

Milford Board of Education Committee of the Whole Meeting September 27, 2010

Board members present:

David Amendola
Tracy Casey
Suzanne DiBiase
Josip Jukic
Diane Kruger-Carroll
Jack O'Connell
Greg Oliver
Jay Tranquilli
Mark Stapleton
Robert White

Administration present:

Michael Cummings
Susan Kelleher
Wendy Kopazna

I. CALL TO ORDER

The Milford Board of Education held a Committee of the Whole meeting on Monday, September 27, 2010, in the Board Room at the Parsons Complex. Chairman Stapleton called the meeting to order at 7:35 p.m. with the reciting of the Pledge of Allegiance immediately following.

II. DISTRICT STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA REPORT:

Mr. Cummings navigated a presentation that contained the states assessment results, comparative data and the district's action plan. (See the attached presentation.) He then explained the five levels of performance. They are below basic, basic, proficient, goal and advanced goal. While the state requires that the district's students be at the proficient level, the district's goal is to be at "goal." The state has grouped districts in DRG's for the purpose of comparisons. The DRG is categorized by the family income, demographics, size of the students etc.

Mr. Cummings then told the board the CMT and CAPT test are seven months old by the time they release the results. The tests are a helpful for long term planning. He then told the board that there is an alignment gap between the curriculum and the state exam materials.

Mr. Amendola asked if Milford had a higher amount of special education students than other districts.

Mr. O'Connell would like to see a demographic comparison. He also asked how the high school rating system is calculated in relation to other schools. Is it apples to apples?

Mr. Cummings then told the board the district's goals are to have 5% of each grade level, per subject area, advance one performance level on the CMT and CAPT. Special education students would advance by 10%. He then said that the Theory of Action is not new. However, a monitoring system has been added. The common core comes from the "No Child Left Behind."

III. PUBLIC COMMENT

Cathy Berni – 96 Centennial Drive – We need to get kids ready for the future. She will be curious to see the impact of the Response to Intervention (RTI) system. Every kid is entitled to a free and good education. The mandates came about because it wasn't being done right.

Mike Taylor – 340 Wolf Harbor Road – The superintendent's goals are tied to common goals. What curriculum are they using? Why can't we use the same? Proficiency is what we set our goals to be. Why not set our bar higher? There are ways around it. It is the board's job to set those goals. How many AP classes are offered? Are you prepared as a board to make it happen?

DRAFT

You cannot support education without supporting every child. Milford should refrain from criticizing scores. An increased amount of students have learning disabilities. It is not just a special education issue.

Mr. Simoncek – Governor’s Way – He said that he personally does everything he can to educate his children. He tries to prepare them for tests. The parent’s need to be held accountable too. It should be a team effort. He then asked where the new parking lot at Orange Avenue School will be installed.

Susan Reed – Ms. Reed would like to know when parents will receive the CMT scores.

Mr. Cummings explained that the information will be sent within two weeks. The administration has been working on a common narrative.

V. ACTION

Mr. White made a motion to approve the 2011-2014 Milford Education Association contract. Mr. Amendola seconded.

Mr. O’Connell said that he believes the contract will serve the students, teachers and parents well. He thanked the bargaining team. He said at all times the dialog was polite and professional. This is the first time in 20 years that the contract did not go to arbitration. He then thanked management team which consisted of Mr. Dugas, Mr. Cummings, Mr. Russell and Mrs. Kopazna.

Motion passed unanimously.

VI. BOARD COMMENT

Mrs. Kruger-Carroll requested to have a board retreat in the week or two. Specifically, to prepare the board for the superintendent search; to define leadership’s role and how it affects the board as a whole, identify goals and the mission of the board.

Any information that has been gathered thus far from the youth league, parent input and anything else for the Lacrosse program and have it presented to the board at the October Committee of the Whole.

Mrs. Kruger-Carroll asked for clarification of the decrease of one enrichment teacher for the district. Mr. Cummings told her that the position was cut from the original budget the board approved.

Mrs. Kruger-Carroll asked what would happen when the CMT test go away and was told the district would then use the current assessment test.

Mrs. Casey requested that the board take into consideration of everyone’s schedule before scheduling the meeting. She then said that she travels far and would appreciate

Chairman Stapleton reported that the board is moving forward with the superintendent search. He told the public focus groups have been schedule for October 5th. Invitations were sent to many groups i.e. parent, business, civic, teachers, administrators and city officials. He also said the website will offer

Mrs. Kruger-Carroll recommended that the people who did not receive invitations have the opportunity to participate another way. Chairman Stapleton told her that invitations were sent to many, many individuals. However, should a board member wish to add to the list, they could.

Mrs. Kruger-Carroll then said she had already communicated her additions to Mrs. Griffin. However, the board did not select the groups of people, leadership did. She then said again, that the public should have the opportunity to give their feedback.

Mr. O’Connell spoke up and said that he recalled the groups were selected by the board during the meeting with the superintendent search consultants.

Mrs. Kruger-Carroll agreed. However, she said the lists had changed.

Chairman Stapleton told her the board agreed to the lists.

DRAFT

Mrs. Kruger-Carroll said that “we” as a group did not agree to the lists.

Mr. White then said that no one person was selected. Leadership agreed to the various groups and then administration selected the names.

Mrs. Casey then said that is a good reason why a retreat is needed. Decisions are being made by leadership without notifying other board members. She would have appreciated it if the board could have reviewed the list prior to the invitations being sent out.

Chairman Stapleton said that the groups were agreed upon.

Mrs. Kruger-Carroll then told the board that if a parent is not a member of a PTA, then they were not given the opportunity to speak. She also said that she brought that up at the meeting to prevent that from happening.

Mr. O’Connell told her he thought that could be repaired. Mrs. Kruger-Carroll agreed.

Mr. White then said the entire public will be able to offer their feedback via a questionnaire that has been uploaded to the website.

Chairman Stapleton also said that a ConnectEd message will be sent to the entire parent community advising the public of the questionnaire.

Mrs. Casey then asked that the leadership meetings be forwarded to her. The board secretary will forward those dates to Mrs. Casey.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. White made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Amendola seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 10:10 p.m.

Robert White
Corresponding Secretary

Pam Griffin
Recording Secretary

Millard Public Schools
Committee of the Whole
September 27, 2010

State Assessments and District Goals, 2010

Presentation Overview

1. State Assessment Results
Review
Growth data
2. Comparative Data
3. District Theory of Action

The Use of Data

Data from State Assessments

Summative

Informs district and school long term planning goals

Data from District Benchmarks and Common Formative Assessments

Formative

Informs daily classroom instructional goals

Data Comparisons

DRG

State

Year to Year

Cohort

Conversion Factor

Small DRG Comparison - Reading

Grade 3 Reading: Comparison of % Goal

Group	# Tested	Avg Score	% Goal
New Milford	277	251.5	72.6
Southington	465	254.4	79.1
Shelton	386	256.9	67.1
Milford	550	244.5	69.8
Wallingford	460	244.8	67.0
State	39005	240.2	57.1

Grade 4 Reading: Comparison of % Goal

Group	# Tested	Avg Score	% Goal
Southington	533	264.1	74.9
Shelton	401	203.7	74.2
New Milford	345	237.7	68
Wallingford	456	257.2	67.3
Milford	561	251.7	64.5
State	39793	252.9	60

Small DRG Comparison - Reading

Grade 5 Reading: Comparison of % Goal

Group	# Tested	Avg Score	% Goal
Shelton	428	254.2	73.6
Southington	504	251.9	72.8
Wallingford	466	249.3	68.9
New Milford	332	247.2	66.3
Milford	563	244.9	66.1
State	39189	243.1	61.8

Grade 6 Reading: Comparison of % Goal

Group	# Tested	Avg Score	% Goal
New Milford	345	279.2	88.7
Shelton	458	275.3	85.6
Milford	539	268.9	82.6
Southington	481	268.2	81.1
Wallingford	520	263.1	77.7
State	40067	265.4	74.9

Small DRG Comparison - Reading

Grade 7 Reading: Comparison of % Goal

Group	# Tested	Avg Score	% Goal
Shelton	421	287	70.1
New Milford	369	264.7	63.1
Milford	566	263.3	66.7
Southington	514	266.5	66
Wallingford	502	258.4	61.1
State	32968	254.2	57.5

Grade 8 Reading: Comparison of % Goal

Group	# Tested	Avg Score	% Goal
Southington	529	266.7	85.6
Milford	566	267.8	82.0
Shelton	417	264.7	80.1
New Milford	371	263.5	78.2
Wallingford	480	259.9	76.3
State	42611	258.7	73.4

Small DRG Comparison - Math

Grade 3 Math: Comparison of % Goal

Group	# Tested	Avg Score	% Goal
Southington	675	252.3	66.5
New Milford	291	248.4	78.3
Wallingford	468	246.2	70.7
Milford	509	240	69.3
Shelton	386	244.3	68.1
State	39433	238.0	62.6

Grade 4 Math: Comparison of % Goal

Group	# Tested	Avg Score	% Goal
Southington	569	275.4	87.8
New Milford	465	275	88.1
Shelton	476	270.5	73.6
Milford	541	269.8	79.4
New Milford	335	267.4	69.1
State	39520	267.1	69.2

Small DRG Comparison – Math

Grade 5 Math: Comparison by % Goal

Group	# Tested	Avg Score	% Goal
Southington	510	287.8	91.9
Shelton	429	278.4	89.4
Wallingford	171	274.1	76.3
Millbrook	166	273.4	75.4
New Milford	140	262	66.2
State	19642	275.1	75.6

Grade 6 Math: Comparison by % Goal

Group	# Tested	Avg Score	% Goal
Southington	433	288.4	88.5
New Milford	166	272.7	77.9
Millbrook	138	273.4	77.3
Shelton	485	273.6	75.7
Wallingford	172	268.3	75
State	40278	287.2	71

Small DRG Comparison – Math

Grade 7 Math: Comparison by % Goal

Group	# Tested	Avg Score	% Goal
Southington	510	288.8	81.0
Shelton	428	278	74.5
Wallingford	164	276.6	77.1
Millbrook	160	274.6	74.6
New Milford	172	265.9	71.7
State	40218	289.5	83.8

Grade 8 Math: Comparison by % Goal

Group	# Tested	Avg Score	% Goal
Southington	522	282	82.9
Shelton	419	271.2	75.7
Millbrook	188	271.3	74.6
Wallingford	188	267.4	74.2
New Milford	174	267.5	76.1
State	41284	284.0	67.9

Small DRG Comparison – Writing

Grade 3 Writing: Comparison of % Goal

Group	# Tested	Avg Score	% Goal
Shelton	388	281.8	72.5
Millbrook	139	260.3	69.2
Southington	475	260.9	68
New Milford	101	238	64
Wallingford	271	246.3	54.4
State	40192	250.7	58.3

Grade 4 Writing: Comparison of % Goal

Group	# Tested	Avg Score	% Goal
Shelton	351	283	79.4
Southington	467	283.4	78.7
Wallingford	460	272.3	70.8
Millbrook	144	272.8	70.8
New Milford	143	255.1	68.7
State	40762	272.4	63.5

Small DRG Comparison – Writing

Grade 5 Writing: Comparison of % Goal

Group	# Tested	Avg Score	% Goal
Shelton	438	288.4	81
Southington	510	281.5	75.3
Wallingford	176	258.8	72.9
Millbrook	168	256.3	70.8
New Milford	150	239.2	58.9
State	41008	268.8	64.2

Grade 6 Writing: Comparison of % Goal

Group	# Tested	Avg Score	% Goal
Southington	508	284.4	76.2
Shelton	420	264.3	73.3
New Milford	151	250.7	71.6
Millbrook	147	258.4	70.8
Wallingford	534	260.8	69.5
State	42772	266.2	65.8

Small DRG Comparison – Writing

Grade 7 Writing: Comparison of % Goal

Group	# Tested	Avg Score	% Goal
Shelton	440	256.9	74.8
Milford	577	250.2	72.4
Southington	531	251.6	71.1
New Milford	364	247.4	68.8
Wallingford	512	244.3	62.5
State	41531	247.8	61.3

Grade 8 Writing: Comparison of % Goal

Group	# Tested	Avg Score	% Goal
Southington	539	257.3	72.1
Milford	574	256.3	71.1
Shelton	421	253.2	66.1
Wallingford	495	248.1	64
New Milford	360	247.7	63.6
State	42263	250.3	62.7

Small DRG Comparison – Science

Grade 5 Science: Comparison of % Goal

Group	# Tested	Avg Score	% Goal
Southington	520	276.5	77.5
Wallingford	478	267.1	71.4
Shelton	438	265.4	69.4
Milford	560	263.2	66.9
New Milford	352	258.6	58.2
State	41059	257.3	59.7

Grade 8 Science: Comparison of % Goal

Group	# Tested	Avg Score	% Goal
Wallingford	496	266.1	76
New Milford	361	263.1	75.1
Milford	578	262.4	75.4
Southington	537	261.1	72.3
Shelton	422	251.8	65.3
State	42301	254.1	61.1

Small DRG Comparison – CAPT

Grade 10 Reading: Comparison of % Goal

Group	# Tested	Avg Score	% Goal
Southington	462	257	60.4
New Milford	369	255.6	56.4
Wallingford	535	252.2	55.1
Shelton	425	248.5	48.7
Milford	489	240.3	43.6
State	40613	244.4	45.9

Small DRG Comparison – CAPT

Grade 10 Math: Comparison by % Goal

Group	# Tested	Avg Score	% Goal
Southington	462	270.2	68.2
New Milford	376	269.1	66.2
Shelton	423	259.8	55.3
Wallingford	537	257.1	52
Milford	493	251.1	48.9
State	40587	253.1	48.9

Small DRG Comparison – CAPT

Grade 10 Writing: Comparison of % Goal

Group	# Tested	Avg Score	% Goal
New Milford	381	274	71.9
Wallingford	519	262.3	64
Southington	478	261.7	62.3
Shelton	422	260.6	62.3
Milford	487	254.9	56.1
State	41162	261.5	59.6

Small DRG Comparison – CAPT

Grade 10 Science: Comparison of % Goal

Group	# Tested	Avg Score	% Goal
New Milford	380	280.7	61.6
Southington	485	268.2	52.8
Wallingford	539	264.9	50.8
Milford	492	261.1	47
Shelton	426	261.8	44.1
State	41432	259.5	45.5

SAT Performance 2010

High School	Reading	Math	Writing
Southington	517	527	513
New Milford	517	538	517
Sheehan	517	519	541
Lyman Hall	510	524	504
Foran High School	505	512	514
Law High School	493	488	490
Shelton	491	508	495

Responding to Data – Case Study

	Strand 1		Strand 2		Strand 3		Strand 4	
	Grade 6 (2009)	Grade 7 (2010)	Grade 6 (2009)	Grade 7 (2010)	Grade 6 (2009)	Grade 7 (2010)	Grade 6 (2009)	Grade 7 (2010)
Milford	88	94	87	91	45	72	88	93
ESMS	94	96	91	92	44	69	88	93
HMS	89	95	90	92	38	78	90	97
WSMS	82	92	80	88	52	68	87	90

Responding to Data – Case Study

	Strand 1		Strand 2		Strand 3		Strand 4	
	Grade 7 (2009)	Grade 8 (2010)	Grade 7 (2009)	Grade 8 (2010)	Grade 7 (2009)	Grade 8 (2010)	Grade 7 (2009)	Grade 8 (2010)
Millford	80	86	82	89	70	76	85	83
ESMS	79	83	80	92	66	66	83	81
HMS	88	90	88	91	81	85	91	88
WSMS	72	87	78	85	64	77	80	81

Trends Toward Goal

Conversion Factors

Past Performance - Math

Math	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	Growth 2009-2010	Growth 2008-2010
Millford	67	69	68	71	75	4	8
Black	41	42	40	53	53	0	12
Hispanic	52	45	48	56	62	6	10
White	69	71	70	72	75	3	6
Asian	81	82	80	87	88	1	7
Special Education	23	24	29	33	35	2	12
Not Special Education	73	75	74	76	79	3	6
ELL	42	34	36	26	33	7	-9
Not ELL	67	69	69	71	75	4	8
Title I	50	50	50	57	58	1	8
Not Title I	71	72	72	73	78	5	7

Past Performance - Reading

Reading	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	Growth 2009 - 2010	Growth 2008 - 2010
Whitford	72	69	69	73	74	1	2
Black	47	46	45	53	58	5	11
Hispanic	51	51	51	53	58	5	7
White	74	71	71	75	76	1	2
Asian	74	72	76	84	80	-4	6
Special Education	28	22	24	30	37	7	9
Not Special Education	78	76	75	78	79	1	1
ELL	29	11	39	21	29	8	0
Not ELL	73	70	70	74	75	1	2
Title I	54	51	49	56	61	5	7
Not Title I	76	73	73	76	77	1	1

District Goals

- 5% of each grade level, per subject area, will advance one performance level on the CMT and CAPT
- 10% of special education students, per subject area, will advance one performance level on the CMT and CAPT
- Every data team will advance 5% of its students per performance level, per subject

District Goals and Actions

A coherent and committed system of educational professionals working together have the transformative power to positively impact the lives of all children. Such a learning collaborative, ever mindful of continual improvement towards the goal of every learner becoming a success, will develop and maintain rigorous and engaging curriculum, lessons, and assessments, powerful informative data systems, and a supportive learning climate and culture.

District Goals and Actions

- If we strengthen and align our organizational systems, particularly those closest to the instructional core at the school level, then student learning will incrementally and notably improve. Changes in the systems of curriculum and assessment infrastructure, data driven decision making and school climate will positively impact the practice of our staff to improve instructional practice and support learning achievement for all students.
- If we design and execute rigorous and engaging district curriculum that are linked across grades and levels by uniformly understood and applied standards, if department and course unit plans exemplify the best practices of Understanding by Design, and if we develop rigorous and pervasive assessment tasks that provide staff with reliable measures of student progress towards standards and district Ends Policies then we will be able to provide timely and effective interventions that ensure success for all students.

District Goals and Actions

- We will
 - Use the Common Core of Standards as the basis for the development of district curriculum.
 - Use Board of Education approved Ends Policies to identify targets of performance expected of all Milford Public Schools graduates
 - Use Understanding by Design as the essential curriculum development tool
 - Develop a variety of assessments aligned to the instructional objective and reflective of a K-12 continuum
 - Use the principles and practices of SRBI to monitor and support the instructional needs of our challenged learners
 - Link learning expectations horizontally and vertically across classrooms, grades, schools, and grade levels and measure student progress through an aligned assessment system
- Evidence
 - Local, state, and national student assessment results
 - Data tracking of student performance pre-kindergarten to post-graduate
 - A collection of integrated curriculum and lessons which serves as frames for the delivery of proven instructional practices

District Goals and Actions

If we focus all instructional efforts through the lens of consistency, rigor, and engagement and monitor instructional practices through data driven accountability systems and student work then we will develop district capacity and sustainability to increase learning achievement for all

District Goals and Actions

- We will
 - Identify the learning needs of individual staff through evaluative and data derived means and develop individual professional development paths for each
 - Expect the implementation of district developed curriculum in each classroom
 - Develop and support professional learning communities who continually and effectively develop lessons aligned to district curriculum, understand and apply the principles of best assessment strategies, and who can use data to continually improve their work
 - Create and support horizontal and vertical teams of teachers and principals to monitor and support district curricular consistency
 - Non-renew underperforming non-tenured staff and aggressively remediate underperforming tenured staff to excellence and nothing less
- Evidence
 - Portfolios of individual teacher professional development plans
 - Walkthrough and evaluation data collection

District Goals and Actions

If we develop and sustain a professionally collaborative school culture which places primary importance on the needs of all students, develops trust among all school staff, and utilizes the entire school community to address the needs of the school, then we will maximize the best learning environment for all students.

District Goals and Actions

- We will
 - Develop a proactive and building based behavioral support system for students
 - Celebrate the success of all community members in academic and non-academic arenas
 - Implement an advisory model for grades 6 to 12
 - Utilize technology to allow for the open and transparent sharing of instructional and student performance information
 - Modulate a systemic and bureaucratic response with an unceasing respect for the individual
- Evidence
 - Student discipline data
 - Participation rates in honor roll, club memberships, athletic team membership, and community involvement
 - Internet traffic on district websites

District Goals and Actions

District Goals and Actions