

# District Review Report

Milford Public Schools

Review conducted December 1-4, 2014

---



Center for District and School Accountability

Massachusetts Department of Elementary and  
Secondary Education

## Organization of this Report

Milford Public Schools District Review Overview .....	1
Milford Public Schools District Review Findings .....	6
Milford Public Schools District Review Recommendations .....	35
Appendix A: Review Team, Activities, Schedule, Site Visit .....	43
Appendix B: Enrollment, Performance, Expenditures .....	45
Appendix C: Instructional Inventory .....	58

### Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

75 Pleasant Street, Malden, MA 02148-4906

Phone 781-338-3000 TTY: N.E.T. Replay 800-439-2370

[www.doe.mass.edu](http://www.doe.mass.edu)



This document was prepared by the  
Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

Mitchell D. Chester, Ed.D.  
Commissioner  
**Published February 2015**

The Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, an affirmative action employer, is committed to ensuring that all of its programs and facilities are accessible to all members of the public. We do not discriminate on the basis of age, color, disability, national origin, race, religion, sex, gender identity, or sexual orientation. Inquiries regarding the Department's compliance with Title IX and other civil rights laws may be directed to the Human Resources Director, 75 Pleasant St., Malden, MA 02148-4906. Phone: 781-338-6105.

© 2015 Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

*Permission is hereby granted to copy any or all parts of this document for non-commercial educational purposes. Please credit the "Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education."*

This document printed on recycled paper

Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education  
75 Pleasant Street, Malden, MA 02148-4906  
Phone 781-338-3000 TTY: N.E.T. Relay 800-439-2370  
[www.doe.mass.edu](http://www.doe.mass.edu)



# Milford Public Schools District Review Overview

---

## Purpose

Conducted under Chapter 15, Section 55A of the Massachusetts General Laws, district reviews support local school districts in establishing or strengthening a cycle of continuous improvement. Reviews consider carefully the effectiveness of systemwide functions, with reference to the six district standards used by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (ESE): leadership and governance, curriculum and instruction, assessment, human resources and professional development, student support, and financial and asset management. Reviews identify systems and practices that may be impeding improvement as well as those most likely to be contributing to positive results.

Districts reviewed in the 2014-2015 school year include districts classified into Level 2 or Level 3 of ESE's framework for district accountability and assistance. Review reports may be used by ESE and the district to establish priority for assistance and make resource allocation decisions.

## Methodology

Reviews collect evidence for each of the six district standards above. A district review team consisting of independent consultants with expertise in each of the district standards reviews documentation, data, and reports for two days before conducting a four-day district visit that includes visits to individual schools. The team conducts interviews and focus group sessions with such stakeholders as school committee members, teachers' association representatives, administrators, teachers, parents, and students. Team members also observe classroom instructional practice. Subsequent to the onsite review, the team meets for two days to develop findings and recommendations before submitting a draft report to ESE. *District review reports focus primarily on the system's most significant strengths and challenges, with an emphasis on identifying areas for improvement.*

## Site Visit

The site visit to the Milford school district was conducted from December 1-4, 2014. The site visit included approximately 30 hours of interviews and focus groups with approximately 60 stakeholders, including school committee members, district administrators, school staff, high school students, and teachers' association representatives. The review team conducted focus groups with 4 elementary school teachers and 10 high school teachers.

A list of review team members, information about review activities, and the site visit schedule are in Appendix A, and Appendix B provides information about enrollment, student performance, and expenditures. The team observed classroom instructional practice in 86 classrooms in 6 schools. The team collected data using an instructional inventory, a tool for recording observed characteristics of standards-based teaching. This data is contained in Appendix C.

## District Profile

Milford has a representative town meeting form of government and the chair of the school committee is elected. There are seven members of the school committee and they meet twice a month September through June and once during the summer.

The current superintendent has been in the position since July 2007. The district core leadership team includes the superintendent; the assistant superintendent for curriculum, instruction, and assessment; the assistant superintendent for business and human resources; the special education director; and the English Language Learner program director. Central office positions have been mostly stable in number over the past decade. The district has seven principals leading seven schools. There are 11 other school administrators: 8 assistant principals, the high school director of guidance, the athletics director, and the PK-12 music director. In addition, the assistant principals and the athletics director are members of a bargaining unit. In the 2013-2014 there were 313 teachers in the district, according to ESE data.

In the 2013-2014 school year, 4,182 students were enrolled in the district's 7 schools:

**Table 1: Milford Public Schools  
Schools, Type, Grades Served, and Enrollment\*, 2013-2014**

School Name	School Type	Grades Served	Enrollment
Shining Star	EEC	PK	153
Brookside	ES	K-2	553
Memorial	ES	K-2	449
Woodland	ES	3-4	641
Milford Middle School East	MS	8	322
Stacy Middle	MS	5-7	953
Milford High	HS	9-12	1,111
<b>Totals</b>	<b>7 schools</b>	<b>PK-12</b>	<b>4,182</b>
*As of October 1, 2013			

Between 2010 and 2014 overall student enrollment increased by 1.5 percent. Enrollment figures by race/ethnicity and high needs populations (i.e., students with disabilities, students from low-income families, and English language learners (ELLs) and former ELLs) as compared with the state are provided in Tables B1a and B1b in Appendix B.

Total in-district per-pupil expenditures matched the median in-district per pupil expenditures for 23 K-12 districts of similar size (4,000-4,999 students) in fiscal year 2013: \$11,729 as compared with \$11,729 (see [District Analysis and Review Tool Detail: Staffing & Finance](#)). Actual net school spending has been above what is required by the Chapter 70 state education aid program, as shown in Table B8 in Appendix B.

## Student Performance

**Milford is a Level 2 district because all its schools with reportable data are in Level 2 for not meeting their gap narrowing targets.**

- Woodland Elementary is in the 29<sup>th</sup> percentile of elementary schools with cumulative Progressive Performance Index (PPI) score of 53 for all students and 58 for high needs students; the target is 75.
- Stacy Middle is in the 81<sup>st</sup> percentile of middle schools and is in Level 2 with a cumulative PPI of 67 for all students and 64 for high needs students; the target is 75.
- Milford Middle East is in the 65<sup>th</sup> percentile of middle schools and is in Level 2 with a cumulative PPI of 73 for all students and 85 for high needs students; the target is 75.
- Milford High is in the 27<sup>th</sup> percentile of high schools and is in Level 2 with a cumulative PPI of 65 for all students and 62 for high needs students; the target is 75.

**The district did not reach its 2014 Composite Performance Index (CPI) targets for ELA, math, and science.**

- ELA CPI was 88.1 in 2014, below the district's target of 91.5.
- Math CPI was 80.8 in 2014, below the district's target of 86.7.
- Science CPI was 83.2 in 2014, below the district's target of 86.7.

**ELA proficiency rates were above the state rate in the district as a whole and in every tested grade except for the 4<sup>th</sup> grade.**

- ELA proficiency for all students in the district was 72 percent in 2011 and 2014, above the 2014 state rate of 69 percent.
- ELA proficiency was above the state rate by 1 percentage point in the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> grade, by 14 percentage points in the 6<sup>th</sup> grade, by 7 percentage points in the 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grades, and by 4 percentage points in the 10<sup>th</sup> grade.
  - Between 2011 and 2014 ELA proficiency rates increased by 6 to 8 percentage points in the 6<sup>th</sup>, 8<sup>th</sup>, and 10<sup>th</sup> grades.

- ELA proficiency in the 4<sup>th</sup> grade was 44 percent in 2014, 10 percentage points below the state rate of 54 percent.
  - Between 2011 and 2014 ELA proficiency rates declined by 4 percentage points in the 4<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> grades and by 6 and 7 percentage points in the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> grades.

**Math proficiency rates were below the state rate in the 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, and 5<sup>th</sup> grades and above the state rates in the 6<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup>, 8<sup>th</sup>, and 10<sup>th</sup> grades. Between 2011 and 2014 there was a notable decline in math proficiency in the 5<sup>th</sup> grade.**

- Math proficiency rates for all students in the district were 61 percent in 2011 and 60 percent in 2014, equal to the 2014 state rate of 60 percent.
- Math proficiency rates in the district were 2 percentage points below the state rate in the 3<sup>rd</sup> grade and 8 and 13 percentage points below the state rate in the 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> grades, respectively.
  - Between 2011 and 2014 math proficiency rates decreased by 11 percentage points in the 5<sup>th</sup> grade and by 1 to 5 percentage points in the 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup>, and 10<sup>th</sup> grades.
- Math proficiency rates were above the state rate by 7 and 8 percentage points in the 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> grades, respectively, and by 2 and 3 percentage points in the 8<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> grades, respectively.
  - Between 2011 and 2014 math proficiency rates improved by 5 percentage points in the 6<sup>th</sup> grade and by 3 percentage points in the 8<sup>th</sup> grade.

**Science proficiency rates were above the state rate in the district as a whole and in each tested grade.**

- 5<sup>th</sup> grade science proficiency rates were 57 percent in 2011 and 55 percent in 2014, 2 percentage points above the state rate of 53 percent.
- 8<sup>th</sup> grade science proficiency rates increased from 44 percent in 2011 to 51 percent in 2014, 9 percentage points above the state rate of 42 percent.
- 10<sup>th</sup> grade science proficiency rates were 72 percent in 2011 and 74 percent in 2014, 3 percentage points above the state rate of 71 percent.

**Milford reached the 2014 four year cohort graduation target of 80.0 and the five year cohort graduation target of 85.0 percent.<sup>1</sup>**

- The four year cohort graduation rate improved by 3.4 percentage points from 83.1 percent in 2010 to 86.5 percent in 2013, above the state rate of 85 percent.

---

<sup>1</sup> 2014 graduation targets are 80 percent for the four year and 85 percent for the five year cohort graduation rates and refer to the 2013 four year cohort graduation rate and 2012 five year cohort graduation rates.

- The five year cohort graduation rate improved by 2.7 percentage points from 84.8 percent in 2009 to 87.5 percent in 2012, equal to the state rate of 87.5 percent.
- The annual dropout rate for Milford was 2.9 percent in 2010 and 3.8 percent in 2013, above the statewide rate of 2.2 percent.

# Milford Public Schools District Review Findings

---

## Strengths

### *Leadership & Governance*

**1. Through a series of administrative changes in personnel in the past few years, the superintendent has developed, mostly through internal promotions, a cohesive leadership team that includes central office and school administrators. The leadership team engages in a collaborative planning process that is purposeful and reflects the priorities of the district.**

**A.** Thirteen administrators are identified as being on the district's leadership team. In addition to the superintendent, the team includes the two assistant superintendents, the six principals, and the four directors: of guidance, of the early childhood center, of the English Language Learner (ELL) program, and of special education.

1. The average number of years in their current leadership positions is slightly more than four, including the 2014-2015 school year. However, these administrators have an average of over 12 years of total service to the district.
2. The superintendent said that he also has a "core" leadership team that includes himself, the two assistant superintendents, the ELL program director, and the director of special education.

**B.** Annually, the entire administrative team engages in a two-day retreat in late summer, just before the start of the school year. The superintendent described this annual event as a "once a year strategic meeting with everybody."

1. Principals considered these annual August meetings to be a team building exercise to plan for the year and said that these meetings brought them closer.
2. Several principals frequently referred to the leadership team as a cohesive group that works together.
3. At the annual administrative retreat, the superintendent distributes a calendar of monthly meetings for the upcoming year.
  - a. A random review of leadership team meeting agendas for the period between May 2013, and November 2014 showed a wide array of topics scheduled for discussion, including professional development and planning, teachers' collective bargaining agreement negotiations, District Determined Measures, strategic plan development, and the educator evaluation process.

**C.** Principals meet monthly with the assistant superintendent for curriculum, instruction, and assessment as well as with the curriculum team leaders (CTLs) to discuss curriculum matters.

- D. Principals said that their input was sought during the development of the 2014-2017 Strategic Plan, noting that School Improvement Plans (SIPs) are aligned to the Strategic Plan and include actions that have an impact on student growth. Currently, the principals set their individual goals consistent with the strategic plan and the SIPs, resulting in systemwide goal alignment.
  - 1. The superintendent told the team that before the development of the current Strategic Plan, there were separate and short-term District and School Improvement Plans, and schools acted autonomously.

**Impact:** A cohesive and collaborative leadership organization, with a focus on district goals, enhances the prospect that goals will be met, and the mission achieved.

**2. Participation in a comprehensive PK-12 school accreditation process by the New England Association of Schools & Colleges (NEASC) and the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) has influenced and supported the district's improvement initiatives in a number of ways.**

- A. The superintendent expressed the belief that the accreditation process fostered peer review and self-reflection. Additionally, he felt that external approval through accreditation had the prospect of engendering community pride and support.
- B. The superintendent said that he viewed accreditation by NEASC and NAEYC as influencing and supporting the district's efforts in a number of areas.
  - 1. By identifying certain needs for improvement, the accreditation reports drive the budgets and help to validate budget requests.
  - 2. The recommendations from the visiting accreditation teams are incorporated into the SIPs and the Strategic Plan.
    - a. In September 2014, the high school implemented a NEASC heterogeneous course requirement in grade 10.
    - b. Beginning in the summer of 2013, and acting on NEASC's recommendations, Memorial Elementary School reviewed arrival and dismissal procedures, reconfigured "front office space to ensure staff visibility to visitors entering the building," and developed "a plan to alleviate concerns with outward opening windows near [the] play area on [the] first floor."
    - c. Brookside Elementary School sought to "ensure that [it] is in compliance with state and local curriculum, instruction & assessment guidelines . . . consistent with NEASC Accreditation standards."

3. The superintendent told the review team that the support for having an assistant superintendent for curriculum, instruction, and assessment was a direct result of a NEASC identified an area for improvement in curriculum alignment and oversight.

**Impact:** In adhering to a comprehensive accreditation process, the district has embedded a capacity for internal and external program evaluation that recognizes achievements and areas for improvement.

### ***Curriculum and Instruction***

#### **3. The district has sufficient curricular and instructional leadership and an effective organizational structure to oversee and to improve curriculum and instruction.**

- A. The district has had dedicated districtwide leadership for curriculum, instruction, and assessment since the 2013-2014 school year.
  1. The assistant superintendent for curriculum, instruction, and assessment is responsible for all topics related to the leadership and administration of curriculum, instruction, and assessment.
  2. The assistant superintendent is in his second year of service. There was no predecessor in this role. Previously, the superintendent assumed responsibility for curricular and instructional leadership in the district.
  3. The assistant superintendent is visible in the schools. He conducts regular walkthroughs with the central office leadership team to observe specific aspects of teaching and learning.
    - a. Recent walkthroughs have focused on student engagement with the intent to be better informed about current practice and to strengthen teacher performance by providing feedback to principals.
- B. Subject area Curriculum Team Leaders (CTLs) in each school have been in place for many years.<sup>2</sup> They are responsible for curriculum in their content areas in their schools and assume other leadership duties in their schools and in the district.
  1. CTLs are full-time teachers who receive a stipend for their leadership role. They do not have an evaluative role, although they may observe and discuss teaching practices.
  2. CTLs identified themselves as the curriculum leaders in their schools. In a focus group, teachers concurred.

---

<sup>2</sup> In an email, the superintendent noted that the position had been in place in the district for about 20 years.

- C.** In several interviews, the review team was told that principals also have responsibility for curricular and instructional leadership.
  - 1. Principals noted that they attend curriculum team meetings with CTLs, collaborate with CTLs at their schools to implement plans, and communicate with teachers about curriculum development and improvement.
  - 2. CTLs and principals also stated that principals were responsible for monitoring the implementation and horizontal alignment of curriculum, mainly through classroom observations and in faculty, department, grade-level, and team meetings.
  - 3. Principals described their role to improve instruction through educator evaluation, classroom observations, and the work they do with teachers at department, faculty, grade-level or team meetings.
  
- D.** The curriculum team plays a major role in planning and decision-making to improve curriculum and instruction and assessment practices in the district.
  - 1. The curriculum team consists of CTLs, principals, and assistant principals.
  - 2. The assistant superintendent sets the agenda and conducts monthly curriculum team meetings. In addition, he emails all staff each month with updates about decisions and initiatives emanating from curriculum team meetings.
  - 3. Curriculum team meetings also provide embedded professional development for attendees as they learn about and develop improvement initiatives. A document review indicated that topics of recent meetings included PARCC assessments, RETELL, literacy and writing across the curriculum, DDMs, curriculum map alignment and the common core standards, assessment rigor, and a pilot of Edwin teaching and learning.
  - 3. Principals noted that district leaders collaboratively developed the district strategic plan at curriculum team meetings.
    - a. A review of goals in both the Strategic Plan and SIPs indicated alignment of goals and action steps for Standard 1: Curriculum, Planning and Assessment.
  
- E.** Although the district does not have a formal districtwide curriculum review process, curriculum team members analyze and monitor student achievement data in curriculum team meetings and identify curricular and instructional areas in need of improvement.
  - 1. Interviews and a document review showed that recent examples include: a new districtwide math committee to study and make recommendations to improve the math program; a “Physics First” program as an alternative to biology to meet the science requirement; the Pathways program for high-risk students; more focused literacy and writing across the

curriculum to address literacy anchor standards; and an Rtl committee to identify the planning and training needed to support the Response to Intervention (Rtl) initiative.

2. CTLs have created curriculum maps to align ELA and math curricula to the 2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks at almost all school levels. Interviewees said that there is a need to develop additional curriculum maps and the units and lesson plans aligned to the maps.

**Impact:** With a new assistant superintendent and a curriculum team composed of CTLs and principals, the district now has the leadership capacity and structure to fully develop and to implement an enriched standards-based curriculum and educational program aligned to the 2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks. In addition, the planning and oversight that the curriculum committee brings to new initiatives can ensure that priorities for teaching and learning can be thoughtfully determined and implemented in the district.

**4. The district has identified research-based instructional practices to improve teaching and learning for all students and has made a solid attempt to implement them.**

- A. The district has set clear expectations for instruction by identifying the workshop model as the district's instructional model for all school levels.
  1. Curriculum Team Leaders (CTLs), principals, and teachers identified the workshop model (sometimes using the term "clock model") as a sequenced instructional strategy for use by all teachers.
  2. Interviewees described the workshop model as posted learning objectives, an activator or warm-up activity, a short lesson (10-15 minutes) using direct instruction followed by guided practice often in pairs or small groups (30-40 minutes), and a sharing session. Planned formative assessments take place during class and may include formats such as turn-and-talk and entrance or exit slips.
  3. An analysis of related teaching and learning characteristics in the 86 classroom observations indicated that the model was more firmly embedded in instructional practices at the elementary and middle school levels.<sup>3</sup>
- B. The district has also prioritized implementing a three-tiered Rtl process to identify and to support all students' academic and social/emotional needs.
  1. Teachers through grade 8 noted that they had made progress using Rtl at the school level this year taking advantage of discussions about student progress and placement in interventions in grade-level or team-level meetings and the newly added 40-minute intervention blocks.

---

<sup>3</sup> See Appendix C, characteristics 4, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 19, 20, and 23.

2. Based on an analysis of assessment data and recommendations about students' social/emotional behaviors, students are assigned to interventions. After six weeks progress is reviewed. When interventions are unsuccessful, students are referred to the Student Teacher Assistance Resource Team (START) for evaluation for an IEP.
3. Interviewees said that this was a "learning year" with the new schedule and that practices varied across schools and at different grade levels within schools.
4. Special education staff noted a focus on RtI at the middle school and high school and said that paraprofessionals and teaching assistants can provide additional support as part of the workshop model.
5. High school interviewees stated that the Pathways and Transitions programs were the high school's version of Tier 3 initiatives as was the academic support center staffed by special education teachers.
6. CTLs and teachers also noted that there had been professional development starting in 2009 to prepare teachers and leaders to effectively implement the RtI model; teachers stated that they needed more professional development.

**Impact:** By clearly articulating the workshop model as the district's research-based instructional model, district leaders have set clear and high expectations for teaching strategies that provide for engaging, student-centered, active learning. The model's grouping and differentiation strategies can address students' diverse learning needs in classrooms. The district's additional priority to implement the RtI process indicates a commitment to identify and to support students needing specific learning and social/emotional supports at all levels. Information from interviews, documents, and observations indicates that many educators have made a strong effort to learn the strategies and techniques involved in implementing both models well. The district is poised to work toward widespread and effective implementation of both models at all schools.

### ***Instruction***

5. **In most observed classrooms, the learning environment created conditions for teachers and students to focus on teaching and learning.**

The team observed 86 classes throughout the district: 30 at the high school, 21 at the middle school level, and 35 at the elementary schools. The team observed 34 ELA/English classes, 28 mathematics classes, 10 science classes, and 14 classes in other subject areas. Among the classes observed were six special education classes, seven ELL classes, and three classes for both ELL and special education. The observations were approximately 20 minutes in length. All review team members collected data using ESE's instructional inventory, a tool for recording observed characteristics of standards-based teaching. This data is presented in Appendix C.

- A. The team found clear and consistent evidence that the tone of interactions between teacher and students and among students (#1) was positive and mutually respectful in 100 percent of observed elementary lessons, in 86 percent of middle school lessons, and in 83 percent of high school lessons.
  - 1. Observers noted a kindergarten teacher encouraging students to listen well and to use their indoor voices when working in groups.
  - 2. In middle school lessons, teachers directed many positive comments toward students. In a middle school inclusion class, a paraprofessional was very focused on supporting all students in the class with good learning behaviors.
- B. Behavioral expectations were clearly and consistently communicated (#2) in 83 percent of observed elementary classrooms, in 86 percent of middle school classrooms, and in 77 percent of high school classrooms.
  - 1. In a grade 2 class, a teacher noted how students and the teacher worked as a team. There, students had created student-friendly classroom rules, which were displayed on the bulletin board as the bases on a baseball field. In another elementary school, the playground rules were prominently displayed in the hallways.
  - 2. In a grade 7 classroom, the “5 Ps for Classroom Expectations: Prompt, Prepared, Productive, Polite and Patient,” were posted above the white board.
- C. Classroom rituals and routines clearly and consistently promoted transitions with minimal loss of instructional time (#4) in 88 percent of observed elementary lessons, in 85 percent of middle school lessons, and in 61 percent of observed high school lessons.
  - 1. Review team members often noted the smooth transitions from learning center to learning center or from large group to small groups in many elementary and middle school classrooms.

**Impact:** In a respectful and well-managed classroom, students and teachers can focus on learning and teaching. Clear behavioral expectations encourage students to develop and practice good learning habits. Clearly understood routines and rituals help students and teachers use class time productively for learning. A teacher’s respectful tone of voice, courtesy, and cues from body language help establish an environment where students sense they are valued as learners and encouraged to take academic risks.

## **Assessment**

### **6. The district has an organized process for collecting, disseminating, and using assessment data to make decisions K-8.**

- A.** A review of documents and interviews with administrators and teachers indicated that the district has developed a comprehensive battery of assessments in kindergarten through grade 4.
1. K-4 teachers administer an abundance of literacy assessments to monitor student performance.
    - a. In kindergarten, literacy assessments are administered three times per year. September's assessment determines eligibility for Title I services. An open-response prompt is conducted twice per year. Running Records are administered twice per year. Sight word and rhyming assessments are also administered.
    - b. The Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) is administered to grade 1 students three times per year.
    - c. In grades 1 and 2, the Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA) is administered three times per year. Examples of other assessments administered include running records, and a primary spelling inventory.
    - d. In grades 3 and 4, the Group Reading Assessment and Diagnostic Evaluation (GRADE) assessment is administered in the fall and spring. The elementary spelling inventory is administered three times a year. Other assessments include writing prompts, the PARCC (The Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers) assessment, running records, and a writing assessment. The DRA is administered mid-year and in the spring to students with special needs and those students in intervention classes.
  2. K-4 staff administers multiple mathematics assessments in each of the K-4 classrooms to monitor student performance.
    - a. All kindergarten students complete the beginning of year district mathematics assessment.
    - b. Grade 1 students are administered common, end-of-unit mathematics assessments multiple times a year. They are administered a mid-year mathematics assessment and answer an open-response prompt in May.
    - c. A beginning of the year mathematics assessment is administered in September to grade 1 and 2 students. The Group Mathematics Assessment and Diagnostic Evaluation (GMADE) is administered on three occasions.

- d. The GMADE is administered to grade 3 and 4 mathematics students three times per year. The beginning of the year mathematics assessment takes place in October. An open-response task is scheduled at the conclusion of each Everyday Math unit. Common end-of-year mathematics assessments are administered throughout the year.
  - e. Teachers said that they fill out an assessment grid in June and provide it to the principals, but were unsure how it is used.
- B.** The district’s middle schools collect and analyze student performance data to improve student achievement. The use of student performance data is key to the middle schools school improvement planning. An analysis of MCAS results is conducted at the beginning of the summer and is provided to each teacher.
1. The Milford Middle School’s 2014/15 SIP goals, objectives, and action steps specify how the school intends to improve and to enrich student learning using student assessment data, as follows:
    - a. “The learning and growth of all students is strengthened by designing and administering meaningful student assessments, analyzing student performance data and using the data to improve instruction.” (p. 3)
    - b. “Students whose pre-test scores demonstrate concept mastery will be provided an alternate activity in the enrichment center.” (p. 7)
    - c. “Data will be used to inform re-teaching in RtI (Response to Intervention) programming. Systemic interventions will be provided to those students who’ve demonstrated a need for assistance so that they become proficient readers and writers by the conclusion of their eighth grade year.” (p. 8)
- C.** Milford administrators and staff told the review team that teachers use the results of assessments to plan and to evaluate the effectiveness of instruction, to monitor student progress, and to form instructional groups based on common student needs.
1. GMADE and GRADE results are used to determine which students need interventions.
  2. MCAS scores and results of a teacher-created test administered at the end of grade 6 are used in pre-algebra course determinations for grade 7.
- D.** Milford’s educators have developed data collection tools to track the multiple measures administered by staff.
1. A *Literacy Card* exists for all K-4 students. The card includes assessment data from the DRA, GRADE, spelling inventory, running records, MCAS, and numerous other literacy assessments. The card is a part of the student’s cumulative record and transitions with the

student to grade 5 where teachers refer to it to make programmatic and placement decisions.

2. The *Assessment Grid* contains all the assessment results for a classroom of students for a school year. In addition to informing instructional strategies, this data is used in decisions related to the tiered system of support (Rtl), eligibility for special education and Title I services, and referrals to the Student Teacher Assistance Resource Team (START). Classroom teachers submit the grid to their principal.
  3. The K-4 Assessment Calendar states that “each teacher should keep a writing folder for each student. The folder should have dated samples of the writing tasks included in the calendar. The samples are to be used throughout the year to assess students’ writing. The samples are to be passed on to the following year’s teacher.”
  4. Edwin Analytics reports are used by middle school staff to aggregate, to disaggregate, and to analyze their students’ MCAS performance.
- E. Assessment data is used by teachers to form instructional groups and to monitor student progress.
1. Grouping takes place across classrooms in K-4 ELA and mathematics. Regrouping takes place every 6 weeks.
  2. GRADE and GMADE assessments are used to identify lower performing students who are scheduled into intervention groups in the elementary and middle schools. Reassessment takes place every 6 weeks.
  3. Interviewees said that the reading specialist reviews assessment data at the elementary levels and discusses the progress of individual students with teachers. The specialist is sent lists of students about whom teachers are concerned.

**Impact:** Through the systematic use of assessment, the district’s elementary and middle schools can identify student strengths and needs and plan and implement effective instruction K-8. By addressing gaps in skills the district can improve individual student performance and support all students in their efforts to achieve standards.

### ***Human Resources and Professional Development***

#### **7. The district has allocated resources to support an organized, tiered mentoring program.**

- A. The Mentor Program Handbook entitled *Teachers for Teachers* describes a three tiered structure of mentoring.

1. The handbook describes the mission, purpose, and goals of the mentoring program. The purpose is to improve student teaching and learning and to provide new teachers with structures and support.
  - a. Examples of goals include attracting and retaining staff in a competitive environment, enhancing a new teacher's personal and professional development, and providing one-to-one support for new teachers.
  - b. The mentoring program includes a support structure for mentees that includes the principal, the mentor coordinator, and the mentor. The handbook describes expectations, roles, and responsibilities for all mentoring participants.
2. A Tier 1 mentor is assigned to a teacher new to the district or new to teaching; a Tier 2 mentor is assigned to a teacher transferring to a new school; and Tier 3 is for a teacher moving to a new position or grade level in the district. The mentor coordinator, curriculum supervisor, or principal selects the appropriate tier for the teacher.
  - a. All mentees are assigned a mentor for one year.
3. Mentees receive an orientation to teachers-to-teachers mentoring during a two-day new teacher program, which includes a description of mentor roles and responsibilities, responsibilities of the mentor coordinator, required documentation, confidentiality guidelines, and mentor/mentee meeting schedule.
  - a. The handbook describes mentor roles and responsibilities for each tier. For example, for Tiers 1 and 2, the mentor observes the mentee in a non-evaluative manner a minimum of two times during the year. Tier 1 mentors and mentees meet weekly for one hour, while Tier 2 mentors and mentees meet bi-weekly. The Tier 3 mentor/mentee relationship is less intensive as the mentor is usually a teacher who has experience in the district; however, monthly meetings are required.
  - b. Mentor coordinators are assigned to prekindergarten through grade 4, grades 5-8, and grades 9-12.
  - c. A review of the district professional development calendar indicated that seven dates are scheduled for mentors and mentees to meet in 2014-2015.
4. Tier 1 mentors receive a stipend of \$1,070, Tier 2 mentors \$750, and Tier 3 mentors \$535. Interviewees said that a training video is used for mentor training and for the most part the district has been able to assign mentors from the same grade level to mentees.
  - a. Mentoring coordinators receive a stipend of \$550.
5. Teachers' association representatives said that the district had implemented a "good" mentoring program.

**Impact:** A well-resourced and organized mentoring program that includes a mission, purpose, and goals builds a supportive environment for both new teachers and teachers moving to new positions in the district. A structured and well-resourced mentoring program helps teachers begin their careers succeeding with support and builds a spirit of collaboration that will improve teacher retention and reduce the cost of consistent turnover. Retaining and supporting teachers also lead to continual improvement in teaching, which will likely lead to improved student achievement.

### ***Student Support***

#### **8. The district has developed and implemented academic and non-academic student support systems PK-12 to enhance the academic and social/emotional progress of students.**

- A.** The district provides student support services to increase literacy and mathematics skills.
  - 1. The district systematically uses the Response to Intervention (RtI) model, which provides student supports necessary for both immediate and long-term academic and social interventions in a consistent and timely manner.
    - a. Tier 1 supports are within the classroom and 40 minutes is allocated for mathematics and reading interventions; exercises are based on students' skill levels. Tier 2 provides specific interventions and strategies, described in the District Curriculum Accommodation Plan (DCAP), to students recommended by the Student Teacher Response Team (START). In Tier 3 (a pre-referral process), remediation, enrichment, and tutors are provided.
  - 2. At the elementary levels, academic and behavioral concerns are referred to and assessed by the Student Teacher Assistance Resource Team (START) to discuss and recommend the appropriate supports. Individual improvement plans are developed for students who need supports.
  - 3. The district has a well-developed DCAP (version 1.3). The DCAP describe numerous elementary, middle, and high school curriculum accommodations and personnel resources to provide support throughout the district. It also includes accommodations and teaching strategies PK-12. Examples of accommodations include ESL support, elementary summer reading programs, and after- school help for all students.

4. There is a summer program for English language learners (ELLs) K-5; a majority of the teachers are ESL certified or have worked with ELLs. There is a focus on literacy and the summer reading list.
  5. At the grades 5-7 middle school, ELLs are clustered by team (three teams per grade). ELLs are placed with teachers who have the SEI endorsement. All grade 8 ELLs are placed together and receive core academic instruction from a teacher who has the SEI endorsement.
  6. Through a partnership with high school students, Project Story Boost is provided to Brookside kindergarten students who have not attended preschool.
  7. Title I and III funds provide reading and mathematics enrichment and remediation in the elementary schools.
  8. Through the family resource center, assessment and supports are provided to provide incoming students the appropriate placement and services needed to experience academic and social success.
    - a. The district provides academic services and testing for children who are two years and six months and diagnosed as learning disabled; eligible children can later attend the Shining Star Early Childhood Center, which is fully funded by the district.
    - b. Kindergartners are screened and tested by special education and ESL teachers in the family resource center for placement in regular classrooms, special education, and ELL programs.
  9. According to information on the district's website, the "Milford Public Schools created the Milestones Program in 2008 to better serve the social and educational needs of children within the Milford Public School system who have the diagnosis of an Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD)." The program allows students with disabilities who might otherwise have to be educated outside of Milford to stay in the district.
  10. The ELL program director has conducted an ELL program evaluation and action plan that is extensive and well thought out. It includes information on assessment, ELL curriculum, professional development, community outreach, teacher support, and parent involvement.
- B.** Milford High School provides supports for students who are struggling to achieve academic success and social inclusion.
1. The RtI model provides direct teacher instruction and students are also supported through the support services included on IEPs and 504 plans. High school staff receives 504 and IEP plans from the middle school, which describe the implemented supports.

2. The high school has a support center for students with disabilities and individual help is also available at the center for students who do not have IEPs. A peer tutoring program enables students to receive academic help from a peer.
3. A Transition Program provides reentry services for students returning from an emotionally based hospitalization.
4. The APEX program enables students to recover credit, and the substantially separate Pathways Program is designed to provide the structures and supports necessary to help students graduate ready for college or career.
5. The high school also houses vocational and pre-vocational programs for students with disabilities to keep them in the district. The program starts at grade 8 and can extend until a student turns 22 years of age. It is a substantially separate program that includes academics and job training.
6. To assist students who have diverse learning styles, many classes at the high school are co-taught by special education and regular teachers or taught in small groups to ELLs, students with disabilities, and regular education students.
7. The high school has a guidance staff and multiple therapeutic staff, such as adjustment counselors, nurses, and a school psychologist, who are available to assist students.

**Impact:** Having access to diverse academic and non-academic supports improves the likelihood that students will have equitable access to all school programs and will graduate from the Milford public schools ready for a career or college. In a diverse community such as Milford with its changing demographics, having programs that provide equity will help narrow achievement gaps and foster a culture of diversity.

### ***Financial and Asset Management***

9. **The district has spent above required net school spending in recent years, and has an organized budget development process, appropriate financial procedures, and good relations with town officials.**
  - A. Local appropriations (actual net school spending) have been consistently above required net school spending in recent years.
    1. The district has been above required net school spending (NSS) by 7 percent to 14 percent from fiscal year 2009 through fiscal year 2013. It is 8 percent above NSS for fiscal year 2014 and is budgeted to be 10.7 percent above NSS for fiscal year 2015. The district has been above foundation budget by 7 percent to 12 percent from fiscal year 2009 through fiscal year 2013.

2. The superintendent expressed the view that the district had good budget relations with the town's finance committee and that budget needs were being met.
  3. The town administrator and town accountant said that the town currently has \$1.9 million in excess levy capacity. In addition, they said that the town has \$16 million in a stabilization fund, which will be used to control the debt service within the levy limit for the Woodland Elementary School project (see the Financial and Asset Management finding below), thus avoiding the need for a debt exclusion vote.
- B.** The district has an organized budget development process and systematically tracks spending and other financial transactions, with the use of efficient accounting technology.
1. The superintendent told the review team that the budget development process starts at the school level with principals receiving input from curriculum team leaders (CTLs) and school councils. Principals said that they received a specific percentage budget allocation and could use it as needed. The costs of new initiatives and new staffing were not included in annual allocations, but required a separate written justification.
  2. The assistant superintendent for business and human resources and two business office staff described the accounting procedures as efficient with proper tracking of financial transactions using a Tyler computer software program. The software is used in all schools for direct input of requisitions, and also in the town accountant's office for direct entry into the town's general ledger. Reports generated for all budget accounts, grants, and revolving accounts are clear and useful, allowing accurate projections for the end-of-year balance.
- C.** The town accountant stated that his office had an excellent relationship with the district business staff and he had confidence that all state-required procurement processes were being followed.

**Impact:** Good accounting practices not only meet the requirements of state regulations (603 CMR 10.03), but also inspire confidence in town officials that the school administration has control over allocated public funds. Cordial relations with finance committee members and other town officials help provide a budget development process in which stakeholders can consider the best ways to provide optimal educational opportunities for students in Milford.

**10. The district has embarked upon the construction of the new Woodland Elementary School.**

- A.** On March 26, 2014, the office of the state treasurer announced that the Massachusetts School Building Authority (MSBA) approved a grant of up to \$28 million, or 59.94 percent of eligible costs, for the construction of a new Woodland Elementary School.
1. The new school will replace the existing Woodland School, built in 1977, which "suffers from deficiencies in major building systems including mechanical, electrical and windows." It will

be built on the athletic field of the current Woodland Elementary School. The current Woodland building will be demolished and a new athletic field built on that location.

2. Groundbreaking for construction of the new school is scheduled for spring 2015 with completion and occupancy scheduled for September 2016.

- B. The opening of the new school will allow for the reorganization of the grade configurations for several schools, which will reduce transitions for students.

**Impact:** The Woodland Elementary School project is underway with approved funding. With groundbreaking scheduled for the spring of 2015, occupancy should take place in September 2016. The opening of the new building and accompanying grade reorganization will have the following results:

- The new structure will greatly improve the learning environment in the school
- The grade reorganization will reduce the number of transitions that students will make between grades 2 and 8, enabling them to spend three years in the Woodland Elementary School and three years in the Stacy Middle School.

## **Challenges and Areas for Growth**

It is important to note that district review reports prioritize identifying challenges and areas for growth in order to promote a cycle of continuous improvement; the report deliberately describes the district's challenges and concerns in greater detail than the strengths identified during the review.

### ***Curriculum and Instruction***

#### **11. The time available for Curriculum Team Leaders to meet and collaborate with teachers in teams or as individuals is extremely limited.**

- A. A great many well-aligned goals in the strategic plan and SIPs involve curriculum and instruction. In addition to the principals and the assistant superintendent for curriculum, instruction, and assessment, the Curriculum Team Leaders (CTLs) are responsible for communication and action steps needed to accomplish many of these goals.
  1. A few examples include: develop aligned curriculum maps and new units modeled after ESE's model units; develop common assessments aligned to state standards; revise standards-based report cards; embed WIDA standards in all curriculum maps and units; create aligned English Language Development curricula for ELL proficiency levels; design lessons and prompts to implement literacy and writing across the curriculum; pilot Edwin Teaching and Learning; support data-driven instruction and RtI; implement and analyze new DDMS; prepare for PARCC; and integrate technology.

- B.** The district has used monthly, day-long curriculum team meetings to improve the ability of CTLs, along with principals, to understand improvement initiatives associated with curriculum and instruction and to support their work with teachers at their schools.
  - 1. Although CTLs can observe teaching, they have no evaluative role or other leverage to directly change teachers' practice. They can best influence improvement by sharing their knowledge and understanding during the time they have to lead and collaborate with teachers.
  
- C.** As full-time teachers, CTLs have limited non-teaching time in their daily schedules to spend with teachers to accomplish district and school goals.
  - 1. Communication about curriculum team meetings is formal and informal and often uncoordinated at the school level because of limited time.
    - a. The assistant superintendent for curriculum, instruction, and assessment emails all faculty and staff about curriculum meeting topics after each meeting.
    - b. Interviewees reported that after each monthly curriculum team meeting CTLs and principals often meet at school to review and prioritize information to share with teachers and to decide who will share it.<sup>4</sup>
    - c. Toward the end of the meeting day, CTLs from both K-2 schools frequently meet to share and to strategize how to implement the meeting's initiatives.
    - d. After the meeting day, CTLs try to check-in or communicate with teachers when possible. This was described as during free periods, in hallways, at lunch, after school, and in grade-level meetings if the CTL shares a grade-level or has coverage. A few specialist CTLs have more flexibility to meet with teachers. At one school, the kindergarten CTL and team have a weekly working lunch.
    - e. Teachers stated that CTLs rarely meet with them about curriculum team meetings, that there is no time, and "everyone is teaching." They said that there might be a meeting if something new takes place, but most communication is by email.
    - f. District leaders reported that CTLs meet every Day 7 and from 12:00 pm to 2:20 pm on district curriculum days to discuss district determined measures (DDMs), curriculum, assessment, and data.
  
  - 2. There was a common acknowledgement among the leadership team that time constraints prevented the curriculum team leaders from disseminating curriculum development information to teachers in an organized way.

---

<sup>4</sup> When curriculum team meetings take place, substitutes cover classes for CTLs.

4. Principals can communicate with teachers in monthly faculty or weekly grade-level or team meetings, in weekly newsletters, or in one-on-one meetings after observations.
  - a. Principals try to attend common planning time meetings for grade-level, team-level, and department collaboration. Meetings take place weekly for K-4, four times in a six-day rotation at the middle schools, and three times in a seven-day rotation at the high school. As full-time teachers, CTLs cannot attend unless they are members of the team that is meeting, have free time, or coverage is secured.
  - b. Most teams and departments meet at different times in several “clusters” since planning time is not common for everyone. High school teachers described department meetings as “meeting in pieces once every seven days.”
5. As stipulated in the teachers’ collective bargaining agreement, after-school meetings in the district take place once a month for an hour.
6. Teachers noted almost no intra-grade or intra-school meetings to develop curriculum or to discuss fidelity of implementation and horizontal or vertical alignment.

**Impact:** The district has created an ambitious agenda for continuous improvement and has attended to improving the ability of CTLs and principals to support that agenda. CTLs cannot address these initiatives well at the classroom level without the time for day-to-day “sit beside” conversations with teachers individually and in groups---to collaborate to renew curriculum, to clarify new programs, and to support new teaching models. Without evaluative leverage to influence changes in practice, CTLs’ leverage comes from the ideas and information they can share and the support they can offer to their teacher colleagues. Without adequate time for CTLs to exert their leadership role, CTLs cannot effectively foster the district’s continuous improvement initiatives.

**12. Several challenges threaten continued progress in curriculum development, organization, management, and implementation, especially insufficient technological support.**

- A. Curriculum documentation is incomplete and the taught curriculum is not fully aligned to the 2011 Massachusetts curriculum frameworks.
  1. Although work began four years ago to develop curriculum maps aligned to the 2011 Massachusetts curriculum frameworks and many are complete, some for key subjects are not.
    - a. In ELA, alignment of the K-2 basal reading series map was described as still in process. A sample grade 1 curriculum outline was a long list of topics and skills. Much curriculum posted on the district website is dated 2009.
    - b. At all levels, most writing prompts and lessons aligned with anchor standards for literacy and writing across the curriculum are incomplete.

- c. In mathematics, the district is using the new K-2 *Everyday Math* series. A curriculum map to ensure alignment to the 2011 Massachusetts Frameworks, which incorporate and go beyond the common core standards, has not been developed because of an absence of time.
  - d. A review of number of science maps showed preliminary alignment to new draft science standards. Anchor standards for literacy and writing are incomplete.
  - e. CTLs, teachers, and leaders also identified the absence in curriculum units of embedded WIDA standards and strategies to support ELLs, and noted that this was on the agenda.
- B.** A review of sample curriculum units and lesson plans in ELA, mathematics, and science from each school level indicated an assortment of formats in use.
- 1. An expectation to include objectives, standards, lesson procedures, resources, and assessments was evident. A few unit plans introduced teaching for understanding components such as enduring ideas and essential questions. Several were units from teachers' manuals, especially in math and science.
- C.** Most curriculum units are retained at the school and available, but not in a systemized way with all leaders and teachers having immediate easy access.
- D.** Curriculum is developed, managed and implemented without adequate technological support or a platform to develop, to manage, and to share the curriculum. The district is currently beginning to address these needs.
- 1. The district does not have an operational web-based curriculum management system to collaboratively develop, store, and share curriculum units and lessons.
  - 2. The use of Edwin Teaching and Learning to create new units was described as "just an idea" with some teachers having been asked to participate in a pilot.
  - 3. Teachers and leaders described instructional technology as underdeveloped. In classroom observations, the use of technology was scant. Classroom technology was often limited to still projections from overhead or digital projectors.
- E.** Expertise is insufficiently shared across roles. The district has developed leaders' knowledge and understanding through curriculum team meetings that improve their ability to lead and guide new initiatives. Yet some teachers find it challenging to develop new curriculum and adopt new instructional practices, mainly because of the limited time to meet with CTLs, as noted above.
- 1. One leader said that CTLs and principals had wonderful training and information about improvement initiatives. She observed that similar opportunities were unavailable to teachers and wished that they could have more such opportunities.

2. The CTLs wrote curriculum maps aligned to the 2011 Massachusetts Frameworks without collaborating with other teachers. This work was mainly accomplished outside the teaching day. Teachers are now developing units and lesson plans aligned to the maps, mostly by themselves.
3. Several teachers agreed that there had not been enough professional development to learn to use the workshop model. They stated they would like to have model lessons followed by discussions of practice.
4. Interviews and classroom observations indicated that some teachers find it difficult to apply basic aspects of the workshop model, such as posting and communicating student-friendly learning objectives for each lesson.
5. Teachers noted that more time is needed to learn the new elementary math series. They said that since they did not know how to teach – or did not have the necessary materials to teach – some new math standards, they focused on prior familiar topics.

**Impact:** Insufficient tools, resources, and supports in the district’s systems and practices slow progress toward realizing the district’s improvement agenda.

### ***Instruction***

**13. Many characteristics of standards-based teaching, which are compatible with the district’s workshop model and tiered system of intervention, were clearly and consistently present in approximately half of observed lessons.**

The team observed 86 classes throughout the district: 30 at the high school, 21 at the middle school level, and 35 at three elementary schools. The team observed 34 ELA/English classes, 28 mathematics classes, 10 science classes, and 14 classes in other subject areas. Among the classes observed were six special education classes, seven ELL classes, and three classes for both ELL and special education. The observations were approximately 20 minutes in length. All review team members collected data using ESE’s instructional inventory, a tool for recording observed characteristics of standards-based teaching. This data is presented in Appendix C.

- A.** The superintendent told the review team that the posting of clear targets and learning objectives aligned to the 2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks is a district priority; however, clear learning objectives aligned to the 2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks (# 8) were clearly and consistently observed in 58 percent of lessons districtwide.
1. Fifty-seven percent of observed elementary classrooms, seventy-one percent of middle school classrooms, and fifty percent of high school classrooms displayed student-friendly learning objectives using content vocabulary that articulated the knowledge, skills, and understandings students should acquire. In some classrooms, the objective may not have been posted, but was clear to observers. Posted examples included:

- a. In a grade 1 ELA lesson, “I can practice my reading strategies for why/cause and what/effect.” In a grade 3 math lesson, “I can compare the value of large numbers and use algorithms to subtract and add large numbers.”
  - b. In a grade 5 science lesson, “I can describe the rock cycle. I can draw and label the rock cycle. I can explain how the three types of rocks form.”
  - c. In most high school lessons, the learning objective was implicit rather than explicit. In a math lesson, a posted objective was “to learn the ‘point-slope’ form and its applications”; in another, “two triangles, two solutions.”
- B.** High expectations and the use of higher-order thinking skills were noted in fewer than half of observed lessons overall.
1. Clear and consistent evidence that lessons reflected rigor and high expectations (#7) was observed in 54 percent of elementary lessons, in 48 percent of middle school lessons, and in 41 percent of high school lessons.
  2. Teachers provided opportunities for students to engage in higher-order thinking such as use of inquiry, exploration, application, analysis, synthesis, and/or evaluation of knowledge or concepts (#11) in 63 percent of elementary lessons. However, this characteristic was observed in 38 percent of middle school lessons and in 28 percent of high school lessons.
    - a. When asked about higher-order thinking in lessons, interviewees stated that they had talked about placing Bloom’s taxonomy in units and relied on teachers to incorporate them, adding that this varied by teacher.
  3. Students elaborated about content and ideas when responding to questions (#20) in 49 percent of observed elementary lessons, in 38 percent of middle school lessons, and in 21 percent of high school lessons. Overall, students articulated their thinking verbally or in writing (#18) in 51 percent of lessons.
  4. Good examples of rigor, high expectations, and higher-order thinking included:
    - a. Preparing to write about “the ironic moment” in a grade 8 ELA lesson, students watched an episode of *The Twilight Zone* and responded to questions on characterization, foreshadowing, conflict, figurative language, mood, and tone.
    - b. In another grade 8 ELA lesson, students, working in pairs, peer-edited their writing drafts using a rubric to compare and contrast elements of fiction (plot, protagonist, antagonist, conflict, tone, and theme) in two texts, one by Haruki Murakami and one by Stephen King.

- c. High school students discussed the Declaration of Independence and concepts of democracy in small groups in a co-taught American history class while the teacher and another adult monitored and checked-in with each group.
  5. Observers found contrasting practices for two similar lessons with the potential to set high expectations. In a grade 8 algebra lesson, students worked in pairs to solve and then to graph linear equations using slope-intercept while the teacher moved from pair to pair discussing and checking their work. In a similar high school algebra lesson, students copied solutions to linear equations as the teacher factored them on the white board. Students usually responded to the teacher's questions with one- or two-word answers.
- C. Observed lessons met only some students' diverse learning needs.**
1. In 50 percent of observed classrooms, the teacher paced the lesson to match content and meet students' learning needs (#14).
    - a. A good practice was observed in a grade 6 ELA lesson. In preparing to write a narrative using relevant details and new vocabulary, students engaged in animated discussions in pairs about a time they had been injured and could refer to a word wall posted with key vocabulary to help them discuss.
  2. Teachers used appropriate modifications for English language learners and students with disabilities such as explicit language objectives, direct vocabulary instruction and differentiation (# 10) in 35 percent of elementary lessons, in 14 percent of middle school lessons, and in 24 percent of high school lessons.
    - a. In a positive example, word walls with pictures supported a math assessment about calculating money in a grade 2 classroom. Students completed differentiated assessments that also required them to explain how they solved the problems. The teacher facilitated the assessment and also helped several students figure out how to do explanations by recalling past class work.
    - b. Students assumed responsibility for their own learning whether individually, in pairs or in groups (# 23) in 55 percent of lessons overall. Often, lessons did not have differentiated strategies, were planned for whole-class instruction, and tuned to the mid-range learner. This precluded students who had mastered the objective from being stretched to the next level. Also, the pace of whole-class lessons often moved too fast for some students.
- D. The availability of multiple resources to meet students learning needs (# 5), especially using technology, was noted clearly and consistently in 42 percent of observed lessons overall.**
1. Multiple resources were clearly and consistently available to meet all students' diverse learning needs in 51 percent of observed elementary lessons, in 26 percent of middle school lessons, and in 40 percent of high school lessons.

2. Review team members particularly noticed the absence of instructional technology as a tool to enhance both teaching and learning. Teachers used available technology to support instruction and enhance learning in 14 percent of observed elementary lessons, in 38 percent of middle school lessons, and in 23 percent of high school lessons. The most common uses were still projections from overhead or digital projectors.
  3. When discussing impediments to student engagement, interviewees named the absence of technology as a key challenge and “a work in progress.”
- E.** In observed classrooms, teachers clearly and consistently conducted frequent formative assessments to check for understanding and inform instruction (#15) in 63 percent of elementary lessons, in 29 percent of middle school lessons, and in 8 percent of high school lessons.
1. Fine examples of formative assessment about rocks were observed in middle school science lessons. In one, students in groups examined and then classified igneous, sedimentary, and metamorphic rocks using a matrix while the teacher circulated to observe, listen, and ask questions and challenge students’ answers. In another, small groups of students demonstrated understanding by dramatizing the formation of one of the three rock types in short “skits,” and then explaining the formation to the class and answering questions from the teacher and other students.
  2. In a language-rich grade 1 ELA lesson on cause and effect in a story, the teacher asked students in a small group to think of something that happened in the story and to tell why it happened, noting that they might have to “infer” why it happened.

**Impact:** Without a more widespread communication of the instructional strategies needed and better implementation of the workshop model, students’ needs will not be well supported in lessons and students will not learn to the best of their ability.

### ***Assessment***

**14. Assessment data is not used strategically in grades 9-12 to make data-driven instructional decisions. The practice of collecting, organizing, and disseminating assessment data at the high school is underused and restricted by limited time for facilitated staff collaboration.**

- A.** The high school has not developed formal procedures, systems, or expectations to use assessment data to modify instruction or to make revisions to the curriculum.
1. Apart from annual reviews of AP, PSAT, and MCAS assessment data, a clear structure is not in place to use all assessment data to modify instruction and make changes to the curriculum.

- a. High school teachers said that MCAS and PSAT data is used to make instructional decisions. How AP data is used depends on the individual teacher.
  - b. Interviewees said that MCAS data comes to the school and administrators and staff spend time analyzing the data to identify gaps in skill sets. Interviewees said that some adjustments to the curriculum have been made and content added to instruction as a result of the analysis.
  - c. Interviewees said that ELL ACCESS scores are reviewed to learn the level and capability of English language learners. Attempts are made to place students with teachers who have taken the Sheltered English Immersion (SEI) Teacher Endorsement course, but some high school teachers have not been able to enroll in the course.
2. Assessment practices vary at the high school. Interviewees said that the school does not have a formal process or protocol to review common mathematics assessment data.
  3. Although it is estimated that 20 to 30 common assessments, including mid-terms and final exams, are administered in both the mathematics and English departments, the results of the common assessments are not aggregated/disaggregated or analyzed formally.
  4. Team members found clear and consistent evidence that teachers frequently used formative assessments to check for understanding and inform instruction (# 15) in 28 percent of the high school classrooms observed.
    - a. Students clearly and consistently elaborated about content and ideas when responding to questions (# 20) in 21 percent of the observed lessons at the high school.
- B.** CTLs, who play a key role in curriculum and assessment practices, are full-time teachers whose collaboration with colleagues is limited (see the Curriculum Challenge finding #11 above).
1. Interviewees said that MCAS, SAT, and PSAT data is disaggregated and provided to CTLs for discussion with teachers.
  2. High school staff stated that limited professional development (PD) had been provided for CTLs to make use of common assessment data.
    - a. Some CTLs reported that they had not received Edwin Analytics training while other CTLs reported having one day of training three or four years ago.
    - b. A review of curriculum committee agendas showed discussion on assessments is included on the agendas. For example, at a meeting of the committee on December 18, 2013, principals and CTLs received PD on writing assessments.

**Impact:** Without systematic aggregation/disaggregation and analysis of classroom-based student assessment data, the high school is unable to monitor and to support the academic progress of its

students in a strategic way. In addition, insufficient data about student performance at the high school constrains school improvement planning and decision-making.

### ***Human Resources and Professional Development***

#### **15. The district has not achieved consistency in the implementation of its new educator evaluation system or in the quality of feedback provided to teachers.**

- A.** Teachers and administrators said that the evaluation process was complex and time consuming and implied that more evaluator capacity was needed to make the evaluations worthwhile.
  - 1. The educator evaluation processes and procedures document ratified by the Milford Teachers' Association in April 2014 states, "The Principal, licensed Assistant Principal, licensed Assistant to the Principal, Shining Star Early Childhood Center Director, Administrator of Special Education, Assistant Superintendent, or Superintendent who carries out *observations* and/or collaborative conferences and synthesizes all data sources in order to write the report" can evaluate educators.
    - a. The superintendent estimated that 16 individuals were allowed to conduct evaluations and said that the most recent version of the agreement between the district and the teachers' association was amended to allow assistants to the principal to evaluate as long as they have principal certification. He also said that he reads all evaluations, which was confirmed by a principal who received feedback from the superintendent.
  - 2. Teachers said that administrators, although they want to do the evaluations, do not have sufficient time to conduct all the evaluations with equal rigor. They said that apart from those of teachers who are struggling, many teachers' evaluations are being done as a formality.
  - 3. Principals said that the evaluation process was a lot of work for evaluators and teachers and they tried to be fair and flexible and validate ratings. They noted that Baseline Edge was difficult to navigate. They also said the process allows them to get into the classrooms more, that teachers are more self-reflective, and the rubric has helped guide everyone in the process. They also said the educator evaluation rubric "tells teachers what we're looking for." Interestingly, they noted that "outstanding" teachers are more critical of themselves on the self-assessment.
- B.** The district submitted a DDMs implementation plan to ESE's Center for Educator Effectiveness in June 2014; the Plan noted that the district was in the process of discussing measures identified by faculty and CTLs.

1. The plan includes DDMs for teachers, administrators, and specialized instructional personnel such as nurses and psychologists. The district DDMs implementation plan indicated DDMs will be implemented in 2014-2015 for all educators.
    - a. The superintendent said that educators submitted DDMs to the assistant superintendent for curriculum, instruction, and assessment. Educators are using state assessments as well as commercial and “home grown” DDMs. The assistant superintendent meets with CTLs monthly and part of the agenda includes discussion on the development of DDMs growth standards. Specialists, such as art, music, and physical education teachers, are just beginning to develop DDMs.
    - b. Teachers said that DDMs training was top-down and limited and some DDMs are not valid because of the variables that have an impact on testing. They said that more face-to-face communication about DDMs was needed in the district.
    - c. The team observed a teacher in the high school using an Algebra II DDM assessment. The teacher told the observer that the mathematics teachers using the assessment would meet to discuss how future Algebra II DDMs would be used to measure low, moderate, and high growth.
  2. At a curriculum committee meeting held on October 28, 2013, the district showed a PowerPoint presentation on DDMs, which included information on student impact regulations, definitions of growth and strategies to identify possible DDMs.
  3. At a December 18, 2013 curriculum committee meeting more DDM discussion took place with curriculum team leaders and principals regarding the development of DDMs. According to the agenda, after the completion of the morning sessions, CTLs went back to the schools to discuss DDMs with staff.
  4. The district has hired a technology integration specialist to develop a DDM data collection and management tool.
- C.** The review team reviewed seven personnel files of administrators and 20 personnel files of teachers.<sup>5</sup> The team also reviewed the most recent summative evaluation of the superintendent by the school committee.
1. All files reviewed in Baseline Edge contained self-assessments, goals setting documents, and multiple observations and formative or summative evaluations. The frequency of the observations, formative and summative evaluation depended on the educators’ evaluation plan.
    - a. The team reviewed evaluations of seven teachers on developing educator plans and 13 teachers in year 1 or 2 of two-year self-directed growth plans.

---

<sup>5</sup> Because of an inconsistent Internet connection, the team reviewed some evaluations in personnel files and some in Baseline Edge. For the most part, personnel files only contained summative evaluations.

2. Most of the evaluations were informative and included general observations about goals or an account of educator skills and accomplishments. Approximately 50 percent of observations and formative and summative evaluations did not include recommendations on using innovative techniques or ideas on how to improve professional growth. Many evaluators suggested that the educators continue what they were doing or commented that they were doing a good job.
  - a. The observations and formative and summative evaluations of developing educators generally contained more specific feedback for improvement.
  - b. Most documents were signed appropriately and two files reviewed were absent most documentation.
    - i. The superintendent said that the district worked with a vendor on the calibration of evaluations.
    - ii. The superintendent told the review team that the evaluation sub-committee reviews the evaluation process monthly.
    - iii. The superintendent said the Strategic Plan is framed by factors included in the evaluation tool to attain alignment between the Strategic Plan and the SIPs.

**Impact:** Unless the district is able to provide needed and ongoing support structures for educators, evaluators will not consistently include feedback necessary to promote professional growth and continuous and comprehensive improvements in instructional strategies and academic progress for all students are unlikely to take place.

### ***Student Support***

#### **16. The district does not have a comprehensive plan to meet the challenge of working effectively with a diverse student body, including its growing numbers of English language learners.**

- A. According to ESE data, while total enrollment in the district increased by 1.5 percent between 2010 and 2014, the proportion of students in special populations increased more during that period.
  1. The proportion of English language learners (ELLs) increased by 63 percent (from 227 to 369), students from low-income families by 24 percent (from 1079 to 1334), students with disabilities by 12 percent (from 619 to 692), and students whose first language is not English by 20 percent (from 699 to 839).
  2. In the 2013-2014 school year ELLs made up 8.8 percent of enrollment. In the 2014-2015 school year they make up 10.2 percent of enrollment.
  3. The racial and ethnic demographics of the student population have changed since 2010. The proportion of Hispanic/Latino students increased from 14 percent of the population in 2010

- to 20 percent in 2014. Between 2010 and 2014 the proportion of African American/black students increased from 2 percent to 3 percent of the population, and that of white students decreased from 78 percent to 70 percent of the population. The proportion of Asian students remained about 3 percent during these years.
4. Some ELLs at the high school are students with interrupted formal education.
  5. School committee members interviewed recognize the demographics of the community are changing and the ELL population is growing. They stressed Milford has always been a community with large immigrant populations and is committed to educating all students.
- B.** In 2014, the district reached its targets toward narrowing proficiency gaps only for the Asian subgroup of students.
- C.** In observed classes, modifications and strategies for teaching the district's ELLs and students with disabilities were not consistently in evidence.
1. The review team found clear and consistent evidence that teachers used appropriate modifications for ELLs and students with disabilities such as explicit language objectives and direct instruction in vocabulary (#10) in 35 percent of elementary school observations, in 14 percent of middle school observations, and in 24 percent of high school observations.
- D.** According to ESE staffing information, in 2014 the district had 11.4 teachers of ELLs, a decrease of 2 from 2012. During the same time, the number of ELLs has increased substantially, from 273 to 369 students.
1. The district website lists 20 staff members who provide instruction to ELLs. The English Language Learner program director told the team that the district has 448 ELL students in 2014-2015, approximately 10 percent of the district enrollment. The largest proportion of ELLs is at the K-2 level.
  2. Principals and central office administrators told the team that the district is short staffed in ELL. They said that classroom observations are used to monitor the implementation of SEI techniques.
- E.** Recognizing the need for more teachers for ELLs, the district has reallocated resources to provide ELL training to current teachers to become dually certified in ESL. Administrators told the review team that the district paid for six teachers to take a summer course at Framingham State College to prepare for the ESL licensure test. Approximately 78 of the over 300 teachers in the district have received RETELL training. All administrators have been trained. Many teachers cannot enroll in the SEI course because of enrollment caps.
1. Some teachers said that they were not prepared to provide instruction to ELLs.

- F. ESL teachers K-4 do not attend common planning time meetings because of scheduling and time restrictions. Attendance of special education and ELL teachers at these meetings at other levels varies.

**Impact:** While student support services are in place across the district, the absence of a staffing and programming strategy to support the district's increasingly diverse population, especially its growing numbers of ELLs, means that the district cannot ensure access to appropriate supports for all students.

### ***Financial and Asset Management***

**17. The district does not have a transparent budget document that provides information to the public on details of district funding sources, including the approved school committee operating budget, grants and revolving accounts, and municipal expenditures in support of the schools.**

- A. While the business office's computerized printouts show the budget and expenditure status of the chart of accounts, there is no document showing the following: detailed budget and expenditure line items for each school and the central office; all funding sources, including grants and revolving accounts; and a summary of budget and expenditure trends over several years.
- B. There is no document with narratives explaining how budget program appropriations are connected to district goals.
- C. There is no executive summary of the budget explaining changes in the budget and how the proposed budget is directed at meeting the district's goals. There is no handout available for members of the public attending the public hearing on the budget, nor is there an electronic version on the school district's website.

**Impact:** Without a transparent budget document, the district's ability to effectively communicate how expenditures address the district's goals is severely compromised. Without program narratives, it is difficult for the public or elected officials to understand why individual programs cost what they do. Without an executive summary, the rationale for trends in the budget from one year to the next is harder to grasp.

# Milford Public Schools District Review Recommendations

---

## ***Curriculum and Instruction***

### **1. The district should develop organizational strategies to help CTLs more effectively fulfill their leadership role and responsibilities, including collaborative time with teachers.**

**A.** The district should ensure that CTLs and teachers have adequate time to:

- share knowledge and expertise in collaborative meetings;
- further develop, refine, and align curriculum units and lessons;
- embed WIDA standards and strategies into curriculum;
- discuss and ensure horizontal alignment;
- prepare common formative and summative assessments; and
- analyze and discuss assessment data.

**Recommended resource:**

The *PLC Expansion Project* website (<http://plcexpansionproject.weebly.com/>) is designed to support schools and districts in their efforts to establish and sustain cultures that promote Professional Learning Communities.

**Benefits** for implementing this recommendation include more effective collaboration between CTLs and teachers in fostering continuous improvement in the district, horizontal and vertical alignment of the curriculum, and fidelity of implementation of curriculum and instruction across the district.

### **2. The district should provide the necessary resources, supports, and tools to support curriculum development, sharing, and management.**

- A.** The district should communicate to teachers the plan for completing the curriculum.
- B.** The district should carry out its plan to continue developing DDMs.
- C.** The district is encouraged to continue referencing ESE's Model Curriculum Units to identify essential components of a comprehensive curriculum and to support teachers as they translate their curricula into instructional practice.
- D.** WIDA standards should be integrated into the district's curriculum.
- E.** The district should continue its efforts to use ESE's Edwin Teaching and Learning platform to develop, share, and manage curriculum units and lessons starting with its pilot this year.

1. Assuming the pilot succeeds, the district should consider offering professional development (perhaps during the summer) on how to use Edwin.
- F. The district should ensure the availability and application of technology-based organizational tools to support curriculum development, sharing, and management.
1. The district should consider developing a multi-year technology plan to add more up-to-date educational technology such as interactive whiteboards and other technological tools to enhance teaching and learning.
  2. The technology plan should include strategies to train teachers and leaders on effective practices related to the use of technology in classrooms, for both students and teachers.

**Recommended resources:**

- ESE's *Common Core State Standards Initiative* web page (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/commoncore/>) includes links to several resources designed to support the transition to the 2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks, which incorporate the Common Core.
- *Creating Curriculum Units at the Local Level* ([http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/model/mcu\\_guide.pdf](http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/model/mcu_guide.pdf)) is a guidance document that can serve as a resource for professional study groups, as a reference for anyone wanting to engage in curriculum development, or simply as a way to gain a better understanding of the process used to develop Massachusetts' Model Curriculum Units.
- *Creating Model Curriculum Units* (<http://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLTuqmiQ9ssquWrLjKc9h5h2cSpDVZqe6t>) is a series of videos that captures the collaboration and deep thinking by curriculum design teams over the course of a full year as they worked to develop Massachusetts' Model Curriculum Units. The series includes videos about developing essential questions, establishing goals, creating embedded performance assessments, designing lesson plans, selecting high-quality materials, and evaluating the curriculum unit.
- *Model Curriculum Units* ([http://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLTuqmiQ9ssquvX\\_Yjra4nBfqQPwc4auUBu](http://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLTuqmiQ9ssquvX_Yjra4nBfqQPwc4auUBu)) is a video series that shows examples of the implementation of Massachusetts' Model Curriculum Units.
- The Model Curriculum Unit and Lesson Plan Template (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/model/MCUtemplate.pdf>) includes Understanding by Design elements. It could be useful for curriculum development and revision.
- ESE's *Quality Review Rubrics* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/model/rubrics/>) can support the analysis and improvement of curriculum units.

- The *World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) English Language Development Standards Implementation Guide (Part I)* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/ell/wida/Guidance-p1.pdf>) provides general information about the WIDA ELD standards framework, expectations for district implementation, and available support.
- The *Edwin Analytics* web page (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edwin/analytics/>) includes links to a Getting Started Guide, as well as a video tutorial series.

**Benefits** from implementing this recommendation include consistent use, alignment, and effective delivery of the district’s curriculum.

**3. The district should ensure that the high quality, rigorous, standards-based, student-centered teaching and learning strategies of its instructional model are communicated to all teachers, and should support teachers in implementing the model.**

- A.** To support teachers in implementing the workshop model, district administrators should develop a plan for sharing instructional expectations with staff.
  1. The district is encouraged to share ideas and strategies from the workshop model.
  2. The administrative team is also encouraged to conduct non-evaluative walkthroughs in pairs or small groups, to generalize and share feedback about trends observed, and to discuss improvement strategies regularly with teachers.
- B.** Teachers should be provided with appropriate guidance and feedback as they implement the model.
  1. Professional development should focus on the elements of the model.
  2. Principals, as instructional leaders, should ensure that teachers have the information and support necessary to meet the district’s expectations for instruction.
  3. Teachers should receive frequent, instructive feedback that helps them to improve instruction.
- C.** The district should continue to provide ample opportunities for RETELL training.

**Recommended resources:**

- ESE’s *Learning Walkthrough Implementation Guide* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/dart/walk/ImplementationGuide.pdf>) is a resource to support instructional leaders in establishing a *Learning Walkthrough* process in a school or district. It is designed to provide guidance to those working in an established culture of collaboration as well as those who are just beginning to observe classrooms and discuss teaching and learning in a focused and actionable manner.

- Appendix 4, *Characteristics of Standards-Based Teaching and Learning: Continuum of Practice* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/dart/walk/04.0.pdf>) is a framework that provides a common language or reference point for looking at teaching and learning.
- *Characteristics of a Standards-Based K-12 Science and Technology/Engineering Classroom* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/STEM/Standards-BasedClassroom.pdf>) and *Characteristics of a Standards-Based Mathematics Classroom* ([http://www.doe.mass.edu/STEM/news07/mathclass\\_char.pdf](http://www.doe.mass.edu/STEM/news07/mathclass_char.pdf)) are references for instructional planning and observation, intended to support activities that advance standards-based educational practice, including formal study, dialogue and discussion, classroom observations, and other professional development activities.

**Benefits** from implementing this recommendation include clear and articulated expectations for administrators and teachers for what constitutes effective instruction. This will provide a common language that will facilitate more focused feedback and professional development. A district that prioritizes high-quality instruction for all students creates and sustains a culture of continuous improvement, resulting in professional growth and increased student achievement.

### ***Assessment***

- 4. The district should collaborate with the high school to develop policies, structures, and practices needed for the continuous collection, analysis, and dissemination of student performance and other data.**
  - A.** The district and the high school should create a structured system of collecting, analyzing, and disseminating all student assessment data.
    1. This should include specific strategies, timelines, and clear expectations for all grade levels and subject areas across the school.
  - B.** Milford High School should use a comprehensive, coordinated, and balanced system of formative, summative, and benchmark assessments, both standardized and locally developed.
    1. In addition to traditional end of unit, quarter, and semester exams, the high school's assessment schedule should include formative assessments such as non-graded unit pre-tests and ongoing checks for understanding during lessons.
  - C.** This unified assessment system should give educators the ability to continuously generate, communicate, and analyze student achievement data, to monitor ongoing progress, to inform instruction, to identify needed interventions, to accurately measure the academic achievement of every student, and to inform ongoing curriculum revision.

1. The data system should provide professional staff with convenient, real-time access to student performance data, as well as to other relevant academic and demographic data, as appropriate.
- D. All staff should receive targeted and ongoing professional development in the development of valid and reliable student assessments, including DDMs.
  1. The high school, in collaboration with the district, should develop structured time for CTLs to meet with teachers to discuss assessment results and instructional strategies.
- E. District and school leaders should systematically review and incorporate student assessment results and other pertinent data into all aspects of policy, prioritization, and decision making including budget development, district and school improvement plans, and the evaluation of programs and services.

**Recommended resource:**

- ESE's *District Data Team Toolkit* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/ucd/ddtt/toolkit.pdf>) provides a set of resources to help a district establish, grow, and maintain a culture of inquiry and data use through a district data team.

**Benefits:** Systematic use of data will strengthen teaching and learning and school-level planning. It will also enable Milford High School to determine the effectiveness of programs and efficiently target its resources. Use of data as evidence can also aid in the presentation of the school's budget, making clear the reasons for emerging budget priorities.

### ***Human Resources and Professional Development***

5. **The district should develop policies and practices to effectively promote the culture of growth oriented collaborative supervision and evidence-based evaluation that is the goal of the MA Educator Evaluation Framework.**
  - A. The district, in collaboration with the Milford Teachers' Association, should review its current supervisory policies, practices, and expectations to ensure that needed and ongoing support structures for educators are in place.
  - B. The district should schedule professional development in school year 2015-2016 to retrain educators in the use and purpose of educator evaluation, including the development of meaningful and instructive feedback loops. According to the strategic plan, this professional development is not scheduled until school year 2016-2017.
    1. The sub-committee on evaluation should take stock of the current educator evaluation system to identify ways to make the evidence collection process less burdensome and more meaningful for educators and the observation and feedback process more efficient and

effective. The sub-committee is encouraged to contact ESE's Center for Educator Effectiveness for assistance identifying districts that have successfully streamlined this work. To inform the professional development needs of teachers and evaluators, the sub-committee on evaluation should continue to make recommendations to the district's professional development committee for inclusion on the professional development calendar.

2. The district should reallocate resources to provide ongoing professional development to evaluators to ensure the consistency of evaluator expectations and improve the quality of observations and feedback, as well as formative and summative evaluations.
  - a. The district should develop, as a form of the current central office walkthrough process, an evaluator peer observation process.

**Recommended resources:**

- **Quick Reference Guide: Educator Evaluation & Professional Development:** Describes how educator evaluation and professional development can be used as mutually reinforcing systems to improve educator practice and student outcomes.  
(<http://www.doe.mass.edu/eval/resources/QRG-ProfessionalDevelopment.pdf>)
- **Implementation Briefs** (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/eval/ddm/briefs.html>): designed to provide targeted guidance focused on timely questions around the implementation of District Determined Measures and Student Impact Ratings.

**Benefits:** Increased time, training, and capacity will likely lead to observations, feedback, and evaluations that promote professional growth and improve student achievement.

***Student Support***

6. **The district should develop a staffing and programming plan to support its diverse student body, particularly its growing number of English language learners.**
  - A. The superintendent, in collaboration with his core administrative team and principals, should develop a plan to engage, educate, and train all staff to work effectively with its increasingly diverse population.
    1. The district should analyze subgroup enrollment and assessment data at each school and strategically allocate staff and programming resources based on the analysis. Additionally, principals should use this data when developing school improvement plans.
  - B. The district should implement a recruitment strategy to diversify district staff and to recruit educators qualified to meet the needs of the student population.

1. Human resource staff should attend job fairs to attract certified ELL and special education teachers and teachers who have the SEI Teacher Endorsement.
- C. The district should continue to provide resources for teachers to support all students.
1. The ELL program director should provide or coordinate targeted professional development beyond the SEI Endorsement course that is focused on strategies for teaching ELLs.
    - a. Professional development should include a focus on supports for students with interrupted formal education.
- D. Scheduled time should be allocated at all levels for special education and ELL teachers to attend common planning time meetings.

**Recommended resources:**

- ESE's *RETELL: Extending the Learning* web page (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/retell/courses.html>) provides a registry of SEI-related courses which have been reviewed and approved by the Department's Office of English Language Acquisition and Academic Achievement. These courses provide opportunities for educators to extend their learning and practice beyond the Sheltered English Instruction (SEI) Endorsement course.
- *Transitional Guidance on Identification, Assessment, Placement, and Reclassification of English Language Learners* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/ell/TransitionalGuidance.pdf>) provides guidelines for using the results of the ACCESS for ELLs assessment to make instructional decisions to support ELLs.

**Benefits:** The development of a plan to allocate staff and programs based on enrollment and assessment data will result in the efficient allocation of resources to students and schools. Allocating revenue to where it is most needed will provide the best educational return on the district's investment.

Ensuring that all staff receive targeted PD to learn teaching strategies for subgroup populations, particularly ELLs, will likely lead to improved student achievement for subgroups. Teachers will also gain a renewed confidence in providing instruction to diverse populations.

***Financial and Asset Management***

7. **The district should develop a comprehensive and transparent budget document to present to the school committee and the public.**
  - A. The administration should look to outside guidance such as the Massachusetts Association of School Business Officials (MASBO) for examples of transparent budget documents used in other districts.

- B.** The budget document should be divided by programs or schools with details on staffing and program funding; changes in program, staffing, and budget accounts for the current year; and actual expenditures from the previous year.
1. Every program or school page should have a narrative explaining how the program or school supports student learning and the district's goals.
  2. The document should include proposed funding for any new initiatives to address the district's goals.
- C.** The budget document should include descriptions of funding from revenue sources other than the approved operational budget, such as:
1. All state and federal grants. If the amounts for the next year are not yet approved, then the current year amounts and usage should be listed with the explanation that it is assumed that these grants will be at least level-funded for the next year. The grants should cross-reference which programs are supported by these supplemental revenues.
  2. All revolving accounts. The balance sheet for every revolving account should show the previous fiscal year opening balance, the revenues and expenditures for that year, and the closing balance, which becomes the opening balance for the next year.
- D.** The budget document should include descriptions of the capital needs of the school district, listing which of these are proposed to be funded in the next fiscal year as part of the capital plan.
- E.** The superintendent should prepare for the public hearing or for any public presentation an executive summary demonstrating major trends in the proposed budget from previous years and new initiatives.

**Recommended resource:**

- *Smart School Budgeting*: The Rennie Center's summary of existing resources on school finance, budgeting, and reallocation.

Overview: [http://www.renniecenter.org/topics/smart\\_school\\_budgeting.html](http://www.renniecenter.org/topics/smart_school_budgeting.html)

Direct link: <http://www.renniecenter.org/research/SmartSchoolBudgeting.pdf>

**Benefits** from implementing this recommendation include enabling the school committee and the public to better understand the details of the proposed budget and supplemental revenues and how they support student learning and the educational needs of the school district. Budget information in the public domain will also help explain supplemental budget requests, if appropriate.

## Appendix A: Review Team, Activities, Schedule, Site Visit

---

### Review Team Members

The review was conducted from December 1-4, 2014, by the following team of independent ESE consultants.

1. Dr. Owen Conway, leadership and governance
2. Dr. Linda Greyser, curriculum and instruction
3. Dr. Peter McGinn, assessment
4. James L. Hearn, *review team coordinator*, human resources and professional development
5. Dr. Kahris McLaughlin, student support
6. Dr. Gerald Missal, financial and asset management

### District Review Activities

The following activities were conducted during the review:

The team conducted interviews with the following financial personnel: assistant superintendent for business and human resources, payroll and accounts payable staff, chair of the board of selectmen, town administrator, town accountant, and chair of the town finance committee.

The team conducted interviews with the following members of the school committee: vice chair, member.

The review team conducted interviews with the following representatives of the teachers' association: president and vice-president.

The team conducted interviews/focus groups with the following central office administrators: superintendent; assistant superintendent for curriculum, instruction, and assessment; assistant superintendent for business and human resources; director of special education; assistant director of special education; English Language Learner program director; Title I director; and family resource center manager.

The team visited the following schools: Milford High School (grades 9-12), Stacy Middle School (grades 5-7), Middle School East (grade 8), Woodland School (grades 3-4), Memorial School (K-2), and Brookside School (K-2).

During school visits, the team conducted interviews with 7 principals and focus groups with 4 elementary school teachers and 10 high school teachers.

The team observed 86 classes in the district: 30 at the high school, 20 at the 2 middle schools, and 35 at three elementary schools.

The review team analyzed multiple data sets and reviewed numerous documents before and during the site visit, including:

- Student and school performance data, including achievement and growth, enrollment, graduation, dropout, retention, suspension, and attendance rates.
- Data on the district’s staffing and finances.
- Published educational reports on the district by ESE, the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC), and the former Office of Educational Quality and Accountability (EQA).
- District documents such as district and school improvement plans, school committee policies, curriculum documents, summaries of student assessments, job descriptions, collective bargaining agreements, evaluation tools for staff, handbooks, school schedules, and the district’s end-of-year financial reports.
- All completed program and administrator evaluations, and a random selection of completed teacher evaluations.

**Site Visit Schedule**

<b>Monday</b>	<b>Tuesday</b>	<b>Wednesday</b>	<b>Thursday</b>
12/1/2014	12/2/2014	12/3/2014	12/4/2014
Orientation with district leaders and principals; interviews with district staff and principals; document reviews; interview with teachers’ association; and visits to Milford High School for classroom observations.	Interviews with district staff and principals; review of personnel files; teacher focus groups; parent focus group; and visits to schools for classroom observations.	Interviews with town or city personnel; interviews with school leaders; interviews with school committee members; visits to schools for classroom observations.	Interviews with school leaders; follow-up interviews; district review team meeting; visits to schools for classroom observations; emerging themes meeting with district leaders and principals.

## Appendix B: Enrollment, Performance, Expenditures

**Table B1a: Milford Public Schools  
2013-2014 Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity**

Student Group	District	Percent of Total	State	Percent of Total
African-American	115	2.7%	82990	8.7%
Asian	119	2.8%	58455	6.1%
Hispanic	829	19.8%	162647	17.0%
Native American	72	1.7%	2209	0.2%
White	2937	70.2%	620628	64.9%
Native Hawaiian	3	0.1%	1007	0.1%
Multi-Race, Non-Hispanic	107	2.6%	27803	2.9%
<b>All Students</b>	<b>4182</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>955739</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Note: As of October 1, 2013

**Table B1b: Milford Public Schools  
2013-2014 Student Enrollment by High Needs Populations**

Student Groups	District			State		
	N	Percent of High Needs	Percent of District	N	Percent of High Needs	Percent of State
Students w/ disabilities	692	39.0%	16.5%	164336	36.0%	17.2%
Low Income	1334	75.1%	31.9%	365885	80.1%	38.3%
ELLs and Former ELLs	369	20.8%	8.8%	75947	16.6%	7.9%
All high needs students	1776	100.0%	42.5%	456639	100.0%	47.8%

Notes: As of October 1, 2013. District and state numbers and percentages for students with disabilities and high needs students are calculated including students in out-of-district placements. Total district enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 4,228; total state enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 965,602.

**Table B2a: Milford Public Schools  
English Language Arts Performance, 2011-2014**

Grade and Measure		Number Included (2014)	Spring MCAS Year					Gains and Declines	
			2011	2012	2013	2014	State 2014	4-Year Trend	2 Year Trend
3	CPI	343	86.1	83.6	80.5	83.2	82.6	-2.9	2.7
	P+	343	64.0%	58.0%	47.0%	58.0%	57.0%	-6.0%	11.0%
4	CPI	305	76.7	85	76	75.7	79.1	-1	-0.3
	P+	305	48.0%	61.0%	48.0%	44.0%	54.0%	-4.0%	-4.0%
	SGP	278	50	51	38	45	49	-5	7
5	CPI	313	89.3	83.3	89.4	85.5	84.5	-3.8	-3.9
	P+	313	72.0%	60.0%	74.0%	65.0%	64.0%	-7.0%	-9.0%
	SGP	295	55	56	65	65	50	10	0
6	CPI	319	89.9	90.6	89.5	92.3	85.8	2.4	2.8
	P+	319	74.0%	76.0%	75.0%	82.0%	68.0%	8.0%	7.0%
	SGP	299	63.5	65	70	73	50	9.5	3
7	CPI	325	93.4	93.2	93.5	90.8	88.3	-2.6	-2.7
	P+	325	83.0%	81.0%	82.0%	79.0%	72.0%	-4.0%	-3.0%
	SGP	305	65	54	61	68	50	3	7
8	CPI	312	91.4	94.5	94.6	93.6	90.2	2.2	-1
	P+	312	80.0%	88.0%	85.0%	86.0%	79.0%	6.0%	1.0%
	SGP	291	55	58	55	56	50	1	1
10	CPI	264	94.8	97.5	97.2	97.3	96	2.5	0.1
	P+	264	87.0%	90.0%	91.0%	94.0%	90.0%	7.0%	3.0%
	SGP	240	46	47	48	47	50	1	-1
All	CPI	2181	88.7	89.6	88.5	88.1	86.7	-0.6	-0.4
	P+	2181	72.0%	73.0%	71.0%	72.0%	69.0%	0.0%	1.0%
	SGP	1708	55	55	55	59	50	4	4

Notes: The number of students included in CPI and percent *Proficient* or *Advanced* (P+) calculations may differ from the number of students included in median SGP calculations. A median SGP is not calculated for students in grade 3 because they are participating in MCAS tests for the first time.

**Table B2b: Milford Public Schools  
Mathematics Performance, 2011-2014**

Grade and Measure		Number Included (2014)	Spring MCAS Year					Gains and Declines	
			2011	2012	2013	2014	State 2014	4-Year Trend	2 Year Trend
3	CPI	343	86.9	77.9	82.1	83.4	85.1	-3.5	1.3
	P+	343	70.0%	58.0%	63.0%	66.0%	68.0%	-4.0%	3.0%
4	CPI	306	78	84.8	76.3	76.6	79.6	-1.4	0.3
	P+	306	46.0%	60.0%	46.0%	44.0%	52.0%	-2.0%	-2.0%
	SGP	280	48	59	47	46	50	-2	-1
5	CPI	313	80.6	77.9	78.3	73.5	80.4	-7.1	-4.8
	P+	313	59.0%	54.0%	55.0%	48.0%	61.0%	-11.0%	-7.0%
	SGP	293	42	40	38	38	50	-4	0
6	CPI	320	82.9	83.7	85.9	84.5	80.2	1.6	-1.4
	P+	320	62.0%	63.0%	68.0%	67.0%	60.0%	5.0%	-1.0%
	SGP	294	52	54	60	67.5	50	15.5	7.5
7	CPI	326	83.3	84.7	81.3	79.6	72.5	-3.7	-1.7
	P+	326	63.0%	63.0%	60.0%	58.0%	50.0%	-5.0%	-2.0%
	SGP	305	73.5	72.5	63	64	50	-9.5	1
8	CPI	314	72.6	79.4	83.1	77.6	74.7	5	-5.5
	P+	314	51.0%	57.0%	66.0%	54.0%	52.0%	3.0%	-12.0%
	SGP	291	54	53	54	38	50	-16	-16
10	CPI	267	93.2	93.2	90	91.5	90	-1.7	1.5
	P+	267	83.0%	82.0%	79.0%	82.0%	79.0%	-1.0%	3.0%
	SGP	244	52	47.5	42	33	50	-19	-9
All	CPI	2189	82.2	82.9	82.3	80.8	80.3	-1.4	-1.5
	P+	2189	61.0%	62.0%	62.0%	60.0%	60.0%	-1.0%	-2.0%
	SGP	1707	53	54	52	48	50	-5	-4

Notes: The number of students included in CPI and percent *Proficient* or *Advanced* (P+) calculations may differ from the number of students included in median SGP calculations. A median SGP is not calculated for students in grade 3 because they are participating in MCAS tests for the first time.

**Table B2c: Milford Public Schools  
Science and Technology/Engineering Performance, 2011-2014**

Grade and Measure		Number Included (2014)	Spring MCAS Year					Gains and Declines	
			2011	2012	2013	2014	State 2014	4-Year Trend	2 Year Trend
5	CPI	313	83.3	84.5	90.1	81.2	79	-2.1	-8.9
	P+	313	57.0%	63.0%	72.0%	55.0%	53.0%	-2.0%	-17.0%
8	CPI	313	75	75.3	78.3	80.1	72.4	5.1	1.8
	P+	313	44.0%	46.0%	50.0%	51.0%	42.0%	7.0%	1.0%
10	CPI	247	90.1	89	87.8	89.6	87.9	-0.5	1.8
	P+	247	72.0%	70.0%	70.0%	74.0%	71.0%	2.0%	4.0%
All	CPI	873	82.3	82.5	85.3	83.2	79.6	0.9	-2.1
	P+	873	57.0%	59.0%	64.0%	59.0%	55.0%	2.0%	-5.0%

Notes: P+ = percent *Proficient* or *Advanced*. Students participate in STE MCAS tests in grades 5, 8, and 10 only. Median SGPs are not calculated for STE.

**Table B3a: Milford Public Schools  
English Language Arts (All Grades)  
Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2011-2014**

Group and Measure		Number Included (2014)	Spring MCAS Year				Gains and Declines		
			2011	2012	2013	2014	4 Year Trend	2-Year Trend	
High Needs	District	CPI	946	77.5	80.2	78.6	77.7	0.2	-0.9
		P+	946	48.0%	51.0%	50.0%	51.0%	3.0%	1.0%
		SGP	681	53	52	50	54	1	4
	State	CPI	241069	77	76.5	76.8	77.1	0.1	0.3
		P+	241069	48.0%	48.0%	48.0%	50.0%	2.0%	2.0%
		SGP	183766	46	46	47	47	1	0
Low Income	District	CPI	710	80	82	81.3	80.4	0.4	-0.9
		P+	710	53.0%	56.0%	56.0%	56.0%	3.0%	0.0%
		SGP	510	55	53	50	57	2	7
	State	CPI	189662	77.1	76.7	77.2	77.5	0.4	0.3
		P+	189662	49.0%	50.0%	50.0%	51.0%	2.0%	1.0%
		SGP	145621	46	45	47	47	1	0
Students w/ disabilities	District	CPI	396	65.8	70.3	66.2	65	-0.8	-1.2
		P+	396	27.0%	31.0%	27.0%	30.0%	3.0%	3.0%
		SGP	277	50	53	50	46	-4	-4
	State	CPI	90777	68.3	67.3	66.8	66.6	-1.7	-0.2
		P+	90777	30.0%	31.0%	30.0%	31.0%	1.0%	1.0%
		SGP	66688	42	43	43	43	1	0
English language learners or Former ELLs	District	CPI	183	68.9	69.2	70.8	67.1	-1.8	-3.7
		P+	183	31.0%	34.0%	35.0%	30.0%	-1.0%	-5.0%
		SGP	96	55.5	55	50	58	2.5	8
	State	CPI	47477	66.2	66.2	67.4	67.8	1.6	0.4
		P+	47477	33.0%	34.0%	35.0%	36.0%	3.0%	1.0%
		SGP	32239	50	51	53	54	4	1
All students	District	CPI	2181	88.7	89.6	88.5	88.1	-0.6	-0.4
		P+	2181	72.0%	73.0%	71.0%	72.0%	0.0%	1.0%
		SGP	1708	55	55	55	59	4	4
	State	CPI	488744	87.2	86.7	86.8	86.7	-0.5	-0.1
		P+	488744	69.0%	69.0%	69.0%	69.0%	0.0%	0.0%
		SGP	390904	50	50	51	50	0	-1

Notes: The number of students included in CPI and percent *Proficient* or *Advanced* (P+) calculations may differ from the number of students included in median SGP calculation. State figures are provided for comparison purposes only and do not represent the standard that a particular group is expected to meet.

**Table B3b: Milford Public Schools  
Mathematics (All Grades)  
Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2011-2014**

Group and Measure		Number Included (2014)	Spring MCAS Year				Gains and Declines		
			2011	2012	2013	2014	4 Year Trend	2-Year Trend	
High Needs	District	CPI	952	67.9	69.8	69	66.8	-1.1	-2.2
		P+	952	36.0%	38.0%	38.0%	37.0%	1.0%	-1.0%
		SGP	677	49	52	50	45	-4	-5
	State	CPI	241896	67.1	67	68.6	68.4	1.3	-0.2
		P+	241896	37.0%	37.0%	40.0%	40.0%	3.0%	0.0%
		SGP	184937	46	46	46	47	1	1
Low Income	District	CPI	714	70.1	72	70.6	69.5	-0.6	-1.1
		P+	714	40.0%	41.0%	41.0%	41.0%	1.0%	0.0%
		SGP	508	49	53	50	47	-2	-3
	State	CPI	190183	67.3	67.3	69	68.8	1.5	-0.2
		P+	190183	38.0%	38.0%	41.0%	41.0%	3.0%	0.0%
		SGP	146536	46	45	46	47	1	1
Students w/ disabilities	District	CPI	397	56	56.4	55.3	52.1	-3.9	-3.2
		P+	397	19.0%	16.0%	17.0%	16.0%	-3.0%	-1.0%
		SGP	272	47	46	48.5	41.5	-5.5	-7
	State	CPI	91181	57.7	56.9	57.4	57.1	-0.6	-0.3
		P+	91181	22.0%	21.0%	22.0%	22.0%	0.0%	0.0%
		SGP	67155	43	43	42	43	0	1
English language learners or Former ELLs	District	CPI	183	62.9	64.8	66	65.4	2.5	-0.6
		P+	183	29.0%	31.0%	34.0%	34.0%	5.0%	0.0%
		SGP	95	42	61.5	49	53	11	4
	State	CPI	47847	62	61.6	63.9	63.8	1.8	-0.1
		P+	47847	32.0%	32.0%	35.0%	36.0%	4.0%	1.0%
		SGP	32607	52	52	53	52	0	-1
All students	District	CPI	2189	82.2	82.9	82.3	80.8	-1.4	-1.5
		P+	2189	61.0%	62.0%	62.0%	60.0%	-1.0%	-2.0%
		SGP	1707	53	54	52	48	-5	-4
	State	CPI	490288	79.9	79.9	80.8	80.3	0.4	-0.5
		P+	490288	58.0%	59.0%	61.0%	60.0%	2.0%	-1.0%
		SGP	392953	50	50	51	50	0	-1

Notes: The number of students included in CPI and percent *Proficient* or *Advanced* (P+) calculations may differ from the number of students included in median SGP calculation. State figures are provided for comparison purposes only and do not represent the standard that a particular group is expected to meet.

**Table B3c: Milford Public Schools  
Science and Technology/Engineering (All Grades)  
Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2011-2014**

Group and Measure		Number Included (2014)	Spring MCAS Year				Gains and Declines		
			2011	2012	2013	2014	4 Year Trend	2-Year Trend	
High Needs	District	CPI	354	69.1	69.4	73.8	69.6	0.5	-4.2
		P+	354	32.0%	33.0%	40.0%	33.0%	1.0%	-7.0%
	State	CPI	100582	63.8	65	66.4	67.3	3.5	0.9
		P+	100582	28.0%	31.0%	31.0%	33.0%	5.0%	2.0%
Low Income	District	CPI	268	72.1	71.8	75.1	70.9	-1.2	-4.2
		P+	268	38.0%	39.0%	41.0%	35.0%	-3.0%	-6.0%
	State	CPI	79199	62.8	64.5	66.1	66.8	4	0.7
		P+	79199	28.0%	31.0%	32.0%	33.0%	5.0%	1.0%
Students w/ disabilities	District	CPI	161	59.8	59.6	63.2	63.4	3.6	0.2
		P+	161	14.0%	17.0%	22.0%	20.0%	6.0%	-2.0%
	State	CPI	38628	59.2	58.7	59.8	60.1	0.9	0.3
		P+	38628	20.0%	20.0%	20.0%	22.0%	2.0%	2.0%
English language learners or Former ELLs	District	CPI	38	59.8	50	68.3	52	-7.8	-16.3
		P+	38	24.0%	15.0%	29.0%	13.0%	-11.0%	-16.0%
	State	CPI	16871	50.3	51.4	54	54	3.7	0
		P+	16871	15.0%	17.0%	19.0%	18.0%	3.0%	-1.0%
All students	District	CPI	873	82.3	82.5	85.3	83.2	0.9	-2.1
		P+	873	57.0%	59.0%	64.0%	59.0%	2.0%	-5.0%
	State	CPI	211440	77.6	78.6	79	79.6	2	0.6
		P+	211440	52.0%	54.0%	53.0%	55.0%	3.0%	2.0%

Notes: Median SGPs are not calculated for STE. State figures are provided for comparison purposes only and do not represent the standard that a particular group is expected to meet.

**Table B4: Milford Public Schools  
Annual Grade 9-12 Dropout Rates, 2010-2013**

	School Year Ending				Change 2010-2013		Change 2012-2013		State (2013)
	2010	2011	2012	2013	Percentage Points	Percent	Percentage Points	Percent	
All students	2.9	2.2	2.8	3.8	0.9	0.31	1	0.36	2.2

Notes: The annual dropout rate is calculated by dividing the number of students who drop out over a one-year period by the October 1 grade 9–12 enrollment, multiplied by 100. Dropouts are those students who dropped out of school between July 1 and June 30 of a given year and who did not return to school, graduate, or receive a GED by the following October 1. Dropout rates have been rounded; percent change is based on unrounded numbers.

**Table B5a: Milford Public Schools  
Four-Year Cohort Graduation Rates, 2010-2013**

Group	Number Included (2013)	School Year Ending				Change 2009-2012		Change 2011-2012		State (2013)
		2010	2011	2012	2013	Percentage Points	Percent Change	Percentage Points	Percent Change	
High needs	109	66.0%	69.0%	72.2%	68.8%	2.8	4.2%	-3.4	-4.7%	74.7%
Low income	84	66.7%	68.4%	70.5%	71.4%	4.7	7.0%	0.9	1.3%	73.6%
Students w/ disabilities	43	53.7%	59.0%	78.3%	58.1%	4.4	8.2%	-20.2	-25.8%	67.8%
English language learners or Former ELLs	10	66.7%	55.6%	60.0%	50.0%	-16.7	-25.0%	-10.0	-16.7%	63.5%
All students	281	83.1%	85.3%	85.1%	86.5%	3.4	4.1%	1.4	1.6%	85.0%

Notes: The four-year cohort graduation rate is calculated by dividing the number of students in a particular cohort who graduate in four years or less by the number of students in the cohort entering their freshman year four years earlier, minus transfers out and plus transfers in. Non-graduates include students still enrolled in high school, students who earned a GED or received a certificate of attainment rather than a diploma, and students who dropped out. Graduation rates have been rounded; percent change is based on unrounded numbers.

**Table B5b: Milford Public Schools  
Five-Year Cohort Graduation Rates, 2009-2012**

Group	Number Included (2012)	School Year Ending				Change 2009-2012		Change 2011-2012		State (2012)
		2009	2010	2011	2012	Percentage Points	Percent Change	Percentage Points	Percent Change	
High needs	133	70.5%	68.9%	75.9%	76.7%	6.2	8.8%	0.8	1.1%	78.9%
Low income	105	69.6%	70.4%	75.4%	75.2%	5.6	8.0%	-0.2	-0.3%	77.5%
Students w/ disabilities	46	64.8%	58.5%	65.6%	84.8%	20.0	30.9%	19.2	29.3%	73.8%
English language learners or Former ELLs	15	63.3%	66.7%	72.2%	66.7%	3.4	5.4%	-5.5	-7.6%	68.5%
All students	281	84.8%	85.2%	88.4%	87.5%	2.7	3.2%	-0.9	-1.0%	87.5%

Notes: The five-year cohort graduation rate is calculated by dividing the number of students in a particular cohort who graduate in five years or less by the number of students in the cohort entering their freshman year five years earlier, minus transfers out and plus transfers in. Non-graduates include students still enrolled in high school, students who earned a GED or received a certificate of attainment rather than a diploma, and students who dropped out. Graduation rates have been rounded; percent change is based on unrounded numbers. Graduation rates have been rounded; percent change is based on unrounded numbers.

**Table B6: Milford Public Schools  
Attendance Rates, 2011-2014**

Group	School Year Ending				Change 2011-2014		Change 2013-2014		State (2014)
	2011	2012	2013	2014	Percentage Points	Percent Change	Percentage Points	Percent Change	
All students	95.3%	95.8%	95.5%	95.3%	0.0	0.0%	-0.2	-0.2%	94.9%

Notes: The attendance rate is calculated by dividing the total number of days students attended school by the total number of days students were enrolled in a particular school year. A student's attendance rate is counted toward any district the student attended. In addition, district attendance rates included students who were out placed in public collaborative or private alternative schools/programs at public expense. Attendance rates have been rounded; percent change is based on unrounded numbers.

**Table B7: Milford Public Schools  
Suspension Rates, 2010-2013**

Group	School Year Ending				Change 2010-2013		Change 2012-2013		State (2013)
	2010	2011	2012	2013	Percentage Points	Percent Change	Percentage Points	Percent Change	
In-School Suspension Rate	2.9%	2.9%	7.0%	2.6%	-0.3	-10.3%	-4.4	-62.9%	2.2%
Out-of-School Suspension Rate	5.1%	4.0%	4.8%	3.2%	-1.9	-37.3%	-1.6	-33.3%	4.3%

Note: This table reflects information reported by school districts at the end of the school year indicated. Suspension rates have been rounded; percent change is based on unrounded numbers.

**Table B8: Milford Public Schools  
Expenditures, Chapter 70 State Aid, and Net School Spending Fiscal Years 2012–2014**

	FY12		FY13		FY14	
	Estimated	Actual	Estimated	Actual	Estimated	Actual
Expenditures						
From local appropriations for schools:						
By school committee	\$37,592,536	\$37,987,283	\$38,344,397	\$38,373,627	\$39,770,851	\$39,785,271
By municipality	\$12,880,198	\$13,013,341	\$13,242,921	\$13,263,742	\$13,317,871	\$13,690,173
Total from local appropriations	\$50,472,734	\$51,000,624	\$51,587,318	\$51,637,368	\$53,088,722	\$53,475,444
From revolving funds and grants	--	\$6,853,241	--	\$7,204,969	--	\$7,440,037
Total expenditures	--	\$57,853,865	--	\$58,842,337	--	\$60,915,481
Chapter 70 aid to education program						
Chapter 70 state aid*	--	\$16,702,939	--	\$18,734,609	--	\$19,457,577
Required local contribution	--	\$22,785,673	--	\$23,315,453	--	\$23,819,112
Required net school spending**	--	\$39,488,612	--	\$42,050,062	--	\$43,276,689
Actual net school spending	--	\$44,140,976	--	\$44,844,752	--	\$46,733,501
Over/under required (\$)	--	\$4,652,364	--	\$2,794,690	--	\$3,456,812
Over/under required (%)	--	11.8	--	6.6	--	8.0

\*Chapter 70 state aid funds are deposited in the local general fund and spent as local appropriations.

\*\*Required net school spending is the total of Chapter 70 aid and required local contribution. Net school spending includes only expenditures from local appropriations, not revolving funds and grants. It includes expenditures for most administration, instruction, operations, and out-of-district tuitions. It does not include transportation, school lunches, debt, or capital.

Sources: FY11, FY12 District End-of-Year Reports, Chapter 70 Program information on ESE website

Data retrieved November 25, 2014 and January 8, 2015

**Table B9: Milford Public Schools  
Expenditures Per In-District Pupil  
Fiscal Years 2011-2013**

<b>Expenditure Category</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>
Administration	\$308	\$304	\$394
Instructional leadership (district and school)	\$735	\$729	\$672
Teachers	\$4,852	\$4,956	\$5,148
Other teaching services	\$837	\$814	\$900
Professional development	\$137	\$65	\$79
Instructional materials, equipment and technology	\$286	\$224	\$178
Guidance, counseling and testing services	\$405	\$374	\$414
Pupil services	\$950	\$969	\$1,030
Operations and maintenance	\$939	\$914	\$899
Insurance, retirement and other fixed costs	\$1,988	\$2,166	\$2,014
<b>Total expenditures per in-district pupil</b>	<b>\$11,438</b>	<b>\$11,514</b>	<b>\$11,729</b>

Sources: [Per-pupil expenditure reports on ESE website](#)

## Appendix C: Instructional Inventory

Learning Environment & Teaching	By Grade Span	Evidence		
		None	Partial	Clear & Consistent
		(0)	(1)	(2)
1. Tone of interactions between teacher and students and among students is positive & respectful.	ES	0%	0%	100%
	MS	5%	10%	86%
	HS	10%	7%	83%
	<b>Total #</b>	4	4	78
	<b>Total %</b>	5%	5%	91%
2. Behavioral standards are clearly communicated and disruptions, if present, are managed effectively & equitably.	ES	17%	0%	83%
	MS	10%	5%	86%
	HS	10%	13%	77%
	<b>Total #</b>	11	5	70
	<b>Total %</b>	13%	6%	81%
3. The physical arrangement of the classroom ensures a positive learning environment and provides all students with access to learning activities.	ES	0%	17%	83%
	MS	5%	5%	90%
	HS	7%	11%	82%
	<b>Total #</b>	3	10	71
	<b>Total %</b>	4%	12%	85%
4. Classroom rituals and routines promote transitions with minimal loss of instructional time.	ES	6%	6%	88%
	MS	10%	5%	85%
	HS	32%	7%	61%
	<b>Total #</b>	13	5	64
	<b>Total %</b>	16%	6%	78%
5. Multiple resources are available to meet all students' diverse learning needs.	ES	37%	11%	51%
	MS	58%	16%	26%
	HS	40%	20%	40%
	<b>Total #</b>	36	13	35
	<b>Total %</b>	43%	15%	42%
6. The teacher demonstrates knowledge of subject and content.	ES	0%	3%	97%
	MS	0%	5%	95%
	HS	0%	14%	86%
	<b>Total #</b>	0	6	77
	<b>Total %</b>	0%	7%	93%
7. The teacher plans and implements a lesson that reflects rigor and high expectations.	ES	0%	46%	54%
	MS	33%	19%	48%
	HS	38%	21%	41%
	<b>Total #</b>	18	26	41
	<b>Total %</b>	21%	31%	48%

Teaching	By Grade Span	Evidence		
		None	Partial	Clear & Consistent
		(0)	(1)	(2)
8. The teacher communicates clear learning objective(s) aligned to 2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks.	ES	11%	31%	57%
	MS	19%	10%	71%
	HS	40%	10%	50%
	<b>Total #</b>	20	16	50
	<b>Total %</b>	23%	19%	58%
9. The teacher uses appropriate instructional strategies well matched to learning objective (s) and content.	ES	6%	20%	74%
	MS	10%	38%	52%
	HS	34%	24%	41%
	<b>Total #</b>	14	22	49
	<b>Total %</b>	16%	26%	58%
10. The teacher uses appropriate modifications for English language learners and students with disabilities such as explicit language objective(s); direct instruction in vocabulary; presentation of content at multiple levels of complexity; and, differentiation of content, process, and/or products.	ES	47%	18%	35%
	MS	67%	19%	14%
	HS	76%	0%	24%
	<b>Total #</b>	52	10	22
	<b>Total %</b>	62%	12%	26%
11. The teacher provides opportunities for students to engage in higher order thinking such as use of inquiry, exploration, application, analysis, synthesis, and/or evaluation of knowledge or concepts (Bloom's Taxonomy).	ES	31%	6%	63%
	MS	52%	10%	38%
	HS	62%	10%	28%
	<b>Total #</b>	40	7	38
	<b>Total %</b>	47%	8%	45%
12. The teacher uses questioning techniques that require thoughtful responses that demonstrate understanding.	ES	11%	9%	80%
	MS	38%	5%	57%
	HS	34%	24%	41%
	<b>Total #</b>	22	11	52
	<b>Total %</b>	26%	13%	61%
13. The teacher implements teaching strategies that promote a safe learning environment where students give opinions, make judgments, explore and investigate ideas.	ES	0%	6%	94%
	MS	19%	14%	67%
	HS	17%	34%	48%
	<b>Total #</b>	9	15	61
	<b>Total %</b>	11%	18%	72%
14. The teacher paces the lesson to match content and meet students' learning needs.	ES	5%	43%	51%
	MS	14%	33%	52%
	HS	33%	20%	47%
	<b>Total #</b>	15	29	44
	<b>Total %</b>	17%	33%	50%
15. The teacher conducts frequent formative assessments to check for understanding and inform instruction.	ES	17%	20%	63%
	MS	48%	24%	29%
	HS	38%	34%	28%
	<b>Total #</b>	27	22	36
	<b>Total %</b>	32%	26%	42%
16. The teacher makes use of available technology to support instruction and enhance learning.	ES	77%	9%	14%
	MS	57%	5%	38%
	HS	54%	23%	23%
	<b>Total #</b>	53	10	19

	<b>Total %</b>	65%	12%	23%
<b>Learning</b>	<b>By Grade Span</b>	<b>Evidence</b>		
		<b>None</b>	<b>Partial</b>	<b>Clear &amp; Consistent</b>
		<b>(0)</b>	<b>(1)</b>	<b>(2)</b>
17. Students are engaged in challenging academic tasks.	<b>ES</b>	11%	38%	51%
	<b>MS</b>	38%	29%	33%
	<b>HS</b>	34%	25%	41%
	<b>Total #</b>	23	28	39
	<b>Total %</b>	26%	31%	43%
18. Students articulate their thinking verbally or in writing.	<b>ES</b>	23%	17%	60%
	<b>MS</b>	38%	14%	48%
	<b>HS</b>	38%	21%	41%
	<b>Total #</b>	27	15	43
	<b>Total %</b>	32%	18%	51%
19. Students inquire, explore, apply, analyze, synthesize and/or evaluate knowledge or concepts (Bloom’s Taxonomy).	<b>ES</b>	26%	17%	57%
	<b>MS</b>	57%	10%	33%
	<b>HS</b>	66%	14%	21%
	<b>Total #</b>	40	12	33
	<b>Total %</b>	47%	14%	39%
20. Students elaborate about content and ideas when responding to questions.	<b>ES</b>	43%	9%	49%
	<b>MS</b>	57%	5%	38%
	<b>HS</b>	55%	24%	21%
	<b>Total #</b>	43	11	31
	<b>Total %</b>	51%	13%	36%
21. Students make connections to prior knowledge, or real world experience, or can apply knowledge and understanding to other subjects.	<b>ES</b>	43%	9%	49%
	<b>MS</b>	48%	0%	52%
	<b>HS</b>	59%	7%	34%
	<b>Total #</b>	42	5	38
	<b>Total %</b>	49%	6%	45%
22. Students use technology as a tool for learning and/or understanding.	<b>ES</b>	86%	3%	11%
	<b>MS</b>	95%	5%	0%
	<b>HS</b>	79%	18%	4%
	<b>Total #</b>	72	7	5
	<b>Total %</b>	86%	8%	6%
23. Students assume responsibility for their own learning whether individually, in pairs, or in groups.	<b>ES</b>	20%	17%	63%
	<b>MS</b>	24%	24%	52%
	<b>HS</b>	33%	19%	48%
	<b>Total #</b>	21	16	46
	<b>Total %</b>	25%	19%	55%
24. Student work demonstrates high quality and can serve as exemplars.	<b>ES</b>	46%	20%	34%
	<b>MS</b>	88%	6%	6%
	<b>HS</b>	81%	15%	4%
	<b>Total #</b>	53	12	14
	<b>Total %</b>	67%	15%	18%