



There are several purposes to sharing today's data report:

- To provide an update on data since the last meeting when PSSA data was shared in October.
- To gather questions and/or concerns related to academic performance.
- To provide a more global, district perspective in relation to your individual student's performance.

PSSA GRADE 6 2015

ELA

School	Proficient %	Advanced %	Total % P/A
State	39.6	21.0	60.6
District	49.9	30.1	80.0
Milford	54.3	30.2	84.5

MATH

School	Proficient %	Advanced %	Total % P/A
State	28.7	11.3	40.0
District	38.7	24.3	63.0
Milford	38.0	33.3	71.3



Milford's performance exceeded state performance for both ELA and Math for all 3 grades.

Scores for Grade 6 Reading are particularly noteworthy, as they improved over the previous year's performance despite the more rigorous assessment.

PSSA GRADE 7 2015

ELA

School	Proficient %	Advanced %	Total % P/A
State	41.9	16.7	58.6
District	45.4	27.5	72.9
Milford	41.0	38.1	79.1

MATH

School	Proficient %	Advanced %	Total % P/A
State	23.6	9.5	33.1
District	32.4	13.8	46.2
Milford	35.8	17.2	53.0

With the new cut scores established for the PSSAs in 2015, it is noteworthy that less than 10% of students statewide scored at the Advanced level in Math for both Grades 7 and 8 (next slide).

PSSA GRADE 8 2015

ELA

School	Proficient %	Advanced %	Total % P/A
State	43.6	14.3	57.9
District	56.0	23.9	79.9
Milford	56.2	25.4	81.6

MATH

School	Proficient %	Advanced %	Total % P/A
State	22.0	7.9	29.9
District	39.8	15.8	55.6
Milford	43.1	18.5	61.6

SCIENCE

School	Proficient %	Advanced %	Total % P/A
State	32.3	26.5	58.8
District	41.1	38.3	79.4
Milford	37.4	44.3	81.7

Science performance is only measured at Grade 8 at the middle school level. We have consistently performed at high levels on the Science PSSA. This test did not change from previous years, unlike the ELA and Math PSSA tests. What is notable is that we had more students Advanced than Proficient on the Science PSSA – something to celebrate!

**2013-2014 and 2014-2015 COMPARISON POINTS
STATE AND DISTRICT
GRADES 6-8 ELA PSSA**

Grade 6 Reading 2014			Grade 6 ELA 2015			Gained 8
State	64.5		State	60.6		
District	72.0	+7.5	District	80.0	+19.4	
Grade 7 Reading 2014			Grade 7 ELA 2015			Lost 13
State	71.9		State	58.6		
District	85.9	+14.0	District	72.9	+14.3	
Grade 8 Reading 2014			Grade 8 ELA 2015			Lost 12.6
State	84.3		State	57.9		
District	92.5	+8.2	District	79.9	+22	

Due to the change in PSSA cut scores and the actual PSSA assessment itself, it is helpful to measure our changes in performance against the state performance.

This slide focuses on our ELA performance from 2014 and 2015. Grade 6 ELA actually had an increase despite the statewide decline. This is the one area in which we did see an increase in percent of proficient/advanced students. The consistent implementation of SpringBoard and its alignment to the PA Core Standards are contributing factors to this performance.

2013-2014 and 2014-2015 COMPARISON POINTS
STATE AND DISTRICT
GRADES 6-8 MATH PSSA

Grade 6 Math 2014			Grade 6 Math 2015			Lost 17.6
State	71.7		State	40.0		
District	80.6	+8.9	District	63.0	+23.0	

Grade 7 Math 2014			Grade 7 Math 2015			Lost 45.6
State	75.0		State	33.1		
District	91.8	+16.8	District	46.2	+13.1	

Grade 8 Math 2014			Grade 8 Math 2015			Lost 27.8
State	73.1		State	29.9		
District	83.4	+10.3	District	55.6	+25.7	

This slide focuses on our Math performance from 2014 and 2015. One of the biggest drops we saw was in Grade 7 Math performance. While all of the other drops were less than the State, we actually had a greater decline in the percent of proficient/advanced students (45.6%).

**2015 NEIGHBORING DISTRICT
BUILDING COMPARISONS**

Grade 6 ELA 2015			Grade 6 Math 2015		
Place	School/District	Score	Place	School/District	Score
1 ★	Milford/Quakertown	84.5	1 ★	Milford/Quakertown	70.4
1	New Hope Solebury	84.5	2	New Hope Solebury	63.6
3	Pennridge North	83.3	3	Strayer	61
4	Strayer/Quakertown	80.6	4	Pennridge Central	59.5
5	Pennridge Central	79	5	Pennridge South	58.6
6	Pennridge South	74.5	6	Pennridge North	56.4
7	Palisades MS	73.3	7	Palisades MS	47.9
8	Klinger/Centennial	68.2	8	Klinger MS Centennial	40.1



You will notice that we do not have any CB schools in the comparison chart because CB middle schools have a Grade 7-9 configuration. For consistency purposes, we then kept these same comparison schools for the other PSSA tested areas and grade levels.

For both ELA and Math, Milford topped the chart of local schools.

**2015 NEIGHBORING DISTRICT
BUILDING COMPARISONS**

Grade 7 ELA 2015

Place	School/District	Score
1	Pennridge Central	81.0
2	Pennridge North	80.7
3	New Hope Solebury	80.1
4	Palisades MS	79.3
5 ★	Milford	78.4
6	Strayer	71.8
7	Pennridge South	70.9
8	Klinger/Centennial	68.3

Grade 7 Math 2015

Place	School/District	Score
1	New Hope Solebury	54.6
2 ★	Milford	52.3
3	Pennridge North	47.7
4	Strayer	43.8
5	Palisades	41.5
5	Pennridge Central	41.5
7	Pennridge South	34.5
8	Klinger MS Centennial	34.4



Grade 7 ELA was not quite as strong when compared across local schools. We already noted our weaker performance in Grade 7 math, but this did not substantially affect our performance when compared to other local schools.

**2015 NEIGHBORING DISTRICT
BUILDING COMPARISONS**

Grade 8 ELA 2015			Grade 8 Math 2015		
Place	School/District	Score	Place	School/District	Score
1	Pennridge North	82.1	1 ★	Milford	62
2 ★	Milford/Quakertown	81.4	2	New Hope Solebury	57.6
3	Strayer/Quakertown	80.1	3	Strayer	53.9
4	Pennridge Central	79.1	4	Pennridge Central	49.3
5	Palisades MS	74.7	5	Pennridge North	43.3
6	New Hope Solebury	72.9	6	Palisades	43
7	Pennridge South	67.2	7	Pennridge South	37.7
8	Klinger MS/Centennial	53.0	8	Klinger MS/Centennial	26.6



Grade 8 ELA performance was quite strong, with the top performing schools in a very small range.

Milford outperformed neighboring schools for Grade 8 Math.

DECEMBER NWEA DATA – GRADE 6 MATH

Mathematics

MAP: Math 6+ PA 2013 (CCSS) / PA Common Core Mathematics PK-12: 2013

Summary	
Total Students With Valid Growth Test Scores	150
Mean RIT	228.1
Standard Deviation	15.7
District Grade Level Mean RIT	*
Students At or Above District Grade Level Mean RIT	*
Norm Grade Level Mean RIT	221
Students At or Above Norm Grade Level Mean RIT	112

Overall Performance	Lo %ile < 21		LoAvg %ile 21-40		Avg %ile 41-60		HiAvg %ile 61-80		Hi %ile > 80		Mean RIT (+/- 1 Smp Err)	Std Dev
	count	%	count	%	count	%	count	%	count	%		
MAP: Math 6+ PA 2013 (CCSS) / PA Common Core Mathematics PK-12: 2013	16	11%	16	11%	26	17%	31	21%	61	41%	227-228-229	15.7
Goal Area												
Numbers and Operations	19	13%	14	9%	17	11%	32	21%	68	45%	231-232-234	18.3
Algebraic Concepts	21	14%	26	17%	19	13%	41	27%	43	29%	225-226-227	16.6
Geometry	20	13%	19	13%	25	17%	46	31%	40	27%	224-226-227	15.3
Data and Probability	18	12%	23	15%	26	17%	26	17%	57	38%	228-229-230	16.8

Milford students in Grade 6-8 took their second NWEA assessment of the year in December. The data that follows provides a global perspective of the building performance.

When looking at the tables above, we want to see bars with more green (HiAvg) and Blue (Hi), placing our students in the 61st percentile and above. Our Mean RIT in Grade 6 Math was a 228.1, while the Mean Grade Level RIT was 221. This is a national point of comparison.

For Grade 6 Math, Numbers and Operations is a strength with 66% of students performing at HiAvg or Hi.

Geometry and Data and Probability are not strengths yet – however, this content has not yet been taught in Grade 6 and we should see respectable gains in those areas by the final test administration later this school year.

By looking at this data in relation to an individual student's Progress Report, you will find some of the same information that is listed in this table within any student's report.

DECEMBER NWEA DATA – GRADE 6 READING

MAP: Reading 6+ PA 2013 (CCSS) / PA Common Core English Language Arts PK-12: 2013

Summary	
Total Students With Valid Growth Test Scores	151
Mean RIT	219.2
Standard Deviation	14.1
District Grade Level Mean RIT	*
Students At or Above District Grade Level Mean RIT	*
Norm Grade Level Mean RIT	213.5
Students At or Above Norm Grade Level Mean RIT	109

Overall Performance	Lo %ile < 21		LoAvg %ile 21-40		Avg %ile 41-60		HiAvg %ile 61-80		Hi %ile > 80		Mean RIT (Hi- 5mp Err)	Std Dev
	count	%	count	%	count	%	count	%	count	%		
MAP: Reading 6+ PA 2013 (CCSS) / PA Common Core English Language Arts PK-12: 2013	16	11%	13	9%	32	21%	41	27%	49	32%	218-219-220	14.1
Goal Area												
Reading Informational Text	16	11%	20	13%	32	21%	33	22%	50	33%	218-219-221	15.1
Reading Literature	19	13%	15	10%	27	18%	35	23%	55	36%	219-220-221	15.9
Vocabulary Acquisition and Use	18	12%	18	12%	32	21%	41	27%	42	28%	217-218-220	14

Grade 6 Reading is very consistent across Goal Areas. Overall, 59% of the students were at HiAvg and Hi performance levels.

Students also take a third test – Language Usage. The results for this test have been strong, with 60%+ of students in HiAvg and Hi performance levels.

NWEA – GRADE 7 MATH

MAP: Math 6+ PA 2013 (CCSS) / PA Common Core Mathematics PK-12: 2013

Summary	
Total Students With Valid Growth Test Scores	103
Mean RIT	231
Standard Deviation	16
District Grade Level Mean RIT	-
Students At or Above District Grade Level Mean RIT	-
Norm Grade Level Mean RIT	226.3
Students At or Above Norm Grade Level Mean RIT	76

Overall Performance	Lo %ile < 21		LoAvg %ile 21-40		Avg %ile 41-60		HiAvg %ile 61-80		Hi %ile > 80		Mean RIT (+/- Smp Err)	Std Dev
	count	%	count	%	count	%	count	%	count	%		
MAP: Math 6+ PA 2013 (CCSS) / PA Common Core Mathematics PK-12: 2013	12	12%	7	7%	17	17%	32	31%	35	34%	229-231-233	16
Goal Area												
Numbers and Operations	18	17%	7	7%	11	11%	33	32%	34	33%	231-233-235	19
Algebraic Concepts	17	17%	14	14%	23	22%	31	30%	18	17%	227-229-230	16.7
Geometry	16	16%	17	17%	22	21%	32	31%	16	16%	228-229-231	14.8
Data and Probability	16	16%	8	8%	16	16%	31	30%	32	31%	231-233-234	17.3

For Math in Grades 7-8, students in Algebra 1 take a different assessment that is focused on the Algebra 1 Keystone exam. These students are not included in the data above. Despite this, we still have high levels of performance overall, with 65% of students at HiAvg and Hi performance.

The Classroom Diagnostic Tools (CDT) data is useful for teachers as they are preparing students for the Algebra 1 Keystone exam. It is taken in September and again in January. Teachers may opt to give it to students one more time in March if more data is needed to support their success.

NWEA – GRADE 7 READING

MAP: Reading 6+ PA 2013 (CCSS) / PA Common Core English Language Arts PK-12: 2013

Summary	
Total Students With Valid Growth Test Scores	124
Mean RIT	223.2
Standard Deviation	13.6
District Grade Level Mean RIT	*
Students At or Above District Grade Level Mean RIT	*
Norm Grade Level Mean RIT	210.4
Students At or Above Norm Grade Level Mean RIT	94

Overall Performance	Lo %ile < 21		LoAvg %ile 21-40		Avg %ile 41-60		HiAvg %ile 61-80		Hi %ile > 80		Mean RIT (1+ Smp Err)	Std Dev
	count	%	count	%	count	%	count	%	count	%		
MAP: Reading 6+ PA 2013 (CCSS) / PA Common Core English Language Arts PK-12: 2013	10	8%	13	10%	21	17%	33	27%	47	38%	222-223-224	13.6
Goal Area												
Reading Informational Text	17	14%	18	15%	22	18%	29	23%	38	31%	220-222-223	14.6
Reading Literature	15	12%	7	6%	25	20%	38	31%	39	31%	222-224-225	14.7
Vocabulary Acquisition and Use	12	10%	13	10%	23	19%	33	27%	43	35%	223-224-225	14



The students in Grade 6 who had strong performance on the 2015 ELA PSSAs are showing continued high levels of performance on the Grade 7 Reading NWEA.

NWEA – GRADE 8 MATH

MAP: Math 6+ PA 2013 (CCSS) / PA Common Core Mathematics PK-12: 2013

Summary	
Total Students With Valid Growth Test Scores	87
Mean RIT	227.4
Standard Deviation	17.9
District Grade Level Mean RIT	~
Students At or Above District Grade Level Mean RIT	~
Norm Grade Level Mean RIT	228.5
Students At or Above Norm Grade Level Mean RIT	42

	Lo %ile < 21		LoAvg %ile 21-40		Avg %ile 41-60		HiAvg %ile 61-80		Hi %ile > 80		Mean RIT (+/- Smp Err)	Std Dev
	count	%	count	%	count	%	count	%	count	%		
Overall Performance												
MAP: Math 6+ PA 2013 (CCSS) / PA Common Core Mathematics PK-12: 2013	16	18%	12	14%	23	26%	20	30%	10	11%	225-227-229	17.9
Goal Area												
Numbers and Operations	25	29%	18	18%	24	28%	17	20%	5	6%	224-226-228	18.3
Algebraic Concepts	20	23%	19	22%	20	23%	18	21%	10	11%	225-227-229	19.2
Geometry	27	31%	15	17%	21	24%	10	22%	5	6%	223-225-227	18
Data and Probability	18	21%	9	10%	20	23%	24	28%	16	18%	229-231-233	19.9

A more significant number of students in Grade 8 Math are not included in these numbers due to taking Algebra 1. Some skill areas for continued focus include Numbers and Operations.

NWEA – GRADE 8 READING

MAP: Reading 6+ PA 2013 (CCSS) / PA Common Core English Language Arts PK-12: 2013

Summary	
Total Students With Valid Growth Test Scores	125
Mean RIT	222.8
Standard Deviation	17.4
District Grade Level Mean RIT	*
Students At or Above District Grade Level Mean RIT	*
Norm Grade Level Mean RIT	218.7
Students At or Above Norm Grade Level Mean RIT	86

Overall Performance	Lo %ile < 21		LoAvg %ile 21-40		Avg %ile 41-60		HiAvg %ile 61-80		Hi %ile > 80		Mean RIT (+/- Smp Err)	Std Dev
	count	%	count	%	count	%	count	%	count	%		
MAP: Reading 6+ PA 2013 (CCSS) / PA Common Core English Language Arts PK-12: 2013	15	12%	14	11%	21	17%	35	28%	40	32%	221-223-224	17.4
Goal Area												
Reading Informational Text	21	17%	19	15%	18	14%	34	27%	33	26%	221-222-224	18.2
Reading Literature	22	18%	17	14%	18	14%	24	19%	44	35%	221-223-225	19.1
Vocabulary Acquisition and Use	21	17%	13	10%	23	18%	37	30%	31	25%	222-223-225	17.5



Grade 8 Reading is strong, with 60% of students at HiAvg and Hi levels of performance.

ACTION PLAN FOR IMPROVEMENT

- Implementation of new Reading class in Grade 6 for all, Grade 7 for all but highest readers, and Grade 8 for students not reading on grade level
- Implementation of Membeam Program for building vocabulary skills (MS & HS)
- Strategic use of resource time to support students in need
- Flexibility and enrichment during resource time for high-achieving students
- Streamlined Instructional Support Team process to enhance student access to interventions
- Establishing teacher/team leaders to support student success

Some of these action steps were shared in October. Others have been added based on the expanding efforts to meet every student's needs for support.

Last year, we had a combined RELA course that all students took. This year, we now have a separate Reading course and an ELA course.

Some other action plan steps we have taken are as follows:

- **Part-time Learning Facilitator completely devoted to MS math support (planning, implementation, data analysis, etc.)**
- **Implementation of a process to ensure that each student's IEP needs are followed with fidelity**
- **Supervision of READ 180 implementation fidelity**