$5,000.00 from the Minnetonka Preschool and ECFE PTO, and $\$ 10,000.00$ from the Excelsior Rotary Foundation, all to be placed in the MCE Playground Account. $\$ 25.00$ from the Edward Jones Trust to be placed in the MHS Arts Center Account. \$8.40 from the Blackbaud Giving Fund to be placed in the MMW Principal Discretionary Account. $\$ 100.00$ from the Minnetonka Skippers Booster Club to be placed in the MHS DESI Club Account. \$100.00 from the Minnetonka Skippers Booster Club to be placed in the MHS Fencing Club Account. $\$ 100.00$ from the Minnetonka Skippers Booster Club to be placed in the MHS Ultimate Frisbee Club Account. $\$ 100.00$ from the Minnetonka Skippers Booster Club to be placed in the MHS Robotics Club Account. \$100.00 from the Minnetonka Skippers Booster

Club to be placed in the MHS Jazz Band Account. \$100.00 from the Minnetonka Skippers Booster Club to be placed in the MHS Marching Band Account. $\$ 5,000.00$ from the MHS Soccer Booster Club to be placed in the MHS Striker Club Account. $\$ 100.00$ from Thomas \& Laurie Burns, $\$ 960.00$ from the Blackbaud Giving Fund, $\$ 330.00$ from the Blackbaud Giving Fund, $\$ 100.00$ from Brenda Van Dixhorn, and $\$ 10.00$ from Anonymous, all to be placed in the MHS Principal Discretionary Account. \$6,092.59 from the Minnetonka Hoops Booster Club to be placed in the MHS Basketball Coach Stipend Account. $\$ 300.00$ from Gap, Inc. to be placed in the MHS Fastpitch Team Account. \$5,757.50 from Minnetonka Girls Lacrosse Boosters to be placed in the MHS Girls Lacrosse Coach Stipend Account. \$500.00 from the Optimists Club of Glen Lake to be placed in the MHS Supermileage Program Account. \$33,253.64 from the MTFCCA to be placed in the MHS Track and Field Account. $\$ 300.00$ from Shannon Richter, $\$ 500.00$ from Thomas and Laurie Pohlad, and $\$ 1,000.00$ from Kurt and Janet Swiecichowski, all to be placed in the MHS Dr. Dennis Peterson Scholarship Account. \$2,000.00 from the Lions Foundation of Victoria to be placed in the MHS Scholarship Account for Graduating Seniors. \$10,000.00 from the Rotary Club of Lake Minnetonka-Excelsior to be placed in the MHS Tonka Prep Account. $\$ 67.14$ from Jeff \& Erin Anderson and $\$ 333.00$ from the Blackbaud Giving Fund, both to be placed in the MHS Minnetonka Research Account. \$400.00 from Digineer Consulting to be placed in the MHS Tonka Hacks Account. $\$ 650.00$ from Paul Bourgeois to be placed in the Admin Council Spirit Wear Account. A 2004 Toyota Corolla from Carrie Webber and a 2002 Jeep Liberty from Kelly Keading, both to be donated to the MHS MOMENTUM Program for educational purposes. A cello from Sandy Weigel to be donated to the Deephaven Elementary School Orchestra Department. Plants from the Tonkadale Greenhouse to be placed in the MHS Secret Garden. A trombone from Suzanne LaCroix to be placed in the Minnetonka Schools Band Department (Grades 5-8). $\$ 40,000.00$ from the Minnewashta PTO to be placed in the Minnewashta Principal Discretionary Account. Total Gifts and Donations thus far for 2022-23: \$242,469.84.

- Electronic Fund Transfers
- Collective Bargaining Agreement with Custodial and Maintenance Employees

Upon vote being taken on the foregoing Consent Agenda items, the motion carried unanimously.

## 8. BOARD REPORTS

There were no Board reports this evening.

## 9. SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORT

Superintendent Law said his first month on the job has been spent meeting with district administrators and principals, community members, the School Board members and parents and students. He is excited for the school year to begin and to have students
back. He also reminded the public about the community bike ride Tour de Tonka, which takes place this Saturday, August 6.

## 10. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chairperson Vitale officially welcomed Superintendent Law to the district.

## 11. ADJOURNMENT

Wagner moved, Becker seconded, adjournment at 7:37 p.m. Upon vote being taken thereon, the motion carried unanimously.


# School Board <br> Minnetonka I.S.D. \#276 <br> 5621 County Road 101 <br> Minnetonka, Minnesota <br> Board Agenda Item IX. b 

Title: Study Session Summary
Date: September 1, 2022

## OVERVIEW:

The summary of the proceedings of the Minnetonka School Board's August 18 Study Session is attached.

## RECOMMENDATION/FUTURE DIRECTION:

It is recommended that the School Board approve this summary as presented.

Submitted by:


Carrie Voeltz, Executive Assistant to the Superintendent and School Board

# MINNETONKA INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT \#276 <br> District Service Center <br> 5621 County Road 101 <br> Minnetonka, Minnesota 

## Summary of August 18, 2022 Study Session

The School Board of Minnetonka Independent School District \#276 met in study session at 6:00 p.m. on Thursday, August 18, 2022 in the Community Room at the District Service Center, 5621 County Road 101, Minnetonka, Minnesota. Chairperson Chris Vitale presided. Other Board members present were Mark Ambrosen, Katie Becker, Patrick LeeO'Halloran, John Odom, Meghan Selinger, Lisa Wagner and Superintendent David Law, ex officio.

## UPDATE ON OPEB TRUST FUND

Executive Director of Finance and Operations Paul Bourgeois led the discussion. He explained that in August of 2008, the Board had established the Minnetonka Independent School District 276 Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB) Revocable Trust to provide assets for the payment of lifelong post-employment benefits for health insurance owed to employees who had been working under contracts with those provisions prior to July 1, 2002. The School Board specifically chose to establish a revocable trust, as the statutes authorizing such trusts allowed for the trusts to be either irrevocable or revocable. Under the statutes governing the revocable trust option, there is a provision that allows for any excess assets over the actuarial accrued liability to be withdrawn by the School Board and used for any District purpose.

In the ensuing approximately 13 years, OPEB Trust assets grew from their original amount of $\$ 17,742,555$ in August 2008 to $\$ 28,051,349$ as of June 20, 2021, while the OPEB Liability decreased from $\$ 17,742,555$ in August 2008 to $\$ 10,985,427$ as of June 30, 2021.

During Fiscal Year 2022, the School Board decided to withdraw $\$ 9,850,000$ of OPEB Trust Excess assets so that they could be invested in the construction of the VANTAGE MOMENTUM Building, which will be a 100-year asset for the District.

## OPEB Revocable Trust History and Purpose

- MN Legislature in 2008 passed MN Statute 471.6175 allowing public entities to fund a trust for Other Post Employment Benefits
- OPEB liabilities were primarily lifetime health insurance benefits paid to retirees that had been negotiated in bargaining unit contracts
- To establish a trust, the participation in these types of benefits had to have been capped by 7/1/02
- The trust could be funded by the issuance of General Obligation Bonds
- The District chose to establish a revocable trust because we knew excess assets were likely to accrue for several reasons:
- Actuaries were directed to use a conservative 3.0\% discount rate to calculate the initial liability
- Sufficient funds would be in the trust to cover any economic downturns
- At the time, 3.0\% was what the District could earn on its own with its cash investments
- With a fixed number of participants, normal mortality would result in the liability decreasing significantly
- The Trust was established in 2008 with a liability of $\$ 17,742,555$ for 615 participants
- Wells Fargo Private Wealth Management was selected as the investment manager for the Trust
- From FY08 through FY22, $\$ 9,218,998$ has been disbursed to the General Fund to pay for retiree benefits expenditures
- Without the OPEB Trust, the General Fund Unassigned Fund Balance would be \$9,218,998 lower as of June 30, 2022
- \$23,727,906-17.0\% - projected at June 30, 2022 closing
- \$14,508,908-10.0\% - without the OPEB Trust
- $\$ 17,742,555$ initial investment has returned $\$ 19,068,998$ in "dividends" for retiree benefit payments and VANTAGE/MOMENTUM construction
- The Corpus of the Trust remains at $\$ 15,254,695$ at $6 / 30 / 22$
- The Actuarial Accrued Liability is $\$ 8,708,215$ as of CBIZ Actuaries' 6/30/22 update
- Participants are down to 209 from the initial 615
- Liability is funded at $175 \%$ as of $6 / 30 / 22$
- $\$ 9,461,726$ in "dividends" for retiree benefits scheduled for FY23-FY39
- Amortization ends after 30 years in FY39 - due to mortality
- 6/30/22 status:
- Trust assets had grown to $\mathbf{\$ 2 8 , 0 5 1 , 3 8 0}$
- Liability had declined from \$17,742,555 in 2008 down to $\$ 10,985,427$
- On October 7, 2021, the Board approved the use of $\$ 7,000,000$ in excess assets from the OPEB Revocable Trust for use to construct the strategic asset of the VANTAGE/MOMENTUM building
- On May 19, 2022, the Board approved the use of $\$ 2,850,000$ in excess assets from the OPEB Revocable Trust for use to construct the strategic asset of the VANTAGE/MOMENTUM building after construction inflation had impacted the price of the project

In closing, Mr. Bourgeois thanked the members of the 2008 School Board who had established the trust and chose to make it a revocable trust, saying the fund had been a wonderful asset for the District. Board Treasurer Becker, who sits on the District's OPEB Advisory Committee, said that the committee had been very supportive of using some of the fund's excess assets to help fund the construction of the VANTAGE/MOMENTUM building.

## CITIZEN INPUT

Chairperson Vitale extended an invitation to members of the audience who wished to address the Board on any topic. No one responded to this invitation to speak.

## UPDATE ON ADDITIONAL VANTAGE/MOMENTUM PARKING ABOVE CLEAR SPRINGS POND

Mr. Bourgeois led the discussion. By way of background, he noted that in 2014 and 2015, Highway 101 in front of Clear Springs Elementary School underwent a major rebuilding. As part of that process, the bus corral was relocated to an entrance off Covington Road to the south of Clear Springs. The driveway is over an easement from the City of Minnetonka over a conservation area that they purchased from Kolstad K-9 Acres many years ago. As part of the bus driveway relocation, what had been a pond used to train dogs to retrieve waterfowl was converted into a stormwater runoff control pond to handle the storm runoff from any additional hard-surface areas that were constructed because of the bus driveway relocation.

The City of Minnetonka has an easement to use any excess capacity in the pond for future roadway improvements in the neighborhoods to the east and south. With the purchase of the Kolstad K-9 Acres parcel, the District now has $100 \%$ of the stormwater runoff going into the pond. The District would like to move the pond underground and place additional parking on top of the pond to serve the VANTAGE/MOMENTUM Building which is under construction on the Kolstad K-9 Acres parcel.

Mr. Bourgeois noted that Hennepin County is considering vacating their easement, with a late 2022 or early 2023 determination. The City of Minnetonka has responded that they do not want to vacate their easement since there is excess capacity in the pond that they may have need of in the future due to future road improvements in the area.

The District has developed a plan that will increase the capacity of the pond by $93 \%$ - from 0.78 acre-feet to 1.51 acre-feet while moving the pond underground, which provides space for an additional 63 parking spaces as part of the project. The additional capacity would be preserved for use by the City to ensure that not only sufficient capacity but additional capacity remains to support any future City improvements in the adjacent neighborhoods. The District would maintain the pond as it does with its other 23 underground ponds. The City would gain more capacity and would be relieved of future maintenance costs. The District parking capacity at the site would increase to 131 spots from the current 68.

Mr. Bourgeois then went over the following next steps with the Board:

- Meet with City planning staff and administration to review the proposal
- Submit plan for approval by City - may take 4-6 months
- Submit plan to Riley Purgatory Bluff Creek Watershed District for approval
- Cost - $\$ 1,500,000$
- Funding source - COP Bonds with payments out of Operating Capital
- Bonds will not be issued until City approval is obtained
- Goal is approval no later than February 2023 if possible - bid out and construct after June 8, 2023 and complete in time for building opening on September 5, 2023


## UPDATE ON BONDING CAPACITY FOR ADDITIONS AND SITE PROJECTS

Mr. Bourgeois led the discussion. He began by noting that in the middle part of the 20002010 decade, the School Board took action to support open enrollment as a way to attract additional students and the associated revenue to benefit all students enrolled in the District. At the time, the facility capacity of the District was approximately 8,100 to 8,200 students, and enrollment was fluctuating between 7,600 and 7,700 students.

In the time period stretching from Fiscal Year 2008 through Fiscal Year 2022, the District has grown in enrollment from approximately 7,700 students to approximately 11,200 students. In order to accommodate these students, the District used existing revenue streams and bonding capacity authorized in statutes to construct additional facility capacity. Approximately 312,000 square feet of additional facilities capacity and supporting site infrastructure projects such as parking lots have been constructed or purchased. The 36,400 -square foot VANTAGE/MOMENTUM Building is under construction for a September 2023 opening and a potential parking lot project to support that building will be constructed in summer 2023 pending City of Minnetonka approval.

The District has used a total of $\$ 85,590,000$ of Certificates of Participation Bonds to construct these facilities. Payment for these bonds are out of existing revenue streams authorized in Minnesota Statutes. The District has worked over the years to maximize the use of the statutory financing tools to meet the facility needs of the growing student body.

Mr. Bourgeois then provided a status report on the various bond issues of the district, the annual bond payments on the outstanding bond principal, and a look at the current and future levels of outstanding bonds as the district moves through its strategic facility initiatives and bonds are paid off over time. The report also contained additional information regarding the financial and budget history of the District, the course of the District set by past School Boards, and additional detail on various bond issues, all of which provide additional context to the information about the outstanding par value of bonds outstanding.

The Board then discussed how inflation has taken its toll on public education, and the importance of engaging the Legislature in the District's efforts to increase funding. Superintendent Law noted that the District was working on its legislative position statements for 2023, and a draft would be brought to the Board in the coming months.

## ADJOURNMENT

The Board adjourned the Study Session at 6:50 p.m.

School Board
Minnetonka I.S.D. \# 276
5621 County Road 101
Minnetonka, Minnesota

Board Agenda Item IX. c
Title: Payment of Bills
Date: September 1, 2022

OVERVIEW:
Presented for Board approval are the monthly disbursement totals by fund for Minnetonka Public Schools for the month of July 2022.

## RECOMMENDATION/FUTURE DIRECTION:

It is recommended that the Board approve the disbursements as presented for the month of July 2022.

Submitted by:


Approved by:

Concurrence:


David Law
Superintendent of Schools

## MINNETONKA DISTRICT \#276

TO: David Law
FROM: Jessica Hulitt
RE: Payment of Bills - July 2022
Board Meeting Date: September 1, 2022
The following disbursements are submitted for the month of July:
Recommend the payment of bills in the sum of $\$ 12,538,495.51$ by check \#473252 \#473876 and ACH \#212202250-\#222300189, and wire transactions \#202200002\#202200473 as follows:

| July |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | FUND |  |
| 01 | GENERAL FUND | 5,223,729.10 |
| 02 | CHILD NUTRITION | 65,022.55 |
| 03 | PUPIL TRANSPORTATION | 1,064,787.19 |
| 04 | COMMUNITY SERVICE | 479,021.93 |
| 05 | CAPITAL EXPENDITURE | 1,099,740.48 |
| 07 | DEBIT SERVICE FUND | 1,031,607.63 |
| 09 | TRUST-FIDUCIARY | 15,108.84 |
| 11 | EXTRA/CO-CURRICULAR | 90,632.00 |
| 12 | ATHLETIC FEE | 11,746.64 |
| 18 | CUSTODIAL FUND | 241,835.89 |
| 20 | SELF INSURANCE | 118,342.92 |
| 40 | CULTURAL ARTS CENTER | 42,361.52 |
| 41 | DOME OPERATIONS | 17,046.08 |
| 42 | AQUATICS PROGRAM | 74,802.58 |
| 43 | PAGEL CENTER | 33,062.78 |
| 46 | LTFM | 942,928.71 |
| 47 | OPEN DEBT SERVICE FUND |  |
| 56 | CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS | 44,269.62 |
| 66 | CAPITAL PROJECTS LEVY | 1,942,449.05 |
|  |  | \$ 12,538,495.51 |
|  |  |  |
|  | SALARIES | \$ 2,667,400.76 |
|  |  |  |
|  | TOTAL | \$ 15,205,896.27 |

August 25, 2022
Date

# SCHOOL BOARD <br> MINNETONKA I.S.D. \#276 <br> 5621 County Rd. 101 <br> Minnetonka, MN <br> Community Room 

## Board Agenda Item IX. d.

TITLE: Recommended Personnel Items
DATE: September 1, 2022
BACKGROUND: Under the authorization of district policy, and the terms and conditions of the collective bargaining agreements between the Minnetonka Public Schools and employee groups recognized under Minnesota law, the executive director for human resources makes recommendations for employment, leaves, employee status changes, and resignations or release from contracts.

Those recommendations of a routine nature are attached in summary fashion. This section includes routine changes affecting an employee under the terms and conditions of the collective bargaining agreements, and new hires that occur between board meetings or are scheduled for the future.

State law requires that the School Board formally approve all personnel actions. At the time of hiring, employees are told that the administration formally recommends employment, and that the employment action is finalized only after Board action. On these routine matters, however, the administration may initiate the change prior to formal Board action in order to provide continuity of service to students.

Personnel changes of an exceptional nature requiring the interpretation of other district policies or laws are marked with an asterisk on the summary page, and have a separate explanation. In these cases, the administration does not take action until after Board action.

## FUTURE ACTION/RECOMMENDATION:

The administration recommends approval of all attached personnel changes.

Submitted by:


Concurrence by:


BALLSRUD, MARY
CHU, JENNIFER DURBIN, MEGAN FLATNESS, SYDNEY FLATNESS, SYDNEY GHANBARZADEH, BROOKE HAUGEN, SEAN HOGLUND, ELLIE HOLTE, TANNER HUGHES, KIM HUNEKE, LAURA KLAERS, AMY KUERSCHNER, CLARA LABATE, CAROLINE LEDMAN, CANDICE MAGNUSON, GINA MCCOY, CAROLINE MILLER, SAMANTHA NELSON, KATHRYN PASTRANA, ARACELI PIERING, KATHRYN PUSPOKI, MARVIN REEDY, ALICIA RODRIGUEZ, CARLOS SALT, ANN
SUTTER, SANDRA
THOMASON, ROSE LAURE
THOMSON, CHRISTOPHER
TUCAT, CRISTINA
WALTHER, AUTUMN
WEIKLE, WILLIAM
WYSE MOORE, EMILY
WRAGGE, BLAKE
ZHANG, TIANYI "JASON"

ASSIGNMENT
SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGIST, 1.0 FTE, MME
LANGUAGE ARTS, O. 6 FTE, MMW
GRADE 2, 1.0 FTE, MWTA
SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGIST, 1.0 FTE, MHS
ART, 1.0 FTE, MHS
ART, 0.4 FTE, MHS
SPEECH LANGUAGE PATHOLOGIST, 1.0 FTE, EXC/SH
PHY ED, 0.9 FTE, CS, MWTA, SH
SOCIAL STUDIES, 0.6 FTE, ELEARN MIDDLE SCHOOL
COMPUTER SCIENCE, 1.0 FTE, MHS
SPECIAL ED, 1.0 FTE, CS
SPECIAL ED, 1.0 FTE, CS
PRESCHOOL, 16-17 HRS/WK, MCEC
MATH, 1.0 FTE, MHS
GRADE 4, 1.0 FTE, EXC
DEAN OF STUDENTS, 1.0 FTE, MMW
ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL, 1.0 FTE, MME
MATH, 0.6 FTE, ELEARN MIDDLE SCHOOL
ECSE, 1.0 FTE, MCEC
SPANISH, 0.05 FTE, MME
SPANISH IMMERSION, 1.0 FTE, MMW
GRADE 5, 1.0 FTE, CS
GRADE 5, 1.0 FTE, ELEARN ELEMENTARY
SPEECH LANGUAGE PATHOLOGIST, 0.75 FTE, MME
SPANISH IMMERION LANG ARTS/SOCIAL STUDIES, 1.0 FTE, MMW
MEDIA SPECIALIST, 1.0 FTE, GR
GRADE 5, 1.0 FTE, SH
GRADE 5, 1.0 FTE, MWTA
MUSIC, 0.9 FTE, GR, MW, SH
GRADE 1 SPANISH IMMERSION, 1.0 FTE, GR
KINDERGARTEN, 1.0 FTE, MWTA
GRADE 1, 1.0 FTE, ELEARN ELEMENTARY
ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL, 1.0 FTE, EXC
NAVIGATOR 4/5, 1.0 FTE, EXC
MUSIC, 1.0 FTE, EXC
FI, EXC

| RESIGNATIONS |
| :--- |
| GARCIA, ANGELA |


| LEAVES | ASSIGNMENT | EFFECTIVE | REASON |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| APONTE TYMINSKI, REBEKAH | SPANISH, 1.0 FTE, MHS | 11/10/22-1/26/23 | CHILD REARING |
| COIL, HANNAH | NURSE, 1.0 FTE, MME | 11/11/22-3/3/23 | CHILD REARING |
| DOW, MARGARET | PHY ED, 0.3 FTE, ELEARN MS - REQUESTING 0.7 FTE LOA | 2022-23 | MEDICAL |
| HASKAMP, MELISSA | SOCIAL STUDIES, 1.0 FTE, MMW | 8/30/22-11/23/22 | CHILD REARING |
| HERMANN, OLIVIA | SPECIAL ED FACILITATOR, 1.0 FTE, MMW | 12/16/22-3/3/23 | CHILD REARING |
| JOHNSON, NICOLE | ELT/RTI, 0.44 FTE, MWTA - REQUESTING 0.56 FTE LOA | 2022-23 | PERSONAL |
| JUSTINAK, CARRIE | RTI/WILSON READING, 0.75 FTE, MWTA - REQUESTING 0.25 FTE LOA | 2022-23 | PT TRA PROGRAM |
| MCWHIRTER, CAITLIN | SCIENCE, 1.0 FTE, MHS | 11/26/22-3/30/23 | CHILD REARING |
| MILLER, CLARE | GRADE 5, 1.0 FTE, SH - REQUESTING 1.0 FTE LOA | 2022-23 | PERSONAL |
| MOLINA, ANNA | RSK, 1.0 FTE, CS | 1/25/23-4/21/23 | CHILD REARING |
| PETERSON, ALISON | SCIENCE, 0.8 FTE, MHS - REQUESTING 0.2 FTE LOA | 2022-23 | MEDICAL |
| PHILLIPS, HEATHER | FACS, 0.65 FTE, MMW | 10/4/22-10/25/22 | MEDICAL |
| THINGVOLD, KELSEY | LANG ARTS, 1.0 FTE, MME | 1/3/23-3/17/23 | CHILD REARING |


| STATUS CHANGES | CURRENT ASSIGNMENT | EFFECTIVE | CHANGE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ALEXANDER, SUSANNE | RESERVE TEACHER | 8/30/22-11/1/22 | SPECIAL ED LTS, 1.0 FTE, EXC |
| BAHR, NICHOLAS | COMPUTER SCIENCE, 1.0 FTE, MHS | 2022-23 | TECH ED/COMPUTER SCIENCE, 1.0 FTE, MHS |
| BAHR, NICHOLAS | TECH ED/COMPUTER SCIENCE, 1.0 FTE, MHS | 8/30/22-1/27/23 | ADD: TECH ED, 0.12 FTE, MHS (OVERAGE) |
| BOTTIGER, WENDI | GRADE 1, 1.0 FTE, ELEARN ELEM | 2022-23 | GRade 2, 1.0 FTE, ELEARN ELEM |
| BURFEIND, MITCH | TECH ED, 1.0 FTE, MHS | 2022-23 | ADD: TECHED, 0.12 FTE, MHS (OVERAGE) |
| BUTCHERT, AMY | SPECIAL ED, 0.9 FTE, SH | 9/6/22-6/9/23 | ADD: SPEC ED TEMP TEACHER, 0.1 FTE, SH |
| CHARTIER, MASON | CLASS D SPEC ED PARA, 6.5 HRS/DAY, MHS | 2022-23 | SPECIAL ED, 1.0 FTE, MHS |
| CRANDELL, KATHRYN | RESERVE TEACHER | 8/30/22-6/9/23 | TOSA: ELEM SPANISH IMM FLOAT TEACHER, 1.0 FTE, MWTA |
| dAVIS, COURTNEY | COUNSELOR, 0.5 FTE, SH | 2022-23 | COUNSELOR, 0.5 FTE, CS |
| donald, James | MATH, 1.0 FTE, MHS | 8/30/22-1/27/23 | ADD: MATH, 0.12 FTE, MHS (OVERAGE) |
| DOW, MARGARET | TEACHER ON 1.0 FTE LOA IN 2022-23 | 2022-23 | PHY ED, 0.3 FTE, ELEARN MIDDLE SCHOOL - 0.7 FTE LOA |
| DRYKE, JON | PHY ED, 0.78 FTE, GR/MMW/ELEARN | 2022-23 | PHY ED, 0.4 FTE, MMW |
| EBY, BRAD | TECH ED, 1.0 FTE, MHS | 2022-23 | ADD: TECH ED, 0.12 FTE , MHS (OVERAGE) |
| FARNUM, ELIZABETH | SPEECH LANGUAGHE PATHOLOGIST, 0.6 FTE, GR | 2022-23 | SPEECH LANGUAGE PATHOLOGIST, 0.75 FTE, GR/MCEC |
| GOMER, CONNOR GROTON, CHARLES | MATH, 1.0 FTE, MHS | 8/30/22-1/27/23 | ADD: MATH, 0.12 FTE, MHS (OVERAGE) |
| GROTON, CHARLES | KINDERGARTEN \& DIGITAL LRNG TOSA, 0.9 FTE, MWTA | 8/30/22-6/9/23 2022-23 | MEDIA: DIGITAL LRNG SPEC, 0.5 FTE, MWTA MEDIA: DIGITAL LRNG SPEC, 0.25 FTE, MWTA \& SH |
| HALVORSON, BRADLEY | INTERIM ASST PRINCIPAL, 1.0 FTE, MME, 11/8/21-6/30/22 | 2022-23 | ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL, 1.0 FTE, MME |
| HEALY, BRENNA | NURSE LTS, 20-30 HRS/WK, GR/DISTRICT, 2/10/22-6/10/22 | 8/222/22-11/4/22 | NURSE LTS, 40 HRS/WK, MHS |
| HESSBURG, JOSEPH | GRADE 5 TEACHER, 1.0 FTE, MWTA | $\begin{aligned} & 8 / 23 / 22-6 / 30 / 23 \\ & 8 / 30 / 22-6 / 9 / 23 \end{aligned}$ | INTERIM TONKA ONLINE PRGM ASST DIRECTOR, 0.4 FTE, DIST. GRADE 5 TEACHER, 0.6 FTE, MWTA |
| JOHNSON, NICOLE | ELT, 0.82 FTE, MWTA - 0.18 FTE LOA IN 2021-22 | 2022-23 | ELT/RT, 0.44 FTE, MWTA - 0.56 FTE LOA |
| JOHNSON, REBECCA J. | TOSA-SPANISH IMMERSION FLOAT, 1.0 FTE, DH | 2022-23 | KINDERGARTEN SPANISH IMMERSION, 1.0 FTE , DH |
| KITZMANN, DAVID | TECH ED, 1.0 FTE, MHS | 8/30/22-1/27/23 | ADD: TECH ED, 0.12 FTE, MHS (OVERAGE) |
| KNES, DALTON | DEAN OF STUDENTS, 1.0 FTE, MMW, 8/30/22-9/30/22 | 10/3/22-6/30/23 | INTERIM ASST PRINCIPAL, 1.0 FTE, MMW |
| LEE, LISA WELLS | CLASS D SPEC ED PARA, MHS ON LEAVE OF ABSENCE | 2022-23 | SPECIAL ED TEACHER, 1.0 FTE, SAIL |
| LOLICH, STEPHANIE | BUSINESS ED, 1.0 FTE, MHS | 2022-23 | ADD: VANTAGE LEAD, 0.2 FTE, VANTAGE (OVERAGE) |
| MCDONALD, KYLE | ART, 0.2 FTE, GR | 2022-23 | ART, 0.45 FTE, GR, MW, SH |
| MEJIA GALVEZ, ANDREA "STEFY" | RESERVE TEACHER | 2022-23 | GRADE 3 SPANISH IMMERSION, 1.0 FTE, MWTA |
| NELSON, KATHRYN | TEACHER ON FULL TIME LOA IN 2021-22 | 8/30/22-6/9/23 | SPANISH, 0.75 FTE, MME |
| OHRT, KATHERINE | MATH, 1.0 FTE, MHS | 8/30/22-1/27/23 | ADD: MATH, 0.12 FTE, MHS (OVERAGE) |
| PAUTLER, ANDREA | ART, 0.75 FTE, MMW | 2022-23 | ART, 0.8 FTE, MMW |
| PETERSON, ALISON | SCIENCE, 1.0 FTE, MHS | 2022-23 | SCIENCE, 0.8 FTE, MHS - 0.2 FTE LOA |
| PHILLIPS, HEATHER | FACS, 0.65 FTE, MMW | 9/1/22-6/9/23 | ADD: FACS, 0.2 FTE, ELEARN MS |
| RAISANEN, TARA REUSS PATRICIA | LANG ARTS, 1.0 FTE, MMW | 2022-23 | LANG ARTS/COUNSELOR, 1.0 FTE, ELEARN ELEM \& MS |
| REUSS, PATRICIA | GRADE 6/SCIENCE LTS, 0.6-1.0 FTE, MME, 11/1/21-6/13/22 SCIENCE 0.6 FTE MMW | ${ }^{2022-23}$ | SCIENCE, 0.6 FTE, MMW |
| REUSS, PATRICIA <br> RUEMMELE, KATHLEEN | SCIENCE, 0.6 FTE, MMW <br> SPEECH LANGUAGE PATHOLOGIST, 0.5 FTE, GR/SH | 8/30/22-6/9/23 2022-23 | ADD: SCIENCE, 0.4 FTE, MMW (TOTAL OF 1.0 FTE ASSGT) SPEECH LANGUAGE PATHOLOGIST, 0.6 FTE, CS/GR |
| SNEDDEN, NICOLE | TOSA-INNOVATION COORD, 1.0 FTE, DISTRICT | 2022-23 | ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL, 1.0 FTE , SH |
| STEPAN, JENNIFER | SPEECH LANGUAGE PATHOLOGIST, 1.0 FTE, MmW/SH | 2022-23 | SPEECH LANGUAGE PATHOLOGIST, 1.0 FTE, MMW/MHS |
| VON RUDEN, PAULINE | SCIENCE, 1.0 FTE, MHS | 2022-23 | ADD: SCIENCE, 0.12 FTE, ELEARN MS (OVERAGE) |
| WHITING, KATELYN | PRESCHOOL TEACHER, 23 HRS/WK, MCEC | 2022-23 | ADD: MEDIA: DIGITAL LRNG SPEC, 0.425 FTE, GR/MWTA |
| ZIEBARTH, COURTNEY ZIELINSKI, SIERRA | SCIENCE, 1.0 FTE, MMW PARA SUB | -2022-23 | SCIENCE, 1.0 FTE, MMW/ELEARN MS LANGUAGE ARTS, 1.0 FTE, MMW |

II. BUSINESS AND OTHER NON-INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES

| APPOINTMENTS | ASSIGNMENT | EFFECTIVE | SALARY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BARBIERI, NATALIA | EXPLORERS CLUB STUD ASST, HOURS VARY, EXC | 8/9/22 | \$13.00/HR |
| BARRIOS, AMBER | CLASS D SPEC ED PARA, 6.5 HRS/DAY, MHS | 8/31/22 | \$21.18/HR |
| BUTEYN, CAROL | CLASS D ECSE PARA, 17.5 HRS/WK, MCEC | 8/31/22 | \$21.18/HR |
| CARLSON, ABIGAIL | TECHNICAL SPECIALIST, 30 HRS/WK, DISTRICT | 8/8/22 | \$22.00/HR |
| FARNEY, ROBYN | TEMP LEVEL V HEAD OFFICE ASST, 8 HRS/DAY, EXC | 8/17/22-11/18/22 | \$25.60/HR |
| FEELEY, NICOLE | CLASS D SPEC ED \& BUS/TRAFFIC PARA, 6.25 HRS/DAY, MWTA | 8/31/22 | \$21.18/HR |
| GONZALEZ ARROYAVE, MARYORY | CLASS D SPEC ED PARA, 6.5 HRS/DAY, MMW | 8/31/22 | \$21.18/HR |
| HEISSERER, ALLISON | LEVEL III SCHOOL OFFICE ASST, 8 HRS/DAY, MWTA | 8/15/22 | \$23.39/HR |
| LAWSON, CLAIRE | EXPLORERS CLUB STUD ASST, HOURS VARY, MWTA | 8/3/22 | \$13.00/HR |
| LUNDTVEDT, AVE | EXPLORERS CLUB STUD ASST, HOURS VARY, SH | 7/26/22 | \$13.00/HR |
| MOYE, MIRACLE | EXPLORERS CLUB STUD ASST, 10 HRS/WK, CS | 8/29/22 | \$13.00/HR |
| PRATS HUMBERT, MARTA | CLASS C SPANISH IMM KINDER PARA, 3 HRS/DAY, MWTA | 8/31/22 | \$20.93/HR |
| QUINN, MADELINE | CLASS D SPEC ED \& BUS/TRAFFIC PARA, 6 HRS 55 MIN/DAY, MWTA | 8/31/22 | \$21.18/HR |


| RESIGNATIONS | ASSIGNMENT | EFFECTIVE | REASON |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BAEB, JULIE | CLASS C ADVANCED LRNG PARA-PROJECT THINK, 14 HRS/WK, CS/SH | 7/29/22 | RESIGNATION |
| CONLEY, KEELAN | CLASS D SPEC ED PARA, 6.5 HRS/DAY, MME | 8/10/22 | RESIGNATION |
| GODFREY, LAURANNA | CLASS C ADVANCED LRNG PARA-PROJECT THINK, 14 HRS/WK, GR/MWTA | 7/28/22 | RESIGNATION |
| HEINS, MICHELLE | CLASS A LR/PG PARA, 6.5 HRS/WK, MWTA | 8/10/22 | RESIGNATION |
| JELLE, DIANE | LEVEL III GUIDANCE OFFICE ASST, 8 HRS/DAY, MME | 9/9/22 | RETIREMENT |
| LALAND, PAMELA | COOK HELPER, 4 HRS/DAY, GR | 8/15/22 | RESIGNATION |
| PAN, LIHUA | CLASS C CHINESE IMM CLRM PARA, 6.5 HRS/DAY, SH | 8/18/22 | RESIGNATION |
| RAMIREZ, LETICIA | RECREATIONAL PROGRAMS COORD, 1.0 FTE, AQUATICS | 9/30/22 | RESIGNATION |
| RIEBE, KATHRYN | CLASS B MTKA PRESCHOOL PARA, 13 HRS/WK, MCEC | 8/13/22 | RESIGNATION |
| SAKULPHAPTONG, RAPEEPONG | CLASS A LR/PG PARA, 3 HRS, 20 MIN/DAY, CS CLASS D SPEC ED \& BUS/TRAFFIC PARA, 3 HRS, 40 MIN/DAY, CS | 8/3/22 | RESIGNATION |
| SCHULENBERG, CATHRYN | CLASS D SPEC ED PARA, 6.5 HRS/DAY, MHS | 7/28/22 | RESIGNATION |
| STUDENSKI, ELIZABETH | CLASS A LR/PG PARA, 2 HRS/DAY, SH CLASS D SPEC ED \& BUS/TRAFFIC PARA, 4 HRS 50 MIN/DAY, SH | 8/18/22 | RESIGNATION |
| THORNHILL, MARLEY | CLASS A LR/PG PARA, 3 HRS/DAY, DH | 8/7/22 | RESIGNATION |
| TOLKINEN, TIFFENNIE | CLASS D SPEC ED \& BUS/TRAFFIC PARA, 6 HRS 20 MIN/DAY, GR | 8/16/22 | RESIGNATION |
| TOTIN, HEATHER | CLASS C ADVANCED LEARNING PARA-INDEPENDENT INVESTIG, 9 HRS/WK, CS | 8/5/22 | RESIGNATION |
| WOLLMAN, SHELLY | CLASS D SPEC ED PARA, 6.5 HRS/DAY, SH | 8/11/22 | RETIREMENT |
| WYATT, JULIE | EXPLORERS CLUB BEHAVIOR ASST, 38-40 HRS/WK, MCEC | 8/30/22 | RESIGNATION |


| LEAVES | ASSIGNMENT | EFFECTIVE | REASON |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BION, KATHLEEN | CLASS D SPEC ED PARA, 6.5 HRS/DAY, SH | 2022-23 | PERSONAL |
| NATHE, KEITH | CUSTODIAN, 8 HRS/DAY, MHS | 8/8/22-8/31/22 | PERSONAL |
| NEWBERG, SUSAN | CLASS D SPEC ED PARA, 6.5 HRS/DAY, ELEARNING | 2022-23 | PERSONAL |
| RODGERS, PAMELA | CLASS C CLRM PARA, 7 HRS/DAY, MWTA | 2022-23 | PERSONAL |


| STATUS CHANGES | CURRENT ASSIGNMENT | EFFECTIVE | CHANGE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ALLANSON, TRACY | CLASS D MEDIA PARA, 4 HRS/DAY, GR | 2022-23 | CLASS D MEDIA PARA, 5.5 HRS/DAY, GR |
| ALTIERI, MERRI | CLASS D MEDIA PARA, 4 HRS/DAY, MWTA <br> LEVEL III SCHOOL OFFICE ASST, 2 HRS/DAY, MWTA | 2022-23 | ADD: CLASS D SPEC ED PARA, 2 HRS/DAY, MWTA |
| ANDERSON, MARY J. | COOK, 5.5 HRS/DAY, MMW | 2022-23 | COOK, 6 HRS/DAY, MMW |
| BAKER, HEATHER | CLASS C ADVANCED LEARNING PARA: INDEP INVEST. \& PROJECT THINK, 21 HRS/WK, EXC | 2022-23 | ADD: CLASS C ADVANCE LEARNING PARA: PROJECT THINK, 7 HRS/WK, SH |
| BRANDT, PATRICIA | COOK HELPER, 7 HRS/DAY, SH | 2022-23 | CLASS B HALL PARA, 7.25 HRS/DAY, MHS |
| BROWN, MEGAN | RESERVE TEACHER | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 8/31/22- } \\ & \text { 12/16/22 } \end{aligned}$ | CLASS C NAVIGATOR PARA, 4 HRS/DAY, EXC |
| CARUTH, BETH | PARA SUB | 2022-23 | CLASS D SPEC ED PARA, 6.5 HRS/DAY, CS |
| CODY, DIANE | LEVEL III COOK MGR, 7.5 HRS/DAY, SH | 2022-23 | LEVEL I COOK HELPER, 6 HRS/DAY, SH |
| COLEMAN, BEN | EXPLORERS CLUB PRGM ASST, 20 HRS/WK, MWTA | 2022-23 | CLASS D SPEC ED \& BUS/TRAFFIC PARA, 6 HRS 55 MIN/DAY, MWTA |
| DANIELSON, DAWN | PARA SUB | 2022-23 | CLASS D SPEC ED PARA, 5 HRS/DAY, MMW |
| DOMMER, MEREDITH | CLASS D SPEC ED PARA, ELEARNING IN 21-22 | 2022-23 | CLASS D SPEC ED PARA, 6.5 HRS/DAY, MMW |
| ESCH, SARAH | CLASS D SPEC ED PARA, 3 HRS 35 MIN/DAY, SH CLASS A LR/PG PARA, 2 HRS 25 MIN/DAY, SH | 2022-23 | CLASS B MTKA PRESCHOOL PARA, 13 HRS/WK, MCEC |
| EVERETT, JACELYN | PARA SUB | 2022-23 | CLASS D SPEC ED \& BUS/TRAFFIC PARA, 6 HRS 25 MIN/DAY, MWTA |
| GRANGER, KATHERINE | PARA SUB | 2022-23 | CLASS D SPEC ED PARA, 4.5 HRS/DAY, MMW |
| HACKER, GAY | CLASS A LR/PG PARA, 4.5 HRS/DAY, EXC | 2022-23 | CLASS A LR/PG PARA, 3 HRS/DAY, EXC CLASS D SPEC ED PARA, 3.5 HR/SDAY, EXC |
| HASZ, MALLORY | PARA SUB | 2022-23 | CLASS D ECSE PARA, 15.5 HRS/WK, MCEC |
| HERMANSEN, MARY | COOK HELPER, 4 HRS/DAY, CS | 2022-23 | COOK HELPER, 6 HRS/DAY, CS |
| HOLLAND, LUCIE | CLASS D SPEC ED PARA, 4 HRS/DAY, CS | 2022-23 | CLASS D SPEC ED PARA, 6 HRS/DAY, CS |
| HOUSE, MEGHAN | CLASS E HEALTH PARA, 35 HRS/WK, MMW | 2022-23 | CLASS E HEALTH PARA, 28 HRS/WK, MMW |
| JOHNSON, GERRY | CLASS D SPEC ED PARA, ELEARNING IN 21-22 | 2022-23 | CLASS D SPEC ED PARA, 6.5 HRS/DAY, EXC |
| KELLY, JENNIFER | PARA SUB | 2022-23 | CLASS D ECSE PARA, 14.5 HRS/WK, MCEC |
| KOSKI, SHARLA | COOK HELPER, 4 HRS/DAY, MHS | 2022-23 | COOK HELPER, 6 HRS/DAY, GR |

LABOUCHERE, NORMA ELIZABETH LEGG, WENDY
LENZ, CYNTHIA
LEVITON, SARAH
LOSCHEIDER, CHRISTENA
MAAS, KARIN
MAXWELL, ALLISON
MILLER, CLARE
MORSCHING, EMILY NELSON, VALERIE NEWBERG, SUSAN NORTHWAY, RENEE NOYES, MELISSA O'CALLAGHAN-COLE, DENISE OLSON, ROBYN POTAS, ANGELA RASCHKE, SONJA RIVERA LEON, MARILUZ

RUFF, MARK
SARCIA, GABRIELLE
SCHULTZ, WENDY SO, TUNG LING "BONNIE" SPENCER, LORI SUNDAL, AMBER SWEDENBORG, KRISTA
TEARLE, JUNE
TORNES, ALYSSA
VEGA MAYERLE, MELISSA
WEFRING, DANIELLE
WEIMAN, NOLAN
WENHAM, ROBYN

CLASS C SPANISH IMM KINDER PARA, 4.5 HRS/DAY, GR CLASS D SPEC ED PARA, 1.5 HRS/DAY, GR

2022-23
LEVEL I COOK HELPER, 6 HRS/DAY, SH
LEVEL IV ACCOUNTS PAYABLE OFFICE ASST, 8 HRS/DAY, DSC CLASS C SPANISH IMM KINDER PARA, 6.5 HRS/DAY, CS RESERVE TEACHER
UNPAID LEAVE OF ABSENCE FROM PARA ROLL 2021-22 SWIM CLUB ASST COACH, HOURS VARY, AQUATICS
TEACHER ON FULL TIME LEAVE OF ABSENCE IN 2022-23
CLASS B HALL PARA, 4 HRS/DAY, MHS
COOK MGR, 7.5 HRS/DAY, EXC
CLASS D SPEC ED PARA, ELEARNING IN 21-22
CLASS D SPEC ED PARA, ELEARNING IN 21-22
PARA SUB
CLASS A LR/PG PARA, 3 HRS/DAY, EXC
EXPLORERS CLUB PRGM LEAD, 7 HRS/DAY, GR
CLASS C KINDER PARA, 15 HRS/WK, GR
CLASS D SPEC ED PARA, 6.5 HRS/DAY, MMW
UNPAID LEAVE OF ABSENCE IN 2021-22
CLASS A LR/PG PARA, 3.25 HRS/DAY, MWTA
LEVEL III SCHOOL OFFICE ASST, 10 HRS/WK, MWTA
PARA SUB
COOK, 5.5 HRS/DAY, MME
CLASS C CHINESE IMM KINDER PARA, 3 HRS/DAY, EXC CLASS D MEDIA PARA, 7 HRS/DAY, GR
MCE MARKETING SPECIALIST, 8 HRS/DAY, MCEC
UNPAID LEAVE OF ABSENCE FROM PARA ROLL 2021-22
CLASS B ECFE/MTKA PRESCHOOL PARA, 20.5 HRS/WK, MCEC
CLASS E HEALTH PARA, 22.5 HRS/WK, GR
CLASS C SPANISH IMM KINDER PARA, 4.5 HRS/DAY, GR CLASS D SPEC ED PARA, 1.5 HRS/DAY, GR
LEAD GROUP COACH, 25 HRS/WK, AQUATICS
CLASS B SUPERVISORY PARA, 7.5 HRS/DAY, MMW
PARA SUB

LEVEL IV ACCOUNTS PAYABLE CLERK, 8 HRS/DAY, DSC
LEVEL III COOK MGR, 7.5 HRS/DAY, SH
LEVEL IV STUDENT ACCT/TONKA ONLINE OFFICE ASST, 8 HRS/DAY, DSC
CLASS C SPANISH IMM KINDER PARA, 3.5 HRS/DAY, CS CLASS D SPEC ED \& BUS/TRAFFIC PARA, 6 HRS 55 MIN/DAY, MWTA
CLASS C CLRM PARA, 6 HRS/DAY, MWTA
LEAD GROUP COACH, 1.0 FTE, AQUATICS
CLASS C ADV LRNG PARA: INDEP INVEST, 14 HRS/WK, GR CLASS C ADV LRNG PARA: PROJECT THINK, 7 HRS/WK, GR CLASS A LR/PG PARA, 3 HRS/DAY, CS
CLASS D SPEC ED PARA, 6.5 HRS/DAY, EXC
CLASS D SPEC ED PARA, 6.5 HRS/DAY, MWTA
CLASS D SPEC ED PARA, 6.5 HRS/DAY, MME
CLASS B MTKA PRESCHOOL PARA, 13 HRS/WK, MCEC
CLASS A LR/PG PARA, 2 HRS/DAY, EXC
CLASS C NAVIGATOR PARA, 4 HRS/DAY, EXC
CLASS D SPEC ED PARA, 6.5 HRS/DAY, CS
CLASS C ADVANCE LEARNING PARA: INDEP INVESTIG, 14 HRS/WK, DH
CLASS D SPEC ED PARA, 6.5 HRS/DAY, MHS
CLASS C SPANISH IMM KINDER PARA, 3 HRS/DAY, CS CLASS D SPEC ED PARA, 3.5 HRS/DAY, CS
STAFFING SPECIALIST, 1.0 FTE, DSC
CLASS C EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS COACH PARA, 10 HRS/WK, MWTA
COOK, 6 HRS/DAY, MME
CLASS C CHINESE IMM KINDER PARA, 6 HRS/DAY, EXC CLASS D MEDIA PARA, 8 HRS/DAY, GR
ADULT \& YOUTH PRGM MGR, 1.0 FTE, MCEC
CLASS C KINDER PARA, 3 HRS/DAY, MWTA
CLASS B ECFE/MTKA PRESCHOOL PARA, 20.5 HRS/WK, MCEC CLASS D ECSE PARA, 9.75 HRS/WK, MCEC
CLASS E HEALTH PARA, 7 HRS/WK, MMW
CLASS C SPANISH IMM KINDER PARA, 4.5 HRS/DAY, GR
LEAD GROUP COACH, 1.0 FTE, AQUATICS
CLASS B HALL PARA, 7.5 HRS/DAY, MHS
CLASS A LRIPG PARA, 3 HRS/DAY, DH
III. IN-DISTRICT APPOINTMENTS

| APPOINTMENT | ASSIGNMENT | BUILDING | EFFECTIVE | SALARY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ANDRUSKIEWICZ, TONYA | GIRLS CROSS COUNTRY RUN ASST COACH | MHS | 8/15/22-11/5/22 | \$2,414.40 |
| BARNISKIS, CHARLES | BOYS SOCCER ASST COACH | MHS | 8/15/22-11/4/22 | \$4,612 |
| BRADLEY, JOHN | GIRLS SWIM AND DIVE HEAD COACH | MHS | 8/15/22-11/18/22 | \$6,642 |
| COHEN, JESSICA | PERFORMANCE DANCE ASST COACH | MHS | 8/15/22-10/14/22 | \$2,000 |
| DADASHEV, DENNIS | GIRLS SWIM AND DIVE ASST COACH | MHS | 8/15/22-11/18/22 | \$4,612 |
| DESCHEPPER, SYDNEY | ELEM CHEER COACH | MCEC | 9/13/22 | \$1,600 |
| FRANK, CARLEY | PERFORMANCE DANCE ASST COACH | MHS | 8/15/22-10/14/22 | \$2,000 |
| GEHRMANN, KRISTINE | GIRLS CROSS COUNTRY RUN ASST COACH | MHS | 8/15/22-11/5/22 | \$2,485.80 |
| GROUX, ALEXIS | GIRLS SOCCER ASST COACH | MHS | 8/15/22-11/4/22 | \$4,612 |
| HANS, KELSEY | GIRLS SOCCER HEAD COACH | MHS | 8/15/22-11/4/22 | \$6,642 |
| JOHNSON, ALEX | BOYS SOCCER ASST COACH | MHS | 8/15/22-11/4/22 | \$4,848 |
| KRENIK, LAURA | GIRLS TENNIS ASST COACH | MHS | 8/15/22-10/28/22 | \$4,143 |
| LARSON, KRISTA | GIRLS CROSS COUNTRY RUN ASST COACH | MHS | 8/15/22-11/5/22 | \$4,143 |
| LABLANC, LEEANN | GIRLS CROSS COUNTRY RUN ASST COACH | MHS | 8/15/22-11/5/22 | \$4,024 |

LEWIS, KELLY MOON, TAYLOR MULVANEY, JOHN NEWVILLE, IAN OLINGER, MADELYN PEARCE, RICHARD PEARS, CHRIS POWERS, JENNA REIMER-MORGAN, JANE RENLUND, JEFF ROGERS, MIKE SAMSAL, NICK SCHULTZ, WES STANCZYK, ELIZABETH STEUBER, KIRSTEN STORLIE, SCOTT SWEENEY, JONATHAN SYMMS, KEVIN VENNES, STEPHANIE VERCRUYSSE, KELSEY
WARD, KAYLA
WHEATON, DAN
WHEATON, MARK
2022-23 DEPARTMENT CHAIRS:
AIKEN, AMANDA
BAKKE, JOSH
BARRY, MELINDA
BECKER, MEGHAN
BIERLY, DAVE
BUISMAN, KERI
BURFEIND, MITCH
CHOPITE, MARIA
COSSETTE, JOE CUSHING, JORDAN CUTSHALL, SUZANNE
DONALD, JIM
FISHER, KELLY HASKAMP, MELISSA JOHNSEN, LAUREN JOHNSON, LAURAL KENEALY-BREDICE, MARY KOTTOM, ERIK KUKOWSKI, JOSHUA LEWIS, KELLY MCGLASSON, CYNTHIA MCWHIRTER, CAITLIN MENKE, JENA MOSIMAN, KELLY NELSON, JESSE OHRT, KATE

CROSS COUNTRY RUN HEAD COACH WEIGHT ROOM ASST SUPVR
BOYS CROSS COUNTRY RUN ASST COACH
BOYS SOCCER ASST COACH
MCE TENNIS ASST COACH
MEN OF COLOR ADVISOR
BOYS SOCCER ASST COACH
GIRLS SOCCER ASST COACH
GIRLS CROSS COUNTRY RUN HEAD COACH
BOYS CROSS COUNTRY RUN HEAD COACH
BOYS SOCCER HEAD COACH
BOYS SOCCER ASST COACH
GIRLS SWIM AND DIVE ASST COACH
GIRLS TENNIS ASST COACH
MCE VOLLEYBALL COACH
GIRLS SOCCER ASST COACH
BOYS CROSS COUNTRY RUN ASST COACH
GIRLS SOCCER ASST COACH
GIRLS SWIM AND DIVE ASST COACH
PERFORMANCE DANCE HEAD COACH
CI ADAPTED SOFTBALL HEAD COACH
BOYS TENNIS ASST COACH
BOYS TENNIS ASST COACH

9-12 SOCIAL STUDIES: OPERATIONAL
6-12 PHY ED
K-12 MEDIA/TECHNOLOGY
6-8 SPECIAL ED
6-12 COUNSELOR
K-5 ELEMENTARY ELT
6-12 TECH ED
K-8 SPANISH IMMERSION
9-12 SCIENCE: OPERATIONAL
9-12 LANG ARTS: OPERATIONAL
K-5 SCIENCE
9-12 MATH: OPERATIONAL
K-5 READING/BASIC SKILLS
6-8 SOCIAL STUDIES
ECFE/ECSE
9-12 SPECIAL ED: OPERATIONAL
K-5 HIGH POTENTIAL
9-12 SOCIAL STUDIES: INSTRUCTIONAL
6-8 SOCIAL STUDIES
6-8 MATH
6-8 MATH
9-12 SCIENCE: INSTRUCTIONAL
6-12 VOCAL MUSIC
9-12 LANG ARTS: INSTRUCTIONAL
6-12 PHY ED
9-12 MATH: INSTRUCTIONAL

| MMW | 8/15/22-10/27/22 | \$5,238 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PAGEL | 8/29/22-11/14/22 | \$4,000 |
| MHS | 8/15/22-11/5/22 | \$3,907 |
| MHS | 8/15/22-11/4/22 | \$4,848 |
| MCEC | 7/28/22 | \$13.30/HR |
| MMW | 2/18/22-6/10/22 | \$1,847 |
| MHS | 8/15/22-11/4/22 | \$4,848 |
| MHS | 8/15/22-11/4/22 | \$4,612 |
| MHS | 8/15/22-11/5/22 | \$5,662 |
| MHS | 8/15/22-11/5/22 | \$5,662 |
| MHS | 8/15/22-11/4/22 | \$6,642 |
| MHS | 8/15/22-11/4/22 | \$4,848 |
| MHS | 8/15/22-11/18/22 | \$4,612 |
| MHS | 8/15/22-10/28/22 | \$3,907 |
| MCEC | 8/8/22 | \$22.00/HR |
| MHS | 8/15/22-11/4/22 | \$4,848 |
| MHS | 8/15/22-11/5/22 | \$3,907 |
| MHS | 8/15/22-11/4/22 | \$4,612 |
| MHS | 8/15/22-11/18/22 | \$4,848 |
| MHS | 8/15/22-10/14/22 | \$2,762 |
| MHS | 3/7/22-6/4/22 | \$2,975 |
| MHS | 3/28/22-6/10/22 | \$3,810 |
| MHS | 3/28/22-6/10/22 | \$1,500 |
| MHS |  | \$4,746 |
| MME |  | \$1,780 |
| SH |  | \$2,373 |
| MMW |  | \$4,034 |
| MHS |  | \$3,560 |
| GR |  | \$3,560 |
| MHS |  | \$3,560 |
| MWTA |  | \$4,746 |
| MHS |  | \$4,746 |
| MHS |  | \$4,746 |
| GR |  | \$4,746 |
| MHS |  | \$4,746 |
| EXC |  | \$4,746 |
| MMW |  | \$3,560 |
| MCEC |  | \$3,560 |
| MHS |  | \$4,746 |
| SH |  | \$4,746 |
| MHS |  | \$4,746 |
| MME |  | \$3,560 |
| MMW |  | \$3,560 |
| MME |  | \$3,560 |
| MHS |  | \$4,746 |
| MMW |  | \$3,560 |
| MHS |  | \$4,746 |
| MMW |  | \$1,780 |
| MHS |  | \$4,746 |

PAUTZ, JILL
PETERS, JENNIFER
ROELS, RENEE SCHREDER, KATELYN SMITH, KIMBERLY SUZREZ, CAROLYN SUN, YI
SYVERSON, JEN UNGERMAN, HANNAH WHITESIDE, KELL WILDER, MANDIE YOUNG, SARAH

| 6-8 LANG ARTS | MME |
| :--- | :--- |
| K-5 LANG ARTS | DH |
| 6-8 ART | MME |
| 6-8 LANG ARTS | MMW |
| 6-12 READING/BASIC SKILLS | MME |
| K-5 SOCIAL STUDIES | MWTA |
| K-8 CHINESE IMMERSION | EXC |
| 6-8 HEALTH | MMW |
| 9-12 SPECIAL ED: INSTRUCTIONAL | MHS |
| K-12 MEDIA/TECHNOLOGY | DH |
| 6-12 FACS | MHS |

9-12 SPECIAL ED: INSTRUCTIONAL

# School Board <br> Minnetonka ISD \#276 <br> 5621 County Road 101 <br> Minnetonka, Minnesota 

Board Agenda Item IX. e

## Title: Gifts and Donations

Date: September 1, 2022

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

In accordance with Minnetonka School District Policy \#706, the Minnetonka School District encourages gifts and donations to enhance quality education to both students and residents. The School Board makes the final determination on the acceptability of a gift or donation. All gifts and donations become District No. 276 property under the complete authority of the Minnetonka School Board.

RECOMMENDATION: That the School Board accepts the following donations to be placed in the Groveland Elementary Outdoor Classroom Fund:

Groveland PTO \$36,195.98

RECOMMENDATION: That the School Board accepts the following donations to be placed in the Minnetonka High School Principal Discretionary Fund:

The Blackbaud Giving Fund
$\$ 330.00$
RECOMMENDATION: That the School Board accepts the following donation to be placed in the Minnetonka School District General Fund:
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { The Blackbaud Giving Fund } & \$ 52.00 \\ \text { The Benevity Community Fund } & \$ 80.30\end{array}$
RECOMMENDATION: That the School Board accepts the following donation to be placed in the Boys Lacrosse Assistant Coaches Stipend Fund:

Skippers Fastbreak Club
\$21.936.00
RECOMMENDATION: That the School Board accepts the following donation to be placed in the Minnetonka High School South Upper Turf Fund:

Tonka United Soccer Association
\$5,000.00
RECOMMENDATION: That the School Board accepts the following donation to be placed in the Minnetonka High School Girls Tennis Fund:

Catalin \& Maria-Isabella Constantin $\quad \$ 1,500.00$
TOTAL GIFTS AND DONATIONS FOR 2022-2023*
$=\$ 307,564.12$
*Total amount reflects gifts \& donations submitted for board approval in 2022-2023.

Submitted by:


Paul Bourgeois, Executive Director of Finance \& Operations

## CONSENT

> School Board Minnetonka I.S.D. \#276
> 5621 County Road 101
> Minnetonka, Minnesota

## Board Agenda Item IX. f

Title: Electronic Fund Transfers
Date: September 1, 2022

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Minnesota Statute 471.38 requires that a list of electronic fund transfers be submitted to the School Board each month for approval.

## RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the School Board approve the attached automatic withdrawals and investments from the General Fund for July 2022.

Submitted by:


| JULY 2022 FROM GENERAL FUND |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DATE | PAYEE |  |  | AMOUNT |
| 7/1/2022 | AP Payment |  |  | 1,038.99 |
| 7/5/2022 | Further - Flex |  |  | 6,006.79 |
| 7/5/2022 | Claims HealthPartners |  |  | 104,168.12 |
| 7/5/2022 | Delta Dental |  |  | 29,924.79 |
| 7/5/2022 | HealthPartners Premium |  |  | 75,182.97 |
| 7/8/2022 | AP Payment |  |  | 1,056,298.12 |
| 7/11/2022 | Payroll |  |  | 2,038,802.15 |
| 7/11/2022 | Further - Flex |  |  | 4,612.46 |
| 7/11/2022 | Claims HealthPartners |  |  | 196,616.39 |
| 7/11/2022 | Delta Dental |  |  | 35,128.98 |
| 7/13/2022 | HealthPartners Premium |  |  | 74,543.10 |
| 7/15/2022 | Solutran - Wellness Program |  |  | 4,196.82 |
| 7/15/2022 | AP Payment |  |  | 221,019.29 |
| 7/18/2022 | Further - Flex |  |  | 4,299.24 |
| 7/18/2022 | Claims HealthPartners |  |  | 335,886.45 |
| 7/18/2022 | Delta Dental |  |  | 23,719.95 |
| 7/20/2022 | Wex |  |  | 2,149.40 |
| 7/21/2022 | Delta Dental Premium |  |  | 6,638.50 |
| 7/21/2022 | Deluxe Business Systems |  |  | 98.07 |
| 7/22/2022 | AP Payment |  |  | 352,820.25 |
| 7/25/2022 | Payroll |  |  | 1,805,155.77 |
| 7/25/2022 | Delta Dental |  |  | 24,551.23 |
| 7/25/2022 | Further - Flex |  |  | 433.94 |
| 7/25/2022 | Claims HealthPartners |  |  | 281,291.10 |
| 7/26/2022 | Wex |  |  | 2,796.55 |
| 7/28/2022 | Wex |  |  | 2,967.73 |
| 7/29/2022 | AP Payment |  |  | 182,749.38 |
| JULY | Postage Fees |  |  | 5,904.00 |
| JULY | Art Center CC Processing Fees |  |  | 50.26 |
| JULY | MCEC Credit Card Processing Fees |  |  | 21,433.77 |
| JULY | Mtka Webstore CC Processing Fees |  |  | 11,465.08 |
| JULY | Athletic CC Processing Fees |  |  | 1,444.82 |
| JULY | Bank Monthly Service Charge |  |  | 1,422.63 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | \$ 6,914,817.09 |
| JULY |  |  |  |  |
| INVESTMENT |  | MATURITY | INTEREST | ENDING |
| DESCRIPTION | BANK | DATE | RATE | BALANCE |
| Money Market | Alerus Bank ICS Savings | NA | 0.22\% | 10,733,967.47 |
| Money Market | MSDLAF+ Liquid Class | NA | 0.23\% | 162.75 |
| Money Market | MSDLAF+MAX Class | NA | 0.35\% | 0.01 |
| Term | MSDLAF | NA | Var | 39,848,797.48 |
| CD | MSDLAF | NA | 0.25\% | - |
| Money Market | PMA IS | NA | 1.38\% | 18,158,986.62 |
| Term | PMA MN Trust Term Series | NA | 0.00\% | - |
| Municipal Bonds | Northland Securities | NA | 0.00\% | 624,631.29 |
| Various | Wells Fargo OPEB | NA | Var | 16,053,655.52 |
|  |  |  |  | \$ $85,420,201.14$ |

# School Board <br> Minnetonka I.S.D. \# 276 <br> 5621 County Road 101 <br> Minnetonka, Minnesota <br> Board Agenda Item IX. g 

Title: Approval of Agreement with Paraprofessionals
Date: September 1, 2022

## CONTEXT/BACKGROUND:

District representatives and the Minnesota School Employees Association (paraprofessionals) met and negotiated on the terms and conditions of employment for the 2022-2024 collective bargaining agreement. Paraprofessionals will vote on the parameters of the contract on August 31, 2022. The final agreement, assuming employee ratification, will be a carry-in document at the Board Meeting on September 1, 2022.

## RECOMMENDATION/FUTURE DIRECTION:

That the School Board approve the collective bargaining agreement between the Minnetonka Public Schools and the Minnesota School Employees Association (paraprofessional) for the period of July 1, 2020, through June 30, 2022.

Submitted by:


Concurrence:


David Law, Superintendent

# School Board <br> Minnetonka I.S.D. \# 276 <br> 5621 County Road 101 <br> Minnetonka, Minnesota 

Board Agenda Item IX. h

## Title: Approval of Agreement with Nutrition Services Employees

Date: September 1, 2022

## CONTEXT/BACKGROUND:

District representatives and the School Services Employees Local 284 (Nutrition Services) representatives met and negotiated on the terms and conditions of employment for the 2022-2024 collective bargaining agreement. Nutrition Services employees will vote on the parameters of the contract on Wednesday, August 29, 2022. The final agreement, assuming employee ratification, will be a carry-in document at the Board Meeting on September 1, 2022.

## RECOMMENDATION/FUTURE DIRECTION:

That the School Board approve the collective bargaining agreement between the Minnetonka Public Schools and the Nutrition Services employees for the period of July 1, 2022, through June 30, 2024.

Submitted by:


Michael Cyrus, Executive Director of Human Resources

Concurrence:


David Law, Superintendent


[^0]:    GUIDELINES FOR COMMUNITY COMMENTS
    Welcome to the Minnetonka Schools Board Meeting! In the interest of open communications, the Minnetonka School District wishes to provide an opportunity for the public to address the School Board. That opportunity is provided at every regular School Board meeting during Community Comments.

    1. Anyone indicating a desire to speak to an item included in this agenda-except for information that personally identifies or violates the privacy rights of employees or students-during Community Comments will be acknowledged by the Board Chair. When called upon to speak, please state your name, address and topic. All remarks shall be addressed to the Board as a whole, not to any specific member(s) or to any person who is not a member of the Board.
    2. If there are a number of individuals present to speak on the same topic, please designate a spokesperson that can summarize the issue.
    3. Please limit your comments to three minutes. Longer time may be granted at the discretion of the Board Chair. If you have written comments, the Board would like to have a copy, which will help them better understand, investigate and respond to your concern.
    4. During Community Comments the Board and administration listen to comments. Board members or the Superintendent may ask questions of you in order to gain a thorough understanding of your concern, suggestion or request. If there is any follow-up to your comment or suggestion, you will be contacted by a member of the Board or administration.
    5. Please be aware that disrespectful comments or comments of a personal nature, directed at an individual either by name or inference, will not be allowed. Personnel concerns should be directed first to a principal, then to the Executive Director of Human Resources, then to the Superintendent and finally in writing to the Board.
[^1]:    * Pre-ACT instead of PLAN

[^2]:    David Law, Superintendent

