

NEWS

Connecticut Department of Education

Dr. Mark K. McQuillan
Commissioner



For Immediate Release:

Friday, July 27, 2007

Contact: Tom Murphy 860.713.6525

2007 CMT: Math and Writing scores increase; Reading scores are “disappointing” Achievement gaps are not closing; “We need to do more to achieve success”

(HARTFORD, CONN.) While there are some solid gains in math and modest gains in writing scores statewide, Connecticut’s 2007 Mastery Test results show a continued downward trend in student reading performance.

“We are very concerned with the state of our students’ comprehension skills, particularly in their ability to read by third grade,” said State Education Commissioner Mark K. McQuillan in announcing the statewide scores. “It is clear that we need to do much more to address our students’ ability to read. We need significant change to have an impact on the achievement gaps that are now growing larger, not smaller.” The decline in reading performance appears to reach back several years on the CMT and is evident in the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) test scores as well.

This is the second year of the 4th generation CMT which is now administered in the spring to all public school students in Grades 3 through 8. In addition to statewide average scores in reading, writing and mathematics, the test results also present data for student subgroups that give insight into substantial achievement gaps among racial and economic groups and between male and female performance.

GRADE	YEAR	MATHEMATICS		READING		WRITING	
		% PRO	% GOAL	% PRO	% GOAL	% PRO	% GOAL
3	2006	78	56	69	54	82	61
	2007	80	59	69	52	82	61
	Change	+2	+3	-	-2	-	-
4	2006	80	59	72	58	84	63
	2007	81	62	71	57	84	65
	Change	+1	+3	-1	-1	-	+2
5	2006	81	61	73	61	85	65
	2007	83	66	73	61	86	65
	Change	+2	+5	-	-	+1	-
6	2006	80	59	75	64	83	62
	2007	83	64	76	64	84	63
	Change	+3	+5	+1	-	+1	+1
7	2006	78	57	76	67	81	60
	2007	80	60	76	66	81	60
	Change	+2	+3	-	-1	-	-
8	2006	79	58	77	67	82	62
	2007	81	61	76	67	83	64
	Change	+2	+3	-1	-	+1	+2

Overall, the scores show:

Gains in most grades in mathematics and writing performance statewide, as measured by the percentage of students scoring at or above the proficient and goal levels;

Modest declines overall in reading scores statewide (percentages at or above proficient and goal levels);

A moderate gender gap in reading and a large gender gap in writing performance with boys scoring substantially lower than girls; females consistently outperform males by about five percentage points in reading and by at least ten percentage points in writing;

No gender gap in mathematics with girls scoring at about the same level as boys;

Large gaps continue to persist in performance between minority and white students and between high poverty and low poverty students across all grades in math, reading and writing as measured by proficient and goal levels; for example, in Grade 4, white students outperform black and Hispanic students at the goal level by 35 to 40 percentage points in reading, writing and math.

“Connecticut should lead the nation in reading performance and in closing the achievement gap,” said Commissioner McQuillan.

“Third Grade reading performance is key,” the Commissioner said. “Our focus must be on reading instruction in the early grades, if we are to make progress on closing the achievement gaps. We must equip our teachers, especially those who are teaching in our neediest schools and districts, with more tools to teach reading. That includes insuring appropriate curriculum, effective instruction and support, strong instructional leadership, more time for instruction and enhanced motivation of students to read for information and pleasure. There are some promising signs that these approaches are working in some schools that mount a school-wide effort to give every student a chance to achieve at high levels.

One example of the success of school-wide reading strategies is **Conte/West Hills Magnet School in New Haven** which instituted the “Reading First” program and has made progress in increasing the percentage of students scoring at or above state goal and proficient levels in grades 3 and 4. Scores improved for black students, Hispanic students and white students. Scores improved and, at the same time, achievement gaps narrowed. **North Windham School in Windham** is another example of improvement in school-wide and subgroup performance. Overall scores improved and, at the same time, scores for Hispanic students increased substantially, thus narrowing the achievement gap in the context of school-wide improvement.

“Connecticut’s entire educational system needs to focus greater attention on the acquisition of basic academic skills, and we should use information provided on CMT performance to improve instruction, particularly for our lowest-performing students. Each teacher, administrator, curriculum expert, school of education professor and policy leader should use the data to take new steps to improve instruction for all students, and establish effective interventions for students who are struggling.”

“As a state, we should be making more meaningful progress. We should all be disappointed with reading performance across the board, even though some districts and schools have made significant gains,” said Commissioner McQuillan. “We believe that emphases on language and pre-reading strategies in Grades Pre-K through Kindergarten will play an important role in future years as early childhood programs expand and develop more targeted curriculum and instruction.”

“While there is some good news for some schools and districts, we should all be aware that our scores statewide are not improving sufficiently for all of our schools to meet the increasing demands of No Child Left Behind in future years. Moreover, it is imperative that our students be prepared for higher education and for the world of work.”

The commissioner said that he will pursue a series of actions to address the challenge:

- Work with teacher preparation institutions to improve the quality of training programs for new teachers – particularly elementary and middle school teachers — to become effective teachers of reading;

- Disseminate to districts newly created model curriculum, grade level expectations and pacing guides to serve as the basis for instruction in Language Arts, Mathematics and Science;
- Support the provision of targeted professional development activities to assist districts/schools in implementing the new curriculum;
- Encourage districts to use benchmark assessments in Language Arts and Mathematics regularly to determine if students are meeting expected standards;
- Expect and encourage schools to focus on teaching the basics of reading in accordance with *Connecticut's Blueprint for Reading Achievement* and *Beyond the Blueprint: Literacy in Grades 4-12 and Across the Content Areas*;
- Support districts in providing information and training for parents to encourage reading in the home and complement efforts in the classroom to help Connecticut's children become confident, capable readers.

“Connecticut has much to do. We need to work together,” said Commissioner McQuillan.

If Making Comparisons: Use Caution.

“Because participation and exemption rates can affect average scores, it is inappropriate to compare district scores without reviewing the percentage of students participating in each district,” Commissioner McQuillan cautioned. “It is also important to note that year-to-year comparisons are of different groups of students.”

District-by-district comparisons can be misleading if they do not take into account such factors as exemption and participation rates, size of test-taking population, and language proficiency, special needs or socioeconomic status of students. That is why CMT scores are presented in several formats to give a more complete picture of student performance.

CMT scores are presented for the following groups:

- all students;
- students by racial group;
- special education/non-special education;
- male/female;
- eligible/not eligible for free/reduced-priced lunch; and
- students in ESL and bilingual programs.

Attached are grade-level charts containing 2007 CMT scores by gender, race and poverty.

Following are PDF charts of grade-level performance by group.

GRADE 3

Students Selected: All

Print Date: 7/11/2007

Group	Year	Mathematics			Reading			Writing		
		Total Mathematics			Total Reading			Total Writing		
		Number Tested	% At/Above Goal	% At/Above Proficiency	Number Tested	% At/Above Goal	% At/Above Proficiency	Number Tested	% At/Above Goal	% At/Above Proficiency
State	2006	41558	56.3	78.3	41460	54.4	69.2	40882	61.1	81.7
	2007	41756	59.4	80.1	41651	52.3	69.3	41363	60.8	82.4
Male	2006	21206	57.8	78.8	21139	52.7	67.0	20756	53.4	76.5
	2007	21425	60.0	79.8	21345	50.2	66.9	21141	52.5	76.8
Female	2006	20352	54.8	77.9	20321	56.2	71.5	20126	68.9	87.0
	2007	20331	58.8	80.4	20306	54.5	71.9	20222	69.5	88.2
Black	2006	5602	28.2	56.3	5781	25.6	43.8	5652	38.6	66.7
	2007	5721	31.4	59.1	5707	23.6	43.4	5612	38.4	67.8
Hispanic	2006	6691	31.0	58.0	6649	24.3	41.1	6436	35.4	63.3
	2007	7063	34.0	61.4	7026	22.9	41.7	6920	38.0	66.4
White	2006	27301	67.5	87.3	27270	67.2	80.9	27045	71.2	88.7
	2007	27115	70.9	88.7	27069	65.1	81.2	26990	70.4	88.9
Asian American	2006	1608	74.3	90.9	1604	66.3	79.4	1594	73.4	90.3
	2007	1694	77.3	92.2	1687	66.2	82.3	1681	76.2	92.4
Am. Indian	2006	156	46.8	65.4	156	41.7	64.1	155	51.6	72.9
	2007	163	55.2	73.0	162	48.1	61.7	160	52.5	83.8
F/R Lunch	2006	12785	30.8	58.1	12726	24.5	42.5	12378	36.4	64.2
	2007	12889	34.4	61.4	12837	23.4	42.8	12640	37.5	66.8
Full Price	2006	28773	67.7	87.3	28734	67.6	81.0	28504	71.7	89.3
	2007	28867	70.6	88.4	28814	65.1	81.1	28723	71.1	89.3
Special Ed.	2006	4431	23.9	45.2	4382	17.2	28.6	4146	20.7	42.3
	2007	4321	23.8	46.1	4258	15.3	27.5	4117	21.0	43.8
Not Special Ed.	2006	37127	60.2	82.3	37078	58.8	74.0	36736	65.6	86.1
	2007	37435	63.5	84.0	37393	56.5	74.1	37246	65.2	86.7
ELL	2006	2717	27.1	52.7	2691	15.2	30.5	2577	29.1	55.3
	2007	2373	26.1	52.5	2349	10.3	24.6	2285	27.0	55.5
Not ELL	2006	38841	58.4	80.1	38769	57.1	71.9	38305	63.2	83.5
	2007	39383	61.4	81.8	39302	54.8	72.0	39078	62.8	84.0

Note: This report does not include ELL-exempt students.

GRADE 4

Students Selected: All

Print Date: 7/11/2007

Group	Year	Mathematics			Reading			Writing		
		Total Mathematics			Total Reading			Total Writing		
		Number Tested	% At/Above Goal	% At/Above Proficiency	Number Tested	% At/Above Goal	% At/Above Proficiency	Number Tested	% At/Above Goal	% At/Above Proficiency
State	2006	42308	58.8	80.3	42179	57.8	71.8	42044	62.8	84.2
	2007	41481	62.3	80.9	41393	57.0	70.6	41185	65.1	84.1
Male	2006	21715	59.9	80.2	21622	55.5	69.2	21529	54.5	78.6
	2007	21250	63.6	81.0	21175	55.2	68.4	21037	58.4	79.7
Female	2006	20593	57.7	80.3	20557	60.2	74.4	20515	71.6	89.9
	2007	20231	61.1	80.7	20218	58.9	72.9	20148	72.1	88.7
Black	2006	5704	28.0	57.0	5673	29.5	47.6	5625	39.9	70.0
	2007	5796	33.0	59.0	5780	29.5	45.9	5736	41.3	69.6
Hispanic	2006	6373	32.8	60.4	6327	27.4	44.4	6272	39.2	69.5
	2007	6724	35.6	60.8	6686	27.5	41.9	6593	40.8	67.8
White	2006	28495	69.9	88.8	28446	69.6	82.1	28417	71.9	89.8
	2007	27179	74.2	89.8	27151	69.5	82.2	27083	75.2	90.6
Asian American	2006	1584	76.0	92.1	1580	69.2	82.5	1576	77.5	93.1
	2007	1625	79.6	93.2	1619	69.3	82.9	1618	80.1	93.8
Am. Indian	2006	152	46.1	70.4	153	50.3	63.4	154	45.1	74.7
	2007	157	49.7	74.5	157	47.1	61.8	155	53.5	81.3
F/R Lunch	2006	12474	31.7	59.9	12406	27.5	45.4	12310	38.6	69.0
	2007	12706	35.4	61.1	12654	28.2	44.1	12519	40.1	67.8
Full Price	2006	29834	70.2	88.8	29773	70.4	82.7	29734	72.9	90.4
	2007	28775	74.2	89.6	28739	69.7	82.3	28666	76.0	91.2
Special Ed.	2006	4926	23.2	46.0	4856	18.1	29.0	4780	21.1	46.0
	2007	4652	25.7	46.7	4612	16.5	27.9	4513	21.2	44.8
Not Special Ed.	2006	37382	63.5	84.8	37323	62.9	77.3	37264	68.2	89.1
	2007	36829	67.0	85.2	36781	62.1	75.9	36672	70.5	88.9
ELL	2006	2351	27.6	54.0	2319	15.2	30.4	2298	31.9	62.1
	2007	2247	23.5	49.2	2225	8.6	19.4	2166	24.7	53.0
Not ELL	2006	39957	60.7	81.8	39860	60.2	74.2	39746	64.6	85.4
	2007	39234	64.6	82.7	39168	59.8	73.5	39019	67.3	85.8

Note: This report does not include ELL-exempt students.

GRADE 5

Connecticut Mastery Test Score Summary Report, 2006, 2007, Grade 5

Students Selected: All

Print Date: 7/11/2007

Group	Year	Mathematics			Reading			Writing		
		Total Mathematics			Total Reading			Total Writing		
		Number Tested	% At/Above Goal	% At/Above Proficiency	Number Tested	% At/Above Goal	% At/Above Proficiency	Number Tested	% At/Above Goal	% At/Above Proficiency
State	2006	42108	60.7	80.8	42075	60.9	72.8	41930	65.0	85.3
	2007	42204	66.0	82.5	42178	61.4	73.4	42140	64.6	85.7
Male	2006	21597	61.0	80.3	21566	58.6	70.3	21466	56.7	80.2
	2007	21651	65.8	81.7	21637	59.0	70.9	21595	57.1	80.7
Female	2006	20511	60.5	81.3	20509	63.3	75.4	20464	73.7	90.6
	2007	20553	66.1	83.3	20541	64.0	76.1	20545	72.6	91.0
Black	2006	5622	31.5	58.4	5619	30.5	46.3	5597	41.3	72.0
	2007	5679	37.9	61.9	5669	33.1	48.6	5662	40.6	72.6
Hispanic	2006	6352	34.1	61.1	6336	31.6	45.8	6288	41.3	69.0
	2007	6441	40.6	64.1	6439	31.3	46.5	6417	39.6	69.8
White	2006	28422	71.4	89.0	28410	72.8	83.4	28333	74.3	91.1
	2007	28333	76.5	90.2	28318	73.3	83.8	28313	74.3	91.5
Asian American	2006	1579	80.1	92.9	1577	74.8	84.2	1580	77.6	93.8
	2007	1593	82.2	93.3	1594	74.8	85.8	1590	80.1	93.9
Am. Indian	2006	133	51.1	77.4	133	45.9	59.4	132	53.0	78.8
	2007	158	56.3	75.3	158	52.5	69.0	158	56.3	81.6
F/R Lunch	2006	12261	34.0	61.2	12237	31.5	46.5	12159	40.6	70.2
	2007	12364	40.3	64.2	12347	32.5	48.2	12322	39.7	71.1
Full Price	2006	29847	71.7	88.9	29838	73.0	83.5	29771	74.9	91.4
	2007	29840	76.7	90.0	29831	73.4	83.8	29818	74.9	91.8
Special Ed.	2006	5140	21.3	41.8	5120	19.9	29.9	5027	22.3	47.7
	2007	4937	24.6	44.9	4913	19.5	31.1	4879	20.7	48.0
Not Special Ed.	2006	36968	66.2	86.3	36955	66.6	78.7	36903	70.8	90.4
	2007	37267	71.5	87.4	37265	67.0	79.0	37261	70.4	90.7
ELL	2006	1973	25.6	51.3	1952	15.9	28.0	1938	27.3	56.8
	2007	2032	24.9	48.7	2024	10.6	23.1	2006	21.4	53.5
Not ELL	2006	40135	62.4	82.3	40123	63.1	74.9	39992	66.8	86.7
	2007	40172	68.1	84.2	40154	64.0	75.9	40134	66.8	87.4

Note: This report does not include ELL-exempt students.

GRADE 6

Connecticut Mastery Test Score Summary Report, 2006, 2007, Grade 6

Students Selected: All

Print Date: 7/11/2007

Group	Year	Mathematics			Reading			Writing		
		Total Mathematics			Total Reading			Total Writing		
		Number Tested	% At/Above Goal	% At/Above Proficiency	Number Tested	% At/Above Goal	% At/Above Proficiency	Number Tested	% At/Above Goal	% At/Above Proficiency
State	2006	43026	58.6	79.8	42944	63.6	75.4	42885	62.2	82.7
	2007	42225	63.9	82.7	42157	64.3	75.7	42140	63.0	83.8
Male	2006	22043	57.8	78.8	22001	60.9	72.6	21933	54.2	76.9
	2007	21665	63.3	81.7	21607	61.9	73.2	21583	55.3	78.0
Female	2006	20983	59.4	80.8	20943	66.5	78.2	20952	70.7	88.6
	2007	20560	64.4	83.8	20550	66.9	78.4	20557	71.0	89.9
Black	2006	5912	27.1	56.2	5890	36.1	52.6	5892	38.3	67.2
	2007	5702	33.0	62.2	5683	36.0	52.1	5683	38.5	69.1
Hispanic	2006	6385	29.6	58.1	6355	33.4	48.7	6331	36.9	66.1
	2007	6530	34.5	62.5	6503	34.4	49.6	6481	38.4	68.3
White	2006	29081	70.4	88.8	29051	75.3	85.3	29014	71.9	89.1
	2007	28270	75.9	91.0	28255	76.3	86.0	28254	72.8	89.6
Asian American	2006	1493	77.8	91.8	1493	75.1	85.3	1493	77.8	92.0
	2007	1579	83.0	93.6	1573	77.4	86.0	1577	77.9	93.2
Am. Indian	2006	155	51.6	70.3	155	52.9	72.9	155	53.5	77.4
	2007	144	56.3	73.6	143	52.4	69.2	145	46.2	74.5
F/R Lunch	2006	12475	29.5	58.0	12430	34.6	50.3	12402	37.1	66.3
	2007	12131	34.9	63.4	12085	35.2	51.1	12068	37.9	68.5
Full Price	2006	30551	70.4	88.7	30514	75.5	85.6	30483	72.5	89.4
	2007	30094	75.6	90.5	30072	76.1	85.6	30072	73.0	89.9
Special Ed.	2006	5157	16.8	39.0	5129	20.0	31.9	5077	18.5	41.9
	2007	4906	20.8	42.8	4862	20.1	31.6	4832	18.6	43.1
Not Special Ed.	2006	37869	64.3	85.3	37815	69.5	81.3	37808	68.1	88.2
	2007	37319	69.5	88.0	37295	70.1	81.5	37308	68.7	89.0
ELL	2006	1724	16.6	41.6	1702	12.6	24.9	1682	21.8	50.2
	2007	1656	15.0	41.8	1648	8.9	18.0	1625	18.5	48.9
Not ELL	2006	41302	60.3	81.4	41242	65.7	77.4	41203	63.9	84.1
	2007	40569	65.9	84.4	40509	66.6	78.1	40515	64.8	85.2

Grade 7

Score Summary Report, 2006, 2007, Grade 7

Students Selected: All

Print Date: 7/11/2007

Group	Year	Mathematics			Reading			Writing		
		Total Mathematics			Total Reading			Total Writing		
		Number Tested	% At/Above Goal	% At/Above Proficiency	Number Tested	% At/Above Goal	% At/Above Proficiency	Number Tested	% At/Above Goal	% At/Above Proficiency
State	2006	43827	57.0	77.8	43740	66.7	76.4	43668	60.0	80.9
	2007	42911	60.3	80.2	42869	65.9	75.5	42847	60.4	81.1
Male	2006	22417	57.4	77.5	22370	62.9	73.1	22306	51.0	74.5
	2007	22046	59.8	79.0	22004	62.5	72.3	21975	51.5	74.7
Female	2006	21410	56.7	78.2	21370	70.7	79.9	21362	69.3	87.6
	2007	20865	60.8	81.5	20865	69.5	79.0	20872	69.8	87.7
Black	2006	6055	23.9	51.8	6058	38.9	53.3	6034	37.1	65.2
	2007	5870	27.9	55.8	5871	38.7	52.8	5884	36.0	64.9
Hispanic	2006	6518	26.0	52.1	6468	36.5	49.7	6425	33.6	60.1
	2007	6467	30.6	57.5	6475	36.1	48.9	6458	32.6	61.0
White	2006	29765	69.8	88.1	29733	78.4	86.5	29729	69.8	88.3
	2007	28912	72.6	89.7	28868	77.4	85.5	28854	70.9	88.4
Asian American	2006	1354	76.7	91.4	1348	79.4	87.1	1346	72.8	89.2
	2007	1501	79.6	91.8	1496	78.9	87.5	1492	75.2	91.0
Am. Indian	2006	135	43.7	73.3	133	60.2	66.2	134	47.8	72.4
	2007	161	47.8	71.4	159	57.9	72.3	159	52.2	72.3
F/R Lunch	2006	12249	26.7	54.0	12207	38.0	52.0	12162	34.6	62.9
	2007	12078	30.1	57.3	12072	37.0	50.4	12064	33.6	62.1
Full Price	2006	31578	68.8	87.0	31533	77.8	85.9	31506	69.8	87.9
	2007	30833	72.1	89.2	30797	77.2	85.4	30783	70.9	88.5
Special Ed.	2006	5133	17.0	35.9	5095	22.5	33.3	5061	17.1	38.6
	2007	5000	18.1	38.8	4978	21.4	31.7	4938	16.3	39.2
Not Special Ed.	2006	38694	62.4	83.3	38645	72.5	82.1	38607	65.6	86.5
	2007	37911	65.9	85.7	37891	71.7	81.3	37909	66.1	86.5
ELL	2006	1610	12.5	33.2	1570	13.1	23.8	1554	15.8	39.8
	2007	1550	12.1	33.3	1539	8.2	17.2	1513	10.8	36.5
Not ELL	2006	42217	58.7	79.5	42170	68.7	78.4	42114	61.6	82.4
	2007	41361	62.1	81.9	41330	68.0	77.7	41334	62.2	82.7

Note: This report does not include ELL-exempt students.

GRADE 8

Score Summary Report, 2006, 2007, Grade 8

Students Selected: All

Print Date: 7/11/2007

Group	Year	Mathematics			Reading			Writing		
		Total Mathematics			Total Reading			Total Writing		
		Number Tested	% At/Above Goal	% At/Above Proficiency	Number Tested	% At/Above Goal	% At/Above Proficiency	Number Tested	% At/Above Goal	% At/Above Proficiency
State	2006	43944	58.3	78.9	43832	66.7	76.6	43836	62.4	81.9
	2007	43719	60.8	80.8	43699	66.6	76.4	43673	64.0	82.5
Male	2006	22492	58.6	78.3	22415	64.1	74.0	22383	54.5	76.3
	2007	22331	61.2	80.5	22332	63.9	74.1	22283	57.1	77.5
Female	2006	21452	58.0	79.5	21417	69.5	79.4	21453	70.7	87.8
	2007	21388	60.4	81.1	21367	69.4	78.8	21390	71.2	87.8
Black	2006	6067	24.6	52.7	6045	38.2	52.8	6049	37.0	65.8
	2007	6023	27.7	56.9	6026	38.3	53.0	6022	36.4	65.0
Hispanic	2006	6367	25.9	53.7	6327	36.2	50.4	6325	34.3	62.0
	2007	6477	29.7	56.9	6472	37.3	49.9	6441	34.5	61.7
White	2006	29957	71.1	88.9	29912	78.5	86.6	29914	72.9	89.0
	2007	29687	73.4	90.4	29678	78.2	86.4	29690	75.4	90.2
Asian American	2006	1411	78.8	92.4	1408	78.6	86.5	1407	76.8	90.3
	2007	1394	81.2	92.3	1388	79.0	87.0	1385	78.3	92.1
Am. Indian	2006	142	42.3	76.1	140	55.0	70.7	141	53.9	75.2
	2007	138	45.7	71.7	135	51.9	70.4	135	48.1	69.6
F/R Lunch	2006	11935	26.5	54.8	11868	37.6	51.8	11890	35.3	63.5
	2007	12002	30.3	58.6	12005	38.2	51.9	11978	36.1	63.9
Full Price	2006	32009	70.2	87.9	31964	77.6	85.9	31946	72.5	88.8
	2007	31717	72.3	89.2	31694	77.3	85.7	31695	74.5	89.6
Special Ed.	2006	5059	17.3	37.8	5000	24.4	35.0	5000	18.8	41.6
	2007	4858	19.5	39.8	4850	23.3	33.9	4817	20.5	41.9
Not Special Ed.	2006	38885	63.7	84.2	38832	72.2	82.0	38836	68.0	87.1
	2007	38861	65.9	85.9	38839	72.0	81.7	38856	69.4	87.6
ELL	2006	1504	16.4	40.2	1483	14.7	24.3	1461	16.8	41.3
	2007	1435	12.7	34.6	1421	8.8	17.6	1394	12.7	33.6
Not ELL	2006	42440	59.8	80.3	42349	68.6	78.5	42375	64.0	83.3
	2007	42284	62.4	82.4	42278	68.5	78.4	42279	65.7	84.1

Note: This report does not include ELL-exempt students.

The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) assesses reading in two content areas: reading for literary experience and to gain information. The NAEP reading scale ranges from 0 to 500.

Overall Reading Results for Connecticut	Student Percentage at NAEP Achievement Levels
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In 2005, the average scale score for fourth-grade students in Connecticut was 226. This was not significantly different from¹ their average score in 2003 (228), and was higher than their average score in 1992 (222). Connecticut's average score (226) in 2005 was higher than that of the Nation's public schools (217). Of the 52 states and other jurisdictions² that participated in the 2005 fourth-grade assessment, students' average scale scores in Connecticut were higher than those in 34 jurisdictions, not significantly different from those in 16 jurisdictions, and lower than those in 1 jurisdiction. The percentage of students in Connecticut who performed at or above the NAEP <i>Proficient</i> level was 38 percent in 2005. This percentage was smaller than that in 2003 (43 percent), and was greater than that in 1992 (34 percent). The percentage of students in Connecticut who performed at or above the NAEP <i>Basic</i> level was 71 percent in 2005. This percentage was not significantly different from that in 2003 (74 percent), and was not significantly different from that in 1992 (69 percent). 	<p>Connecticut (public)</p> <p>Nation (public)</p> <p>Percent below Basic: Percent at Basic, Proficient, and Advanced</p> <p>■ Below Basic □ Basic ▒ Proficient ■ Advanced</p> <p>¹ Accommodations were not permitted for this assessment.</p> <p>NOTE: The NAEP reading achievement levels correspond to the following scale points: Below Basic, 207 or lower; Basic, 208–237; Proficient, 238–267; Advanced, 268 or above.</p>

Performance of NAEP Reporting Groups in Connecticut					
Reporting groups	Percent of students	Average score	Percent below Basic	Percent of students at or above Basic	Percent Advanced
Male	52	222	33	67	9
Female	48	230	25	75	14
White	69	234	19	81	15
Black	13	201	58	42	2
Hispanic	13	203	55	45	3
Asian/Pacific Islander	4	236	20	80	21
American Indian/Alaska Native	1	‡	‡	‡	‡
Eligible for free/reduced-price school lunch	28	202	55	45	2
Not eligible for free/reduced-price school lunch	72	235↓	19	81	16

Average Score Gaps Between Selected Groups	Reading Scale Scores at Selected Percentiles
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In 2005, male students in Connecticut had an average score that was lower than that of female students by 9 points. In 1992, the average score for male students was lower than that of female students by 5 points. In 2005, Black students had an average score that was lower than that of White students by 33 points. In 1992, the average score for Black students was lower than that of White students by 34 points. In 2005, Hispanic students had an average score that was lower than that of White students by 31 points. This performance gap was narrower than that of 1992 (43 points). In 2005, students who were eligible for free/reduced-price school lunch, an indicator of poverty, had an average score that was lower than that of students who were not eligible for free/reduced-price school lunch by 33 points. In 1998, the average score for students who were eligible for free/reduced-price school lunch was lower than the score of those not eligible by 35 points. In 2005, the score gap between students at the 75th percentile and students at the 25th percentile was 48 points. In 1992, the score gap between students at the 75th percentile and students at the 25th percentile was 44 points. 	<p>Scores at selected percentiles on the NAEP reading scale indicate how well students at lower, middle, and higher levels of the distribution performed.</p>

The estimate rounds to zero.

‡ Reporting standards not met.

* Significantly different from 2005.

† Significantly higher than 2003. ‡ Significantly lower than 2003.

¹ Comparisons (higher/lower/not different) are based on statistical tests. The .05 level was used for testing statistical significance. Performance comparisons may be affected by differences in exclusion rates across years for students with disabilities (5% nationally in 2005) and English language learners (2% nationally in 2005) in the NAEP samples. Statistical comparisons are calculated on the basis of unrounded scale scores or percentages.

² "Other Jurisdictions" refers to the District of Columbia and the Department of Defense Education Activity schools.

NOTE: Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding and because the "Information not available" category for free/reduced-price lunch and the "Unclassified" category for race/ethnicity are not displayed. Visit <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/states/> for additional results and detailed information.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), selected years, 1992–2005 Reading Assessments.

Guidelines for Proper Connecticut Mastery Test (CMT) Data Analysis

The CMT provides performance data at six grades in three subjects each year. There are various ways to appropriately compare results across years. However, there are also some commonly made comparisons which are inappropriate and can lead to erroneous conclusions. Therefore, the Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) is providing this brief guide to list both some appropriate comparison techniques and some common mistakes made when analyzing CMT data.

Appropriate Analyses:

- Within a generation and grade, Mathematics, Reading and Writing results may be compared across years. (e.g., fourth-grade mathematics performance levels in 2006 can be compared to fourth-grade mathematics performance levels in 2007.) *Note: As a reminder, the Generation three CMT was administered from 2000-2004 and the Generation four CMT has been administered in 2006 and 2007.*
- Within a generation and grade, Mathematics, Reading and Writing results may be compared across years at the subgroup level (i.e., English language learner status, special education status, gender status, free/reduced meal status or ethnic background status). For example, the performance of 6th-grade girls in writing can be compared to the performance of 6th-grade boys in writing.
- Within a generation and grade, comparisons may be made on the basis of scale scores and achievement levels for all groups of students. In Reading, DRP unit scores may also be compared for all groups of students.

Inappropriate Analyses:

- Direct comparisons across generations are inappropriate. (e.g., it is not appropriate to compare the performance of fourth-grade mathematics students in the fall of 2004 to the performance of fourth-grade mathematics students in the spring of 2006.)
- Comparisons of score-band performance across grades within a content area cannot yet be made. (e.g., with the data available at the time of this writing, one cannot legitimately compare seventh-grade performance in the goal range in 2007 to eighth-grade performance in the goal range in 2007.) *Note: The CSDE is currently attempting to develop a vertical scale, which may provide a way to track progress across grades.*
- Averaging numbers across subjects within a grade is not appropriate. (e.g. the percentage of students at the goal level in reading across grades cannot be averaged; neither can the percentage of students at the goal level be averaged across all the content areas within a grade).

This list is not exhaustive. If you would like further guidance on how to interpret CMT scores, please call the CSDE Student Assessment Office at (860) 713-6860. (*Note: members of the press corps should call the CSDE Public Information Office at (860) 713-6525.*)

