NEWS

Connecticut Department of Education

George A. Coleman Contact: Communications Office (860) 713-6548

EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 A.M., FRIDAY, OCTOBER 27, 2006

State Department of Education Reports 2005-06 'Adequate Yearly Progress' for Districts

HARTFORD – Eighty-one percent of Connecticut's school districts achieved the standards for adequate yearly progress (AYP) for the 2005-06 school year under the No Child Left Behind Act. A total of 139 of the state's 171 local, regional and statewide school districts met the AYP standards.

The AYP identifications are based on the districtwide percentage of students scoring at or above the proficiency level in reading and/or mathematics in Grades 3-8 on the Connecticut Mastery Test (CMT) and in Grade 10 on the Connecticut Academic Performance Test (CAPT). In addition, the identifications are based on CMT writing scores (70 percent at or above the basic level or improvement over the previous year), the district graduation rate (70 percent or improvement over the previous year), and participation rates on the tests (95 percent participation required).

For a district to make AYP, the AYP criteria must be met on either the CMT or CAPT by all students and by each subgroup of 40 or more students including white, black, Hispanic, American Indian and Asian students; students with disabilities; English language learners; and economically disadvantaged students.

Of 171 districts, 32 did not make AYP.

Reasons districts did not make AYP:

| • | Whole district math and reading achievement | 10 |
|---|--|----|
| • | Whole district math academic achievement | 1 |
| • | Whole district reading academic achievement | 1 |
| • | Subgroup math and reading academic achievement | 19 |
| • | Subgroup math academic achievement | 0 |
| • | Subgroup reading academic achievement | 1 |

"The most common reason districts did not make AYP was due to their subgroup performance in math and reading," said Interim Commissioner of Education George A. Coleman. "In large part, this may be due to the different learning styles of the students in these groups. Teachers need to employ more nontraditional and varied instructional methods to help these students learn and achieve at the high levels we expect of them. Districts must tailor instruction to meet the diverse learning needs of all students, and the State Department of Education is committed to helping them do that. As the federal government seeks to partner with states to improve the performance of subgroups, its sponsorship of scientifically based research into this area can be helpful to state and local school districts."

If a district does not achieve AYP in the same content area across both tests for two consecutive years, the district is identified as "in need of improvement." Of the 32 districts not making AYP this year, 22 were identified as "in need of improvement," (i.e., they did not make AYP for at least two consecutive years in the same content area).

The results for these 22 districts also indicate the following:

- One is in Year 2 of district improvement
- 21 are in Year 3 of district improvement

No districts are in Year 4, Year 5 or Year 6 of district improvement.

This year, six districts previously identified as "in need of improvement" made AYP. If they continue to make AYP next year, they will no longer be designated as "in need of improvement," and further sanctions will not be warranted.

This year, 11 districts made AYP for the second consecutive year and therefore are no longer considered "in need of improvement." The districts are Bloomfield, East Haven, Killingly, Milford, New Milford, North Haven, Plainville, Seymour, Southington, Stafford and Windsor Locks.

"I would like to personally commend the professionals, parents and students in these districts for their accomplishments," Coleman said. "They all deserve to be congratulated."

All 22 districts identified as "in need of improvement" this year are Title 1 districts and they face the following consequences:

- Districts in Year 2 of improvement must revise their district improvement plan, reserve 10 percent of their Title I funds for professional development designed to improve classroom teaching, and inform parents that the district has been designated as "in need of improvement."
- Districts in Year 3 of improvement must complete a curriculum survey that will communicate where the district is in the curriculum development cycle, specifically for reading, writing and mathematics. The information gathered from these surveys will enable the State Education Department to provide differentiated technical assistance to districts as they institute and implement new curriculum as required by NCLB for districts in Year 3.

"The disproportionate number of Title I districts 'in need of improvement' is very disconcerting," Coleman said. "These are our most vulnerable students. They need our help the most, and we have to do more for them. We are targeting high school reform; increased access to quality preschool programs; high academic achievement in reading, writing, math and science; and engaging parents to support learning as our priorities for closing the achievement gap in these low-performing districts. This is the approach we will take with every district in the state."

It is possible for a district to be designated as not making adequate yearly progress while none of its schools is designated as not making AYP. This is because subgroup results are reported for AYP only when subgroups contain at least 40 students. It is possible that no schools reach that number, but when subgroup numbers for all schools in the district are totaled, the district as a whole has subgroups of 40 or larger and may then be cited for inadequate student performance by one or more subgroups.

For more information, visit:

http://www.csde.state.ct.us/public/cedar/nclb/dist_school_nclb_results/index.htm

###



Connecticut Public School Districts Not Making Adequate Yearly Progress, by Category: 2005-06 School Year



As per No Child Left Behind Legislation and Connecticut's K-12 Accountability System

Based on the 2006 Connecticut Mastery Test (CMT) and the 2005 and 2006 Connecticut Academic Performance Test (CAPT)

Whole district math and reading, academic achievement

Number of Districts: 10 (Number Districts Last Year = 6)

Bridgeport School District

East Hartford School District

Hartford School District

Meriden School District

New Britain School District

New Haven School District

New London School District

Norwich School District

Waterbury School District

Windham School District

Whole district math academic achievement

Number of Districts: 1 (Number Districts Last Year = 0)

Norwalk School District

Whole district reading academic achievement

Number of Districts: 1 (Number Districts Last Year = 2)

Middletown School District

Subgroup math and reading academic achievement only

Number of Districts: 19 (Number Districts Last Year = 21)

Bristol School District

Brooklyn School District

Columbia School District

Cooperative Educational Services

Danbury School District

Groton School District

Hamden School District

Hebron School District

Learn

Manchester School District

Naugatuck School District

Orange School District

Oxford School District

Stamford School District

Stratford School District

Wallingford School District

West Hartford School District

West Haven School District

Woodbridge School District

Subgroup reading academic achievement only

Number of Districts: 1 (Number Districts Last Year = 0)



Connecticut Public School Districts Not Making Adequate Yearly Progress, 2005-06 School Year



As per No Child Left Behind Legislation and Connecticut's K-12 Accountability System

Based on the 2006 Connecticut Mastery Test (CMT) results and the 2005 and 2006 Connecticut Academic Performance Test (CAPT) results

| | Title I | In Need of Improvement | Whole District Academic Achievement | | Subgroup Academic Achievement | | Whole District or Subgroup Participation Only | |
|-------------------------------|----------|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------|-------------------------------------|----------|---|---------|
| | District | | Math | Reading | Math | Reading | Math | Reading |
| Bridgeport School District | ~ | V | ✓ | ✓ | V | V | | |
| Bristol School District | ✓ | ✓ | | | V | V | | |
| Brooklyn School District | ✓ | | | | ✓ | ✓ | | |
| Columbia School District | • | | | | V | ✓ | | |
| Danbury School District | ✓ | ✓ | | | V | V | | |
| East Hartford School District | ✓ | V | ✓ | ✓ | V | V | | |
| Groton School District | ✓ | ✓ | | | V | V | | |
| Hamden School District | ✓ | ✓ | | | V | V | | |
| Hartford School District | ✓ | V | ✓ | ✓ | V | V | | |

| | Title I | e I In Need of | | Whole District Academic Achievement | | Subgroup Academic Achievement | | District or group ation Only |
|-----------------------------|----------|----------------|----------|---|----------|-------------------------------------|------|------------------------------------|
| | District | Improvement | Math | Reading | Math | Reading | Math | Reading |
| Hebron School District | | | | | ✓ | ✓ | | |
| Manchester School District | V | ✓ | | | ✓ | ✓ | | |
| Meriden School District | ✓ | V | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | |
| Middletown School District | ✓ | V | | ✓ | ✓ | V | | |
| Naugatuck School District | V | V | | | ✓ | ✓ | | |
| New Britain School District | V | V | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | |
| New Haven School District | V | V | ✓ | ✓ | V | V | | |
| New London School District | ✓ | V | ✓ | ✓ | V | V | | |
| Norwalk School District | V | V | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | | |
| Norwich School District | ✓ | V | V | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | |
| Orange School District | | | | | V | V | | |

| | Title I | In Need of | Acad | Whole District Academic Achievement | | Subgroup Academic Achievement | | District or group ation Only |
|----------------------------------|----------|-------------|----------|---|----------|-------------------------------------|------|------------------------------|
| | District | Improvement | Math | Reading | Math | Reading | Math | Reading |
| Oxford School District | ✓ | | | | V | V | | |
| Stamford School District | ✓ | V | | | ✓ | ✓ | | |
| Stratford School District | ✓ | ✓ | | | ✓ | ✓ | | |
| Wallingford School District | ✓ | | | | ✓ | ✓ | | |
| Waterbury School District | ✓ | ✓ | V | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | |
| West Hartford School District | ✓ | V | | | ✓ | ✓ | | |
| West Haven School District | ✓ | V | | | ✓ | V | | |
| Willington School District | ✓ | | | | | ✓ | | |
| Windham School District | ~ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | |
| Woodbridge School District | V | | | | ✓ | ✓ | | |
| Cooperative Educational Services | V | | | | V | V | | |

| | Title I | In Need of | Whole District Academic Achievement | | Subgroup Academic Achievement | | Whole District or Subgroup Participation Only | |
|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------------|--------------|---|---------|
| | District | Improvement | Math | Reading | Math | Reading | Math | Reading |
| <u>Learn</u> | \checkmark | | | | ✓ | \checkmark | | |