

CONNECTICUT DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

NEWS

DR. THEODORE S. SERGI
COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION

Contact: Tom Murphy 860.713.6525

Schools take steps to include all students

Statewide CMT-3 scores continue to trend upward, increase slightly over last year State Education Commissioner asks schools to use new data to “attack your gaps”

Even with an increasing number of test takers – including more limited-English-proficient students and special education students—average performance on the 2001 Connecticut Mastery Test improved somewhat over last year. An average of 60 percent of students statewide achieved goal on each of the Reading, Writing and Math tests in Grades 4, 6, and 8. The new generation test results also present data in several formats that give insight into significant achievement gaps among racial and economic groups and between boys’ and girls’ performance.

“While I wish there were more federal, state and local resources for this mission and we will continue to argue for additional support, nothing should deter each of us from attacking the achievement gaps that are evident in the student performance data we see today,” said Commissioner of Education Theodore S. Sergi. “Each teacher, administrator and curriculum expert should analyze the data by racial, poverty, special need and gender group and by school and take new steps to change instruction.”

Individual student score reports and school and district data were distributed to superintendents in mid-January.

Highlights of the Statewide Results:

Student scores increased somewhat over last year’s. This continues a trend of steady progress in student achievement from 1993 to 2001.

An average of about 60 percent of all students achieved goal on the subtests:

All Students	Reading 2001 Avg. Score	Reading 2001 (% at Goal)	Writing 2001 Avg. Score	Writing 2001 (% at Goal)	Math 2001 Avg. Score	Math 2001 (% at Goal)
Grade 4	248.4	58	256.7	61	248.7	61
Grade 6	253.0	64	249.8	60	255.3	61
Grade 8	249.4	66	248.5	59	250.5	55

“School districts need to focus greater attention on the application of basic academic skills, and should use this information to improve instruction, particularly for our lowest-performing students. Fourth Grade Reading performance remains our greatest concern,” Commissioner Sergi said.

Many more students participated in the standard testing program statewide than last year.

Connecticut has been taking steps to increase student participation in the annual Connecticut Mastery Test in Grades 4, 6, and 8 by raising expectations, limiting exemption, and providing appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities. A total of 126,462 children participated in the 2001 standard assessment. Statewide participation rates increased about two percent from 2000 to 2001, primarily due to the participation of additional bilingual, English-as-a-second-language (ESL) and special education students and improvements in attendance. (A list of participation rates is included on page 4 of the attached report.)

“This test should be seen as an educational resource to which all children should have access,” said Commissioner Sergi in releasing the results of the 2001 assessment. “The information educators and parents obtain about individual student

and school needs can be very helpful in improving student achievement. Local, state and federal policy and practice have helped to increase the number of children who take the CMT and at the same time have provided necessary accommodations to assist with students' special needs so they can participate and benefit from the assessment."

Statewide 2001 district participation rates ranged from about 90 percent to 100 percent. "While our largest and poorest cities still had the lowest participation rates, they also had the greatest improvements in participation."

The results show a small closing of the achievement gaps but with large gaps remaining.

"The achievement gap in Connecticut is troubling," said Commissioner Sergi. **"While some progress is being made –with a small closing of the gap from 1993 to 2001—the rate of improvement is too slow.** We need to step up our actions to do more, faster, in order to address the problem. We need to do more of the things that reduce the gap – more preschool opportunities, earlier intervention, after-school and summer school, more instructional time, more one-to-one reading assistance, more parent training and support."

"Closing the achievement gap can't be accomplished by anyone's efforts alone. Local communities, the state and federal governments must act to address these needs. No one should sit back and wait for someone else to act first. With every district and school taking specific actions to attack their gaps, the next few years should bring greater success," Commissioner Sergi said. "Each of us has an individual contribution to make, and in this context, 'attack' means that with renewed purpose, greater vigor, new methods and zero tolerance for the status quo, we can provide an equal educational opportunity for each child."

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 Sergi cautioned.

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. This is the second year that the 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.

The Department has determined that the scores for non-special education and non-bilingual and non-ESL students would be the most compatible and appropriate data to use to compare this year's district and statewide performance with last year's. This is primarily because of the significant increases in participation for these groups in the 2001 administration of the standard CMT. When scores for special education students and students enrolled in bilingual and ESL programs are factored out of the analysis, students demonstrated more significant growth over last year.

"It is wrong to overemphasize test results – they are not the only measure of student performance," Commissioner Sergi said. "But is also wrong to ignore them. The information we obtain from the CMT can help give direction to school improvement, and can focus discussions among staff and parents about how we can help students improve. No one should be satisfied with these results, but we should use them to do better."

"These results tell us that we are making progress in Connecticut, that we are building on already strong performance in many schools. The scores also show that the achievement gaps are difficult to close and that it will take more than we have been doing to make the type of accelerated progress we need to see in the next few years. Schools must continue to improve instruction and curriculum based upon the information they receive from the assessments, particularly with regard to racial, economic, language and gender group performance data. We need to further focus both attention and resources on these challenges," Commissioner Sergi concluded.

Series 2001-2002

CIRCULAR LETTER – C-18

TO: Superintendents of Schools
 FROM: Theodore S. Sergi, Commissioner of Education
 DATE: February 28, 2002
 SUBJECT: Results From the 2001 Administration of the Connecticut Mastery Test

This report presents the statewide results from the 2001 administration of the third generation of the Connecticut Mastery Test (CMT-3). Although there are now two years of performance data available, it will not be until the 2002 results are available that we can compare results for the same group of students on two tests (Grades 4 and 6, Grades 6 and 8). Due to statutory changes and districts' efforts to include more special education students in the standard test, the statewide participation rate has increased significantly.

Some highlights follow:

- Percentages of students reaching the state goals across the nine tests ranged from 55 to 66 percent. In the majority of cases, these were increases over the 2000 results. The percentage of students scoring in the intervention level ranged from 7 percent to 20 percent. These results were very similar to those of 2000.
- The rates of participation in the standard CMT-3 increased dramatically over the year 2000: nearly two percentage points for the total population, more than 10 percentage points for special education students, and more than 30 percentage points for students in bilingual education and English-as-a-second-language (ESL) programs.
- The achievement gaps – between white students and minorities; between students in ERGs A-H and I; and, between poor and non-poor students – decreased, but by small amounts.
- The 2001 CMT results show that when compared to a national sample of students, Connecticut students as a group scored between the 60th and the 64th percentile in each subject area at each grade level. That is higher than nearly two-thirds of the students in the nation.

I. What was the performance of all students in Grades 4, 6 and 8 on the standard test in 2001?

TABLE 1

2001 STATE RESULTS BY CONTENT AREA FOR ALL STUDENTS

Content Area	Grade	Scale (100-400)	State Goal	Average Scale Score	Percent of Students by Performance Level			
					Level 4 At/Above Goal	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1 Intervention
					2001	2001	2001	2001
Mathematics	4	100-400	242	248.7	61	20	9	9
	6		245	255.3	61	21	10	8
	8		246	250.5	55	21	13	11
Reading	4	100-400	243	248.4	58	13	10	20
	6		239	253.0	64	11	7	18
	8		235	249.4	66	11	8	15
Writing	4	100-400	240	256.7	61	21	11	7
	6		238	249.8	60	21	11	8
	8		239	248.5	59	20	12	10

CMT-3 Results-2001

The CMT-3 is aligned with Connecticut's curriculum frameworks and provides information regarding the mastery of important skills in mathematics, reading and writing. The CMT is administered each fall to measure the academic performance of approximately 126,000 students in Grades 4, 6 and 8.

Reading, writing and mathematics scores were calculated using a scale of 100-400. A state goal standard, as well as two other standards below the goal, was established for each test using this scale, creating four performance levels. Table 1 provides information regarding the percentage of students who scored in each of the four performance levels for 2001.

Grade 4

The percentages of fourth graders who met the state goals were 61 percent in mathematics, 58 percent in reading, and 61 percent in writing.

In mathematics and writing, 82 percent of all students scored in the two highest levels (levels 3 and 4). In reading, 71 percent of all students scored in the top two levels (levels 3 and 4).

The percentages of students in the intervention level in 2001 were 20 percent in reading, 9 percent in mathematics and 7 percent in writing.

Fourth grade reading needs to be a continued focus across all districts.

Grade 6

The percentages of sixth graders who met the state goals were 61 percent in mathematics, 64 percent in reading, and 60 percent in writing.

In mathematics, 82 percent of all students scored in the two highest levels (levels 3 and 4). In writing, 75 percent of all students scored in the top two levels (levels 3 and 4). In reading, 81 percent of all students scored in the top two levels (levels 3 and 4).

The percentages of students in the intervention level in 2001 were 18 percent in reading, 8 percent in mathematics and 8 percent in writing.

Again, the results in reading represent the greatest need.

Grade 8

The percentages of eighth graders who met the state goals were 55 percent in mathematics, 66 percent in reading, and 59 percent in writing.

In mathematics, 76 percent of all students scored in the two highest levels (levels 3 and 4). In writing, 77 percent of all students scored in the top two levels (levels 3 and 4). In reading, 79 percent of all students scored in the top two levels (levels 3 and 4).

The percentages of students in the intervention level in 2001 were 15 percent in reading, 11 percent in mathematics and 10 percent in writing.

These results indicate that a majority of Connecticut students are learning basic skills. The continuing challenge is to have more students able to apply these basic skills to real-life and complex problems.

What Test Results Tell Us About Student Achievement (What Connecticut Students Can Do)

Mathematics

The mathematics section of the CMT emphasizes mastery of basic skills and concepts, and the ability to apply them to solve problems.

Connecticut's Grades 4 and 6 students continued to demonstrate high levels of mastery in the areas of computational skills, number sense, geometric shapes and properties, and probability and statistics. Estimating solutions to problems and integrated mathematics problems are areas of weaker performance. Students in Grade 8 did not perform at the same high levels as fourth and sixth graders, although the ability to solve word problems, estimating solutions to problems and classification and logical reasoning were skills a large majority of students mastered. **Areas in need of attention were computing with percentages, measurement, probability and solving integrated mathematics problems.**

Reading

The reading test has two subtests, the Degrees of Reading Power (DRP®) and Reading Comprehension. The DRP assesses the process of reading and the Reading Comprehension test assesses the product of reading.

In Reading Comprehension, approximately two-thirds of Connecticut students in all three grades were able to form a basic understanding of the text read and could interpret the meaning. **Only a smaller number of students were able to critique or analyze the text they read.**

Based on the DRP results, over 50 percent of Grade 4 students possess the knowledge and skills necessary to comprehend textbooks and other materials used at Grade 4 or above. Other students need some teacher assistance or reading material below Grade 4. Over 89 percent of Grade 6 students, based on DRP results, have the skills to read a typical middle school textbook; but only 37.1 percent have the skills to read and understand an average article in a Connecticut newspaper. Over 58 percent of Grade 8 students demonstrated skill sufficient to read an average article in a Connecticut newspaper and about 70 percent demonstrated skills to read a typical high school textbook.

Writing

There are two subtests that compose the Writing test, Direct Assessment of Writing and Editing & Revising. The Direct Assessment of Writing assesses how well students communicate in writing. The Editing & Revising test assesses a student's ability to revise a written work and make appropriate grammatical edits.

Over 60 percent of Grade 4 students can write fluently, can expand on key events and characters, and exhibit strong organizational skills, as assessed on the Direct Assessment of Writing. A small number of Grade 4 students (5.3 percent) need to improve on their ability to develop a narrative using details and examples in an organized sequence. Close to 60 percent of Grade 4 students achieved mastery on both Editing & Revising content strands: composing/revising and editing.

Over 60 percent of Grade 6 students can produce fluent and elaborated responses with a mix of general and specific details as demonstrated on the Direct Assessment of Writing. A smaller number (4.0 percent) need assistance with developing a theme and elaborating their ideas using a mix of general and specific details. Half of all Grade 6 students achieved mastery on both Editing & Revising content strands: composing/revising and editing.

Over 60 percent of Grade 8 students demonstrated their ability to write fluent and well-developed responses that elaborate on their theme using general and specific details as assessed on the Direct Assessment of Writing. Sixty percent of Grade 8 students mastered both Editing & Revising content strands: composing/revising and editing.

The overall weakness in writing by male students, as compared to females, is a statewide concern.

II. How does the 2001 participation rate of special populations compare to participation in 2000?

TABLE 2

**NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS WHO PARTICIPATED
IN THE STANDARD CMT
2000 AND 2001**

	Special Education		Bilingual Education		English as a Second Language		Total Population	
	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Grade 4								
Mathematics	3,293 (64.1%)	3,998 (77.0%)	359 (44.7%)	743 (78.4%)	212 (32.0%)	555 (71.1%)	41,473 (93.6%)	42,813 (96.0%)
Reading	2,964 (57.7%)	3,630 (69.9%)	350 (43.5%)	717 (75.6%)	199 (30.0%)	550 (70.4%)	41,070 (92.7%)	42,374 (95.0%)
Writing	2,994 (58.3%)	3,579 (68.9%)	342 (42.5%)	673 (71.0%)	199 (30.0%)	545 (69.8%)	40,904 (92.3%)	42,180 (94.6%)
Grade 6								
Mathematics	3,342 (60.8%)	4,309 (73.2%)	165 (31.6%)	433 (69.2%)	82 (17.3%)	313 (61.0%)	41,018 (92.7%)	43,105 (94.7%)
Reading	3,163 (57.6%)	4,084 (69.4%)	160 (30.7%)	423 (67.6%)	79 (16.7%)	305 (59.5%)	40,836 (92.3%)	42,948 (94.4%)
Writing	3,201 (58.3%)	4,155 (70.6%)	160 (30.7%)	406 (64.9%)	78 (16.5%)	303 (59.1%)	40,785 (92.2%)	42,880 (94.2%)
Grade 8								
Mathematics	3,412 (60.9%)	4,124 (71.1%)	58 (12.2%)	235 (56.5%)	88 (22.0%)	251 (56.8%)	38,761 (91.7%)	41,037 (93.8%)
Reading	3,374 (60.3%)	4,108 (70.8%)	55 (11.5%)	240 (57.7%)	74 (18.5%)	248 (56.1%)	38,758 (91.6%)	41,120 (94.0%)
Writing	3,355 (59.9%)	4,100 (70.7%)	48 (10.1%)	222 (53.4%)	70 (17.5%)	240 (54.3%)	38,613 (91.3%)	40,935 (93.6%)

Policy and Legislative Changes

To interpret the changes in CMT results from 2000 to 2001, consideration must be made of policy decisions that led to dramatic changes in the participation of students in the standard CMT testing program. These changes were prompted by changes in federal and state policy and legislation and also by a general increased awareness that participation in testing and accountability systems has a positive impact on the expectations and educational opportunities

available to students. As Table 2 shows, the participation rates for the total statewide population increased by two to three percentage points. The increases are much more pronounced for special populations of students who had traditionally been more likely to be exempted from the testing: special education students and students who participate in bilingual education or ESL programs. In addition, participation in Connecticut's poorest cities (ERG I) increased by five to seven percent from 2000 to 2001.

Special Education Participation

In the fall of 2000, all special education students in Connecticut were required to participate in some version of the CMT-3 (i.e., standard, out-of-level or Skills Checklist) with accommodations as necessary. Between the 2000 administration and the 2001 administration of the CMT-3, guidance and encouragement at the state level has led to higher proportions of special education students participating in the standard version of the CMT-3. As Table 2 shows, the percentage of special education students who participated in the standard CMT-3 increased by more than 10 percentage points from 2000 to 2001.

Bilingual/ESL Participation

In 2001, Connecticut legislation regarding the participation of students in bilingual and ESL programs was changed in response to federal expectations. For the 2000 CMT-3 administration, it was permissible to exempt students from the test who had been enrolled in a bilingual education or ESL program for less than three years. For the 2001 CMT-3 administration, any students who had been enrolled in a bilingual education or ESL program for more than 10 school months were required to participate in the testing program. As a result, there was a substantial increase in the percentage of students in bilingual and ESL programs who participated in the CMT-3 in 2001, an increase of more than 30 percentage points.

Use Caution When Comparing 2000 and 2001 Scores

Given the particular educational challenges of special education students and students in bilingual and ESL programs, it is understandable that these groups of students typically do not score as well as the general population on tests such as the CMT. The disproportionate increases in the participation of these students affect the comparability of CMT-3 results from 2000 to 2001. Therefore, test result data is presented throughout the report in a number of ways: results for all students; results for subpopulations of students; and results for all students, not including special education and bilingual and ESL students. This enables analyses of student performance on the CMT for all students who participated in the standard test and by gender, race/ethnicity, poverty and participation in special education, bilingual and ESL programs. In addition, **the reports displaying test results for all students, not including special education and bilingual and ESL students, allow for more accurate analysis of test result changes from 2000 to 2001 and for comparability across districts.**

III. How does the 2000 student performance compare with performance in 2001, when scores of special education, bilingual and ESL students are not included?

TABLE 3

STATEWIDE RESULTS NOT INCLUDING SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS AND STUDENTS IN BILINGUAL EDUCATION AND ESL PROGRAMS 2000 AND 2001

Content Area	Grade	Scale (100-400)	State Goal	Average Scale Score		Percent of Students by Performance Level							
						Level 4 At/Above Goal		Level 3		Level 2		Level 1 Intervention	
				2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Mathematics	4	100-400	242	253.9	254.6	63.5	66.1	21.4	20.0	8.9	8.1	6.2	5.8
	6		245	253.9	261.3	61.4	66.0	21.2	20.5	9.9	8.5	16.6	14.6
	8		246	254.0	256.3	59.2	60.1	21.7	21.1	11.5	11.3	5.5	3.6
Reading	4	100-400	243	253.6	254.2	60.3	63.0	14.0	13.3	9.2	9.1	7.8	4.7
	6		239	253.7	259.4	66.1	68.9	12.3	11.2	7.4	6.4	14.5	13.4
	8		235	253.9	255.4	71.0	71.6	10.5	10.4	7.0	7.1	4.4	4.3
Writing	4	100-400	240	253.6	262.6	61.1	66.2	21.9	20.7	11.5	9.5	8.2	7.2
	6		238	253.4	255.6	65.1	65.3	21.8	21.2	9.0	9.2	12.2	10.8
	8		239	254.0	254.1	65.1	64.2	19.2	20.0	9.4	10.1	6.9	5.8

Table 3 shows the statewide results by grade level and content area of all students not including special education students and students enrolled in bilingual education and ESL programs.

When scores for special education students and students enrolled in bilingual education and ESL programs are factored out of the analysis, students demonstrated significant growth over 2000. Grade 4 reading scores at the goal level increased by 3.3 percentage points. The Grade 4 writing scores at the goal level increased by 5.1 percentage points. Sixth graders showed significant progress in meeting the mathematics goal, with an increase of 4.6 percentage points. The gains are much smaller in Grade 8 and, in fact, decreased slightly in writing.

Districts should analyze their individual schools and grade-level scores and determine what types of curricular and instructional practices need to be adjusted or reinforced. (See Appendix A for year 2000-2001 district scores – not including special education, bilingual and ESL students.)

IV. How did each subgroup perform on the CMT-3?

Tables 4-6 show CMT data for subgroups by gender, race/ethnicity, eligibility for free/reduced-price lunch, participation in special education, and participation in bilingual education and ESL programs.

PLEASE NOTE: Any comparisons from 2000 to 2001 should be done carefully, keeping in mind the differences in the participation of special populations of students.

TABLE 4

**GRADE 4
2000 AND 2001
CMT-3 RESULTS BY GENDER, RACE, POVERTY, SPECIAL EDUCATION,
BILINGUAL EDUCATION AND ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE**

	% At/Above Goal Mathematics		Average Mathematics Scale Score		% At/Above Goal Reading		Average Reading Scale Score		% At/Above Goal Writing		Average Writing Scale Score	
	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Male	61.1	62.5	250.9	249.6	54.3	55.9	246.6	245.6	50.0	54.1	241.1	247.1
Female	59.2	59.5	249.3	247.7	59.5	59.9	252.9	251.4	65.2	68.5	258.5	266.6
Black	28.0	29.3	217.8	215.5	24.6	25.7	218.1	216.9	34.0	36.2	225.1	229.8
Hispanic	31.1	32.2	219.8	217.9	23.3	24.2	215.2	214.4	34.8	35.7	226.2	228.2
White	70.6	72.6	260.6	260.8	68.0	70.4	260.8	260.8	65.1	70.6	257.6	267.0
Asian	74.2	75.8	266.8	268.0	67.0	70.6	261.1	261.3	69.9	73.1	264.5	271.7
American Indian	52.2	44.9	240.0	232.3	46.5	40.4	240.2	232.3	44.7	46.2	234.8	237.6
Other Race	49.7	55.9	240.9	243.5	47.0	55.6	240.4	246.4	50.9	58.0	243.4	253.6
Eligible F/R Lunch	32.7	33.3	221.9	219.4	26.2	26.5	218.5	217.4	35.0	36.7	226.4	229.7
Not Eligible	69.9	70.6	260.1	258.8	67.7	68.6	260.6	259.0	65.4	69.5	257.9	265.8
Special Education	29.4	25.6	215.9	206.8	22.7	20.8	210.6	206.8	20.0	21.3	208.7	209.1
Not in Special Education	62.8	64.7	253.1	253.0	59.5	61.4	252.7	252.3	60.5	64.9	252.9	261.1
Bilingual Education	6.1	10.6	184.4	187.2	0.6	3.3	180.1	183.6	7.6	14.0	191.5	201.7
English as a Second Language	31.1	32.8	220.3	215.9	18.1	14.7	210.8	204.1	29.7	25.3	222.6	218.5
Not ESL/Bilingual Program	60.8	62.3	250.8	250.2	57.6	59.4	250.5	250.1	58.1	62.4	250.3	258.1
Not SPED/ESL/Bilingual	63.5	66.1	253.9	254.6	60.3	63.0	253.6	254.2	61.1	66.2	253.6	262.6
All Students	60.2	61.0	250.1	248.7	56.9	57.9	249.7	248.4	57.5	61.2	249.7	256.7

TABLE 5

**GRADE 6
2000 AND 2001**

**CMT-3 RESULTS BY GENDER, RACE, POVERTY, SPECIAL EDUCATION,
BILINGUAL EDUCATION AND ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE**

	% At/Above Goal Mathematics		Average Mathematics Scale Score		% At/Above Goal Reading		Average Reading Scale Score		% At/Above Goal Writing		Average Writing Scale Score	
	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Male	57.5	61.0	249.7	255.2	59.3	60.8	245.9	248.9	54.5	53.0	241.7	241.5
Female	57.6	60.9	249.9	255.4	65.1	66.5	253.5	257.3	67.9	67.1	257.3	258.2
Black	23.0	28.0	214.1	221.3	29.4	31.9	216.6	218.8	33.0	32.4	222.0	221.1
Hispanic	26.6	31.1	218.3	224.5	27.9	30.5	214.5	215.1	32.0	32.5	221.2	221.6
White	68.4	72.4	261.1	266.9	73.5	75.6	261.4	266.3	70.9	70.1	258.9	260.1
Asian	77.1	79.0	271.2	278.4	75.7	75.4	263.6	268.4	74.3	74.0	264.3	266.4
American Indian	32.6	32.1	224.8	227.3	42.2	37.9	223.8	224.3	43.1	29.0	229.7	222.4
Other Race	44.0	48.0	234.4	242.4	48.2	50.8	234.2	238.4	48.4	47.4	236.6	236.7
Eligible F/R Lunch	27.5	33.0	218.7	225.9	30.0	33.2	216.7	218.8	34.2	33.4	222.7	222.4
Not Eligible	67.3	69.9	260.0	264.7	72.7	73.3	260.5	264.0	69.9	68.4	258.2	258.5
Special Education	20.5	21.4	207.7	210.5	23.1	22.9	207.1	204.7	22.1	18.8	207.6	204.4
Not in Special Education	60.8	65.4	253.5	260.3	65.4	67.9	253.3	258.1	64.4	64.4	253.0	254.6
Bilingual Education	6.1	7.9	186.9	190.6	3.1	2.8	168.5	168.5	5.0	6.2	181.7	186.7
English as a Second Language	29.3	25.2	216.3	216.3	22.8	14.4	205.1	194.4	34.6	19.8	220.9	206.0
Not ESL/Bilingual Program	57.8	61.8	250.1	256.2	62.5	64.5	250.1	254.3	61.4	60.8	249.8	250.7
Not SPED/ESL/Bilingual	61.1	66.0	253.9	261.3	65.8	68.9	253.7	259.4	64.7	65.3	253.4	255.6
All Students	57.5	61.0	249.8	255.3	62.1	63.6	249.1	253.0	61.1	60.0	249.5	249.8

TABLE 6

GRADE 8
2000 AND 2001
CMT-3 RESULTS BY GENDER, RACE, POVERTY, SPECIAL EDUCATION,
BILINGUAL EDUCATION AND ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE

	% At/Above Goal Mathematics		Average Mathematics Scale Score		% At/Above Goal Reading		Average Reading Scale Score		% At/Above Goal Writing		Average Writing Scale Score	
	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Male	54.9	54.1	249.9	249.2	64.3	62.7	246.2	244.7	52.9	50.0	241.1	238.7
Female	54.7	56.8	249.7	251.7	68.5	69.9	252.7	254.2	68.0	67.8	257.9	258.4
Black	17.4	19.4	210.1	211.9	34.4	32.8	216.1	215.9	32.5	31.7	221.7	221.6
Hispanic	21.2	22.1	214.2	214.2	31.9	31.9	212.8	212.5	32.4	30.4	220.6	220.5
White	65.6	66.6	261.1	262.3	76.6	77.6	260.2	260.9	68.9	67.8	258.2	257.3
Asian	73.0	77.4	273.5	277.9	80.7	78.7	267.0	265.9	77.1	74.0	267.6	266.2
American Indian	35.4	33.7	229.6	225.8	45.1	51.1	227.1	231.2	35.4	39.9	226.7	227.7
Other Race	40.4	42.9	234.4	237.5	53.0	52.8	234.0	236.1	49.4	48.8	236.3	236.9
Eligible F/R Lunch	21.7	23.7	214.8	216.7	34.0	34.3	215.2	216.1	32.3	32.0	220.6	221.8
Not Eligible	64.0	63.4	259.5	258.9	75.4	74.3	258.9	257.7	68.2	65.5	257.5	255.1
Special Education	18.1	16.4	208.4	205.0	27.5	25.0	205.3	203.7	19.1	16.1	204.5	203.8
Not in Special Education	58.4	59.8	253.8	255.5	70.1	70.8	253.6	254.4	64.4	63.6	253.8	253.4
Bilingual Education	0.0	3.0	168.8	183.1	0.0	7.9	149.4	167.1	0.0	7.2	174.8	188.7
English as a Second Language	14.8	20.3	206.4	206.5	13.5	14.1	191.1	188.4	15.7	16.3	203.7	202.5
Not ESL/Bilingual Program	55.0	55.9	250.0	251.1	66.6	66.9	249.7	250.2	60.6	59.3	249.7	249.1
Not SPED/ESL/Bilingual	58.6	60.1	254.0	256.3	70.3	71.6	253.9	255.4	64.5	64.2	254.0	254.1
All Students	54.8	55.4	249.8	250.5	66.4	66.3	249.4	249.4	60.4	58.8	249.5	248.5

According to Tables 4 through 6, 2001 CMT data for subgroups of students show that:

- Across Grades 4, 6, and 8, females significantly outperformed males in the areas of reading and writing. Greater focus needs to be placed on assisting Connecticut's males to read and write at higher achievement levels. However, in mathematics, the results were somewhat mixed, with males scoring somewhat higher at Grade 4, Grade 6 results being practically even, and females scoring somewhat higher at Grade 8.
- White and Asian student performance is substantially higher than that of black, Hispanic and American Indian students in all subject areas at all three grade levels.
- Students from families below the poverty level are scoring far below their non-poverty counterparts on all parts of the CMT.
- Test scores of special education students who are able to take the standard grade-level CMT and bilingual and ESL students are substantially lower than scores of non-special education and non-bilingual and non-ESL students.
- Of note are the results of students in bilingual education programs from 2000 to 2001. Even though more bilingual students took the CMT (from 28.6 percent in 2000 to 65.3 percent in 2001) due to the change in state law, scores improved in all grades and subjects, except in Grade 6 reading. These increases could be attributed, in part, to the small size and generally lower academic levels of the students tested in 2000, and to the bilingual legislation enacted in 1999 which required the annual assessments of all bilingual students and an increase in English instruction.

V. What is the evidence of achievement gaps?

Closing the achievement gaps among Connecticut's students is the most important educational goal of this decade. The Connecticut Association of Urban School Superintendents and the Connecticut Association of Boards of Education have joined with the Department in initiating new strategies to close these gaps. Throughout the second generation of the CMT (1993 – 1999), some progress was made toward this critical goal. In every subject area at every grade level, the average scores of students in ERG I showed more growth than the scores of the statewide population. **Achievement gaps – between students in ERG I and others; between racial/ethnic groups; and between poor students and non-poor students – continue to be a pressing problem that will require the efforts of all who have a role in the education of Connecticut's children.**

Tables 7, 8 and 9 provide an analysis of CMT-3 data in the format that best allows a comparison of achievement gaps from 2000 to 2001. In order to support a valid comparison of achievement gaps from one year to the next, special education students and students in bilingual education and ESL programs are not included. These tables show the relative performance across years of ERG I communities (Bridgeport, Hartford, New Britain, New Haven, New London, Waterbury and Windham) and all other towns; black, Hispanic and white students; and poor (i.e., eligible for free or reduced-priced lunch) and non-poor students.

GRADE 4
STATE CMT-3 RESULTS NOT INCLUDING SPECIAL EDUCATION, BILINGUAL AND ESL STUDENTS

BY:

- ERGs
- RACE/ETHNICITY
- POVERTY

	Mathematics % At/Above Goal		Mathematics % at Intervention		Mathematics Average Scale Score		Reading % At/Above Goal		Reading % at Intervention		Reading Average Scale Score		Writing % At/Above Goal		Writing % at Intervention		Writing Average Scale Score	
	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
ERGs A - H	69.8	72.6	3.8	3.7	260.1	261.0	67.3	70.2	11.4	9.5	260.4	260.9	65.6	71.6	3.9	2.4	258.2	268.3
ERG I	32.1	34.5	18.0	16.2	222.9	223.7	24.5	27.5	42.7	39.5	219.3	221.1	38.4	40.3	13.3	9.6	230.6	235.2
Black	30.0	32.3	17.7	18.6	221.2	220.4	26.3	28.3	39.6	39.6	221.0	221.1	36.3	39.6	13.4	9.6	228.5	234.6
Hispanic	35.1	39.3	16.0	13.5	225.4	228.3	26.8	30.9	40.5	35.2	220.6	224.3	39.1	43.6	12.1	8.3	231.8	237.9
White	73.7	76.5	2.6	2.3	263.8	264.9	71.4	74.4	8.9	6.8	264.3	264.9	68.7	74.7	3.0	1.8	261.2	271.6
Eligible F/R Lunch	35.6	38.4	15.7	14.8	226.1	226.8	28.8	31.4	38.3	34.7	222.7	224.5	38.3	42.3	12.3	8.5	230.8	237.0
Not Eligible	72.9	74.4	2.9	3.1	263.2	263.0	70.9	72.6	9.3	8.6	264.0	263.1	68.7	73.4	3.2	2.2	261.3	270.4

Percentage Point Change from 2000 to 2001 on *Percent At or Above State Goal*

	Mathematics	Reading	Writing
ERGs A - H	2.8	2.9	6.0
ERG I	2.4	3.0	1.9
Black	2.3	2.0	3.3
Hispanic	4.2	4.1	4.5
White	2.8	3.0	6.0
Eligible F/R Lunch	2.8	2.6	4.0
Not Eligible	1.5	1.7	4.7

GRADE 6
STATE CMT-3 RESULTS NOT INCLUDING SPECIAL EDUCATION, BILINGUAL AND ESL STUDENTS

BY:

- ERGs
- RACE/ETHNICITY
- POVERTY

	Mathematics % At/Above Goal		Mathematics % at Intervention		Mathematics Average Scale Score		Reading % At/Above Goal		Reading % at Intervention		Reading Average Scale Score		Writing % At/Above Goal		Writing % at Intervention		Writing Average Scale Score	
	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
ERGs A - H	67.6	72.5	4.8	2.8	260.5	267.4	72.8	76.0	9.5	8.5	260.7	266.9	70.6	71.2	3.0	2.8	259.0	261.4
ERG I	28.1	35.0	23.2	14.3	220.3	230.5	29.6	33.5	40.5	38.2	217.9	222.1	34.9	35.9	11.8	11.8	225.1	227.0
Black	24.9	31.1	24.3	16.2	217.9	226.9	31.7	35.3	38.0	35.1	220.2	224.5	35.3	36.0	11.6	12.3	225.6	226.4
Hispanic	29.4	37.2	20.2	12.4	222.8	233.5	30.8	36.6	38.3	36.3	219.2	224.7	35.0	38.9	12.0	10.7	225.4	229.7
White	72.2	77.2	2.8	1.4	265.0	271.7	77.3	80.4	6.7	5.7	265.2	271.5	74.7	74.9	2.0	1.8	262.8	265.0
Eligible F/R Lunch	30.0	38.3	21.1	12.7	222.9	233.7	32.4	38.5	36.7	33.1	220.7	227.0	37.2	38.9	11.2	10.7	226.8	229.7
Not Eligible	70.9	74.4	3.6	2.4	263.7	269.3	76.3	77.8	7.5	7.7	264.2	269.0	73.4	72.9	2.3	2.4	261.8	263.2

Percentage Point Change from 2000 to 2001 on *Percent At or Above State Goal*

	Mathematics	Reading	Writing
ERGs A - H	4.9	3.2	0.6
ERG I	6.9	3.9	1.0
Black	6.2	3.6	0.7
Hispanic	7.8	5.8	3.9
White	5.0	3.1	0.2
Eligible F/R Lunch	8.3	6.1	1.7
Not Eligible	3.5	1.5	-0.5

GRADE 8
STATE CMT-3 RESULTS NOT INCLUDING SPECIAL EDUCATION, BILINGUAL AND ESL STUDENTS

BY:

- ERGs
- RACE/ETHNICITY
- POVERTY

	Mathematics % At/Above Goal		Mathematics % at Intervention		Mathematics Average Scale Score		Reading % At/Above Goal		Reading % at Intervention		Reading Average Scale Score		Writing % At/Above Goal		Writing % at Intervention		Writing Average Scale Score	
	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
ERGs A - H	65.6	67.5	4.3	4.1	261.4	263.5	77.0	78.4	7.5	6.7	260.8	262.0	70.2	69.5	4.6	4.0	259.6	259.3
ERG I	19.5	23.1	29.7	24.0	213.3	218.5	33.1	35.6	38.0	33.0	215.7	220.5	34.0	36.2	19.1	14.3	223.7	227.3
Black	19.0	21.8	27.7	24.1	213.7	217.3	37.2	36.9	32.1	30.5	220.3	221.8	35.3	35.6	17.5	14.8	225.8	226.8
Hispanic	23.0	26.2	26.1	22.4	217.6	221.4	34.3	37.1	37.2	32.9	216.7	220.6	34.9	35.6	19.1	15.4	224.3	227.1
White	69.9	71.5	2.6	2.4	265.4	267.4	80.8	82.4	5.3	4.5	264.7	265.9	73.4	72.9	3.3	2.9	262.7	262.4
Eligible F/R Lunch	23.8	27.6	24.3	20.5	218.8	223.4	37.1	39.9	33.5	28.9	219.9	223.9	35.6	37.6	18.2	14.0	225.2	228.8
Not Eligible	67.9	67.9	3.9	4.2	263.5	263.8	79.2	78.9	6.4	6.7	263.1	262.6	72.3	70.2	3.8	3.9	261.7	259.9

Percentage Point Change from 2000 to 2001 on *Percent At or Above State Goal*

	Mathematics	Reading	Writing
ERGs A - H	1.9	1.4	-0.7
ERG I	3.6	2.5	2.2
Black	2.8	-0.3	0.3
Hispanic	3.2	2.8	0.7
White	1.6	1.6	-0.5
Eligible F/R Lunch	3.8	2.8	2.0
Not Eligible	0.0	-0.3	-2.1

The data in Tables 7, 8 and 9 show the progress that has been made in narrowing the achievement gaps between the first two years of the third generation CMT.

Grade 4

- Hispanic students made more progress than black or white students in mathematics and reading. (Note that these results do not include Hispanic students with limited English proficiency.)
- In mathematics and in reading, poor students showed a greater increase in the percentage of students reaching the state goals than that of non-poor students.
- The achievement gap in writing appears to have widened whether it is analyzed by ERG, race or poverty. More focus needs to be placed on assisting Grade 4 students with their writing abilities.

Grade 6

- In the percentage of students reaching the state goals, students in ERG I made greater gains than students in ERGs A – H in mathematics, reading and writing.
- In all three content areas, gaps between racial/ethnic groups narrowed, with black and Hispanic students making more progress than white students. In all subjects, the gains made by Hispanic students are particularly notable.
- In all three content areas, poor students made greater gains than their non-poor peers.

Grade 8

- In the percentage of students reaching the state goals, students in ERG I made greater gains than students in ERGs A – H in mathematics, reading and writing.
- In all three content areas, poor students made greater gains than their non-poor peers.
- In all three content areas, Hispanic and black students made greater gains than white students.

Attack Your District and School Gaps

While we should be motivated by the progress we have made in addressing the achievement gaps among Connecticut's students, we know that the remaining large gaps are still unacceptable. Our work is continuing. **Educators in each local school district, school and classroom need to evaluate the data for their own students to determine what seems to be working for which students and which students are still not being reached. These data should be used to inform changes in curriculum and instruction. With the concerted effort of all who are responsible for the education of children in Connecticut, we will ensure the improved achievement of all students and the continued narrowing of Connecticut's achievement gaps.**

VI. How many Connecticut students reached the goal on all three tests?

TABLE 10

**PERCENT OF STUDENTS AT LEVEL 4 (State Goal)
2000 AND 2001**

Grade	Number of Tests	Percentage of Students At Level 4 (State Goal)	
		2000	2001
4	All Three Tests	40.2	42.8
	No Tests	25.8	25.1
6	All Three Tests	43.7	45.4
	No Tests	25.8	25.5
8	All Three Tests	43.5	44.0
	No Tests	25.7	26.7

These results point to continuing progress in increasing the percentage of students achieving the state goal on all three exams, and in decreasing the percentage of students scoring above goal on no tests, with the exception of Grade 8. It also highlights the fact that there are still approximately 25 percent of our students not achieving well at all.

VII. How does Connecticut student performance compare to the nation?

**TABLE 11
COMPARISON OF CONNECTICUT STUDENTS' ACHIEVEMENT WITH A NATIONAL POPULATION
NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANK OF AVERAGE CONNECTICUT STUDENT
2000 AND 2001**

	Mathematics		Reading Comprehension		Written Communication	
	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Grade 4	63	62	62	61	58	63
Grade 6	59	63	61	63	60	60
Grade 8	60	60	65	63	65	64

- The 2001 CMT results show that when compared to a national sample of students, Connecticut students as a group scored between the 60th and 64th percentiles in each subject area at each grade level. That is higher than nearly two-thirds of the students in the nation.
- The percentile ranks from 2000 to 2001 increased or stayed the same in five out of nine tests, which is a positive sign given the increase in the population tested in 2001.

NOTE: Norms are expressed in percentile ranks that provide estimates of student performance relative to the performance of the national MAT-8 norm group (see below). Percentile ranks range from 1 to 99. A percentile rank of 50 represents the score that divides the norm group into two equal parts – half scoring below and half scoring above this value.

*Source: Harcourt Educational Measurement, Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT-8)

*Normative information is provided to indicate how well the average student in Connecticut performed compared to a national sample. For example, it is estimated that Grade 4 students who achieved the state average score on the CMT Mathematics test would have scored better than 62 percent of students nationally.

VIII. What was the participation rate on the 2001 CMT?

State and federal policy on the assessment of special education students changed for the 2000-2001 school year. School districts were asked to assess no less than 80 percent of their special education students with the standard CMT. The purpose of this new policy was to address issues of access and equity and to raise expectations and accountability for achievement. **In 2000, the state average special education participation rate in the standard CMT was 59.7 percent (averaged across subjects and grades). In 2001, the state average special education participation rate increased to 71.2 percent.** While this is a significant increase in the participation of special education students statewide, some districts were well below the state average and significantly below the state goal of 80 percent. They must make additional efforts to include special education students in the standard tests.

Table 12 provides the special education participation rate for those school districts lower than the state average of 71.2 percent and state goal of 80 percent. Only districts with at least 10 percent or more students identified as special education and at least 300 students across Grades 4, 6 and 8 were included in this analysis. **Caution should therefore be used in comparing the CMT scores of any districts or schools without reviewing participation and absence rates and particularly if analyzing the scores of the districts identified below.**

TABLE 12

**AVERAGE SPECIAL EDUCATION PARTICIPATION RATE ON THE STANDARD TEST ACROSS GRADES AND SUBJECTS
CMT-3 2001**

Districts With Special Education Participation Rates Below 35%

DISTRICT	Total Number of Students in Grades 4, 6 and 8	Percent of Special Education Students in Grades 4, 6 and 8	Average Participation of Special Education Students on the Standard Test
BRIDGEPORT	5671	12.9	33.8
PLYMOUTH	503	14.9	34.5

Districts with Special Education Participation Rates Between 45% and 50%

DISTRICT	Total Number of Students in Grades 4, 6 and 8	Percent of Special Education Students in Grades 4, 6 and 8	Average Participation of Special Education Students on the Standard Test
HARTFORD	5517	18.7	49.8
PORTLAND	352	10.5	45.6

Districts with Participation Rates Between 53% and 56%

DISTRICT	Total Number of Students in Grades 4, 6 and 8	Percent of Special Education Students in Grades 4, 6 and 8	Average Participation of Special Education Students on the Standard Test
EAST WINDSOR	400	15.0	54.3
NEW BRITAIN	2535	18.9	55.8
WATERTOWN	876	12.2	54.9
WINDHAM	804	17.5	53.8

The following districts had an average participation rate of special education students on the standard test of between 61.5 percent and the statewide average of 71.2 percent: Berlin, Clinton, Meriden, Milford, Norwich, Plainfield, Plainville, Wallingford, Waterbury, Waterford, West Hartford, Wolcott and Regional School District 8. (See Appendix C for all districts' special education participation rates.)

The Department will continue to work with these districts to improve the participation rate of their special education students on the standard test to ensure all students have access to learning the same skill objectives and competencies.

IX. What was the absentee rate of all students in standard CMT assessments?

In addition to the participation rates of special education students and the exemption of students in bilingual and ESL programs, some students are absent from one or more exams and others have an invalidated score for one or more reasons.

Statewide, the “no valid score” (absent, void or non-scorable) category ranged from 0.6 percent to 1.5 percent in Grade 4, 1.3 percent to 1.7 percent in Grade 6, and 1.9 percent to 2.5 percent in Grade 8. Yet, a number of districts had a “no valid score” report of 5.0 percent or more of their students on any one test (excluding districts with less than 100 students per grade level).

Caution should therefore be used in comparing these scores with districts which fell within the state range. (See Appendix B for all districts' participation rates.)

TABLE 13

**PERCENT OF STUDENTS WITH NO VALID SCORE REPORTED
5% OR HIGHER WITH 100 STUDENTS OR MORE PER GRADE**

NAME	Grade 6		Grade 8		
	Reading	Writing	Math	Reading	Writing
BRIDGEPORT					6.6
HARTFORD				6.9	6.3
MIDDLETOWN					5.5
NEW BRITAIN					7.3
NEW FAIRFIELD	5.0	5.4			5.2
NEW HAVEN	5.1	6.2			5.5
NORWALK					5.1
WATERBURY		6.6	6.0	7.9	7.9

Student Participation: Conclusion

With the growth of the accountability movement at the state and national level and resulting legislation – HR 1, Leave No Child Behind – the assessment of and **accountability for every student** has become a much more serious concern. In 2005-06, the new federal legislation requires no less than a 95 percent participation rate for each subgroup of students who take the standard test. In addition, state and federal grants use or will use district assessment data for distributing funds. As required by state and federal law...”**each student** enrolled in the...fourth, sixth, eighth, and tenth...grade in any public school **shall annually take** a statewide mastery examination.” (C.G.S. 10-14.) All Connecticut school districts should be alerting their staffs to this issue, instructing planning and placement teams, revising individualized education plans and considering methods of accounting for student attendance to ensure participation in CMT/CAPT during the scheduled testing or make-up periods.

The Department and, in particular, the Bureau of Special Education and Pupil Services, are available to assist districts to ensure that more special education students are participating in the same curriculum as their non-disabled peers and are assessed on the standard state tests.

APPENDIX A-1**GRADE 4
2000 AND 2001****COMPARISON OF RESULTS BY DISTRICT NOT INCLUDING SCORES OF SPECIAL
EDUCATION STUDENTS AND STUDENTS IN BILINGUAL EDUCATION AND ESL
PROGRAMS**

NAME	% At/Above Goal Mathematics		Average Mathematics Scale Score		% At/Above Goal Reading		Average Reading Scale Score		% At/Above Goal Writing		Average Writing Scale Score	
	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
ANDOVER	65	74	254.2	257.9	73	69	258.0	263.4	56	51	247.5	251.0
ANSONIA	46	48	237.0	235.7	47	47	240.8	236.7	43	56	236.5	250.7
ASHFORD	69	72	254.2	259.9	57	64	250.1	250.7	49	49	241.5	254.8
AVON	84	87	273.0	273.5	89	91	284.4	281.1	87	94	289.3	306.6
BARKHAMSTED	73	92	262.9	270.7	78	95	273.2	280.1	58	84	253.2	278.8
BERLIN	78	85	270.3	276.1	76	86	267.2	274.6	63	76	254.7	273.5
BETHANY	63	71	246.8	256.8	63	74	253.0	265.8	60	79	250.3	274.7
BETHEL	64	73	251.9	262.1	68	70	261.2	259.3	66	76	258.6	269.1
BLOOMFIELD	44	51	235.9	239.9	43	43	233.0	236.0	43	50	235.3	248.0
BOLTON	73	75	262.4	256.9	79	80	263.5	267.4	67	87	259.7	281.6
BOZRAH	61	57	239.4	244.3	67	50	255.9	251.0	33	46	229.4	244.1
BRANFORD	73	75	262.8	266.0	74	79	266.0	269.4	73	71	262.2	265.4
BRIDGEPORT	26	26	216.9	214.5	21	24	216.9	215.1	32	29	224.6	224.4
BRISTOL	65	67	255.3	254.4	51	55	244.4	245.4	55	66	247.2	262.9
BROOKFIELD	67	69	259.3	260.9	71	70	263.5	257.0	62	71	252.1	266.2
BROOKLYN	65	92	255.1	278.0	54	82	247.5	267.1	45	62	236.7	255.2
CANAAN	40	100	252.2	275.3	80	100	264.3	281.1	50	78	241.0	271.1
CANTERBURY	62	68	251.0	252.3	56	68	248.0	255.6	47	58	234.9	253.8
CANTON	81	78	270.5	268.5	79	84	275.6	268.2	62	75	252.6	271.9
CHAPLIN	64	63	255.5	257.9	67	63	261.5	249.6	63	56	255.9	253.1
CHESHIRE	88	91	282.2	280.0	80	81	274.2	270.2	81	79	277.2	277.4
CHESTER	76	94	267.2	275.8	85	94	285.0	288.3	78	80	269.0	280.9

NAME	% At/Above Goal Mathematics		Average Mathematics Scale Score		% At/Above Goal Reading		Average Reading Scale Score		% At/Above Goal Writing		Average Writing Scale Score	
	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
CLINTON	59	57	251.6	246.0	60	63	252.3	256.5	53	66	246.4	262.0
COLCHESTER	67	69	255.3	257.2	63	65	255.0	256.2	65	58	258.9	255.8
COLEBROOK	75	39	262.4	224.0	56	33	261.1	223.6	31	33	238.9	236.2
COLUMBIA	66	70	254.0	256.6	68	67	254.7	254.3	40	52	234.1	250.7
CORNWALL	47	75	237.8	256.5	80	63	254.5	258.9	60	56	250.7	257.6
COVENTRY	67	64	257.7	256.1	62	68	257.4	259.9	61	68	255.1	264.4
CROMWELL	77	83	268.6	266.1	70	74	263.4	266.4	62	74	254.3	270.6
DANBURY	63	69	254.4	259.5	46	53	239.6	243.2	52	51	244.1	247.0
DARIEN	88	87	273.7	280.9	85	87	277.8	279.0	84	89	276.0	290.5
DEEP RIVER	67	60	255.6	250.1	73	62	272.9	256.9	57	66	264.8	257.7
DERBY	30	52	221.0	238.6	32	48	229.1	239.8	44	55	231.2	249.9
EASTFORD	78	69	270.9	251.9	83	77	281.3	269.3	78	62	276.7	249.4
EAST GRANBY	79	74	267.8	261.6	67	85	264.3	268.2	63	68	251.3	258.2
EAST HADDAM	59	76	251.8	264.0	63	71	261.9	267.2	77	76	267.2	277.2
EAST HAMPTON	66	65	256.3	252.4	73	63	267.8	259.2	69	69	255.1	261.9
EAST HARTFORD	42	35	232.8	225.2	35	35	230.7	225.9	44	42	236.6	239.9
EAST HAVEN	47	56	236.0	243.0	43	52	232.7	241.9	48	59	239.6	251.8
EAST LYME	81	76	270.5	265.9	77	75	267.3	268.4	76	78	268.2	273.1
EASTON	75	86	268.2	272.5	76	86	272.9	277.1	61	83	257.8	285.6
EAST WINDSOR	68	57	251.7	251.8	50	51	243.4	244.0	45	52	238.8	252.8
ELLINGTON	78	84	268.3	274.8	76	84	271.7	274.5	71	81	263.3	275.4
ENFIELD	58	60	248.5	247.4	59	59	251.1	249.6	54	54	247.3	250.7
ESSEX	83	81	279.3	264.0	82	79	276.4	274.7	71	67	257.7	260.6
FAIRFIELD	84	87	274.5	277.1	80	84	276.7	277.3	82	83	275.9	280.8
FARMINGTON	85	81	271.8	272.5	85	78	279.2	273.2	80	85	278.2	292.3
FRANKLIN	47	61	242.3	260.1	29	72	239.9	253.3	35	72	231.1	254.6

NAME	% At/Above Goal Mathematics		Average Mathematics Scale Score		% At/Above Goal Reading		Average Reading Scale Score		% At/Above Goal Writing		Average Writing Scale Score	
	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
GLASTONBURY	84	86	273.7	276.7	85	87	280.8	278.6	79	91	271.5	293.5
GRANBY	86	88	273.7	276.1	78	80	268.6	272.8	83	88	274.5	286.6
GREENWICH	84	84	276.7	273.3	77	82	273.0	271.4	79	81	275.3	276.1
GRISWOLD	36	56	228.5	247.6	35	64	232.0	254.6	26	58	221.9	253.6
GROTON	68	68	256.3	252.6	63	60	255.6	251.7	58	63	250.6	256.4
GUILFORD	67	75	261.0	266.0	78	82	270.0	274.9	81	85	271.3	286.9
HAMDEN	54	52	245.3	238.0	57	57	248.9	246.0	54	55	247.2	251.9
HAMPTON	64	64	251.2	251.3	79	64	264.2	258.8	52	32	241.0	242.0
HARTFORD	32	36	221.8	225.5	20	22	212.8	216.5	34	42	225.4	237.7
HARTLAND	77	67	265.5	255.9	77	65	272.1	254.4	60	67	262.6	265.0
HEBRON	79	90	268.0	276.9	80	90	274.4	278.0	66	87	259.8	286.2
KENT	66	63	247.5	263.2	71	74	267.1	271.7	58	70	254.7	271.4
KILLINGLY	61	71	251.8	258.8	59	63	252.1	253.3	58	65	246.3	256.3
LEBANON	61	74	250.6	264.3	51	67	245.2	256.1	46	59	237.3	255.8
LEDYARD	62	73	252.7	262.9	70	72	263.0	263.5	58	70	250.9	265.8
LISBON	83	56	268.5	247.2	66	65	260.3	248.4	68	63	256.6	250.5
LITCHFIELD	70	80	257.5	261.8	75	74	266.3	262.9	63	70	255.7	262.6
MADISON	84	87	275.4	272.6	89	87	281.2	278.1	76	81	272.2	276.6
MANCHESTER	63	66	255.2	256.3	65	68	257.7	258.1	66	65	258.3	261.3
MANSFIELD	66	77	256.8	267.9	69	79	264.2	274.1	59	79	250.2	279.2
MARLBOROUGH	78	74	267.2	264.7	83	81	271.6	273.6	59	75	251.5	273.7
MERIDEN	57	69	248.7	255.9	51	51	242.4	243.7	60	62	252.3	256.6
MIDDLETOWN	56	56	247.1	243.4	54	51	249.1	244.0	63	59	255.5	254.0
MILFORD	78	80	266.2	264.4	70	72	262.4	262.4	75	73	265.1	267.1
MONROE	79	75	269.0	266.5	87	80	278.9	271.5	86	83	277.1	279.2
MONTVILLE	72	77	259.9	263.0	69	71	259.7	260.2	70	78	253.9	266.8

NAME	% At/Above Goal Mathematics		Average Mathematics Scale Score		% At/Above Goal Reading		Average Reading Scale Score		% At/Above Goal Writing		Average Writing Scale Score	
	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
NAUGATUCK	54	65	243.6	250.9	52	59	244.1	247.4	48	59	240.3	250.8
NEW BRITAIN	35	34	225.2	225.1	31	36	226.9	230.1	46	44	240.0	239.8
NEW CANAAN	87	85	278.8	274.0	89	90	281.9	279.9	77	81	264.9	278.6
NEW FAIRFIELD	76	77	274.1	267.6	72	74	265.1	263.2	64	66	254.7	258.2
NEW HARTFORD	80	87	274.8	276.5	81	88	272.1	279.8	78	91	270.7	290.4
NEW HAVEN	35	35	225.0	224.3	24	22	217.6	217.3	38	37	230.9	231.9
NEWINGTON	74	75	263.3	263.9	67	73	258.6	262.2	71	79	263.2	272.1
NEW LONDON	28	36	216.2	224.1	26	32	219.4	226.6	35	53	224.3	242.8
NEW MILFORD	66	70	256.5	255.1	68	70	258.0	260.1	67	72	255.6	266.4
NEWTOWN	84	87	270.3	277.6	80	82	273.9	271.3	76	79	268.2	277.6
NORFOLK	61	100	247.8	283.6	61	100	254.8	285.4	28	95	236.0	301.3
NORTH BRANFORD	65	72	255.4	259.8	71	76	261.5	264.0	62	71	249.5	264.5
NORTH CANAAN	64	72	254.1	257.0	63	78	248.9	263.8	33	60	234.0	257.3
NORTH HAVEN	81	74	271.7	262.7	79	77	268.4	264.4	80	83	267.2	278.7
NORTH STONINGTON	79	72	262.1	259.9	68	78	262.8	271.0	72	88	267.7	292.4
NORWALK	49	51	241.3	241.3	49	48	241.7	241.7	55	57	247.1	250.3
NORWICH	63	62	251.1	248.6	57	54	253.0	245.6	57	64	248.3	256.8
OLD SAYBROOK	79	75	268.0	265.1	76	78	268.0	270.0	90	87	286.4	294.0
ORANGE	83	74	269.1	258.0	77	76	266.5	267.6	74	78	266.6	278.1
OXFORD	74	67	259.3	252.1	65	73	257.7	260.6	63	72	250.7	267.3
PLAINFIELD	51	52	240.4	240.6	45	48	238.5	242.0	34	54	232.5	246.2
PLAINVILLE	66	74	255.7	258.6	66	68	256.1	256.6	68	69	261.6	267.4
PLYMOUTH	59	69	250.8	252.8	56	65	246.5	257.1	64	79	252.0	276.6
POMFRET	80	70	264.2	265.5	80	79	278.1	273.5	77	79	274.0	289.7
PORTLAND	54	68	246.2	253.6	62	71	255.8	260.7	63	70	256.9	264.2
PRESTON	42	59	231.1	245.3	57	76	249.2	257.1	46	59	236.1	251.9

NAME	% At/Above Goal Mathematics		Average Mathematics Scale Score		% At/Above Goal Reading		Average Reading Scale Score		% At/Above Goal Writing		Average Writing Scale Score	
	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
PUTNAM	52	51	246.6	237.6	55	49	248.0	236.6	41	43	234.6	238.1
REDDING	77	88	269.9	280.7	79	83	277.9	273.3	74	78	268.6	279.9
RIDGEFIELD	83	86	273.2	274.3	86	90	280.2	282.3	87	91	284.7	294.1
ROCKY HILL	75	79	265.1	263.6	70	71	262.3	258.5	73	78	258.5	272.7
SALEM	53	83	246.8	270.5	52	81	248.3	268.9	43	75	237.3	273.2
SALISBURY	90	89	276.0	278.6	93	78	282.6	270.7	88	70	282.9	273.6
SCOTLAND	44	64	233.8	248.6	44	71	230.1	262.6	22	43	220.3	244.5
SEYMOUR	72	69	259.1	258.9	67	72	254.3	262.9	66	81	256.7	275.6
SHARON	72	60	258.9	255.7	52	64	246.1	257.6	57	79	260.4	273.9
SHELTON	72	77	262.1	266.3	68	71	260.0	259.7	75	75	262.6	273.9
SHERMAN	82	89	268.1	279.0	84	88	272.1	274.3	64	85	252.3	282.1
SIMSBURY	93	91	284.9	285.6	91	88	286.9	281.7	92	86	287.7	285.0
SOMERS	81	76	273.0	261.8	79	77	268.2	265.9	60	69	249.9	264.6
SOUTHINGTON	73	79	261.0	265.8	66	70	255.9	259.6	69	76	261.0	269.4
SOUTH WINDSOR	81	78	270.5	267.4	72	75	264.6	264.9	61	68	250.8	265.9
SPRAGUE	54	68	245.5	257.1	57	48	245.8	243.8	61	68	248.5	268.5
STAFFORD	72	72	262.4	261.8	68	65	258.3	255.4	54	76	247.2	271.0
STAMFORD	62	61	250.7	250.6	57	60	249.8	251.1	52	58	245.0	252.3
STERLING	44	57	233.6	243.3	44	68	239.2	255.4	41	60	230.1	257.8
STONINGTON	70	75	262.1	263.4	61	76	261.0	264.9	65	76	255.5	270.6
STRATFORD	61	61	250.9	249.1	54	60	247.2	247.6	49	59	243.5	248.9
SUFFIELD	67	78	263.9	266.4	70	76	268.6	264.2	78	83	278.1	284.9
THOMASTON	51	57	244.7	241.9	56	58	248.5	249.1	55	71	247.1	261.8
THOMPSON	69	78	255.3	261.5	57	75	249.0	267.5	55	74	248.0	262.5
TOLLAND	76	75	264.3	263.0	79	75	267.4	265.3	67	69	255.1	263.7
TORRINGTON	62	62	251.1	248.0	64	68	255.0	257.9	69	72	261.1	265.5

NAME	% At/Above Goal Mathematics		Average Mathematics Scale Score		% At/Above Goal Reading		Average Reading Scale Score		% At/Above Goal Writing		Average Writing Scale Score	
	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
TRUMBULL	79	80	270.6	269.6	73	77	266.3	266.3	77	74	271.1	269.0
UNION	100	82	268.8	275.0	83	100	275.7	284.0	83	91	267.0	273.8
VERNON	74	78	264.1	263.0	68	69	261.3	258.1	60	72	251.2	266.2
VOLUNTOWN	45	71	234.9	254.4	47	60	235.9	251.4	26	69	224.5	264.4
WALLINGFORD	67	74	256.1	258.9	68	71	259.0	261.2	65	76	257.5	269.6
WATERBURY	38	42	231.9	231.4	32	37	228.8	231.5	52	53	243.7	246.9
WATERFORD	78	83	266.4	267.5	74	73	266.8	265.8	66	76	258.0	270.5
WATERTOWN	61	63	251.9	248.9	61	63	253.1	252.4	64	68	253.8	260.4
WESTBROOK	57	75	249.7	268.5	72	66	260.7	262.9	63	77	251.4	266.9
WEST HARTFORD	84	87	276.6	280.2	77	81	274.5	275.1	78	83	276.3	283.8
WEST HAVEN	58	63	249.2	248.9	51	58	244.9	247.8	48	65	241.8	260.5
WESTON	88	89	282.4	277.5	88	92	284.4	285.0	77	89	268.0	289.5
WESTPORT	92	93	283.6	284.7	90	88	283.6	281.2	90	89	290.3	299.2
WETHERSFIELD	81	77	266.5	265.6	70	81	265.0	266.1	66	77	256.2	272.0
WILLINGTON	62	79	259.8	261.3	62	77	259.8	271.4	53	75	248.2	262.9
WILTON	85	89	276.4	280.7	87	88	282.4	278.9	85	88	278.3	293.5
WINCHESTER	64	57	251.6	246.2	49	69	249.3	257.2	66	67	251.5	258.0
WINDHAM	32	45	219.6	234.7	27	41	218.2	230.5	29	42	221.3	237.6
WINDSOR	55	68	245.4	256.9	52	59	244.6	252.4	50	67	241.2	262.2
WINDSOR LOCKS	70	65	255.6	250.1	57	65	249.3	255.5	61	66	250.5	259.7
WOLCOTT	72	81	258.1	267.3	59	74	251.6	260.6	65	81	259.3	278.2
WOODBIDGE	87	83	281.7	271.6	86	75	278.3	264.1	71	90	270.3	287.1
WOODSTOCK	76	78	262.3	265.8	70	84	260.0	272.7	49	53	240.6	252.1
REG SCH DIST 06	62	67	250.6	257.3	76	69	265.1	262.1	70	76	260.5	271.5
REG SCH DIST 10	89	81	280.6	268.9	84	79	282.4	270.7	91	83	293.0	282.5
REG SCH DIST 12	68	82	262.1	265.7	82	72	271.3	265.1	75	68	270.7	271.6

NAME	% At/Above Goal Mathematics		Average Mathematics Scale Score		% At/Above Goal Reading		Average Reading Scale Score		% At/Above Goal Writing		Average Writing Scale Score	
	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
REG SCH DIST 13	75	72	261.1	258.8	70	77	263.2	265.8	70	80	258.5	277.4
REG SCH DIST 14	89	80	281.0	268.4	84	80	275.8	274.0	88	91	283.5	293.3
REG SCH DIST 15	77	81	267.5	269.0	86	87	278.8	277.9	74	86	266.2	290.4
REG SCH DIST 16	70	66	258.5	250.6	76	73	264.8	259.7	74	83	264.8	279.9
REG SCH DIST 17	77	69	264.0	259.6	74	74	262.9	263.6	76	73	266.7	268.2
REG SCH DIST 18	75	79	269.4	263.9	79	78	272.2	268.6	75	72	265.0	266.2
E HRTFD/GLASTONBURY	51	70	245.1	258.5	58	60	256.6	251.2	53	56	245.1	255.7
MONTESSORI MAGNET	13	33	197.3	226.9	13	75	228.4	256.9	14	50	229.7	245.7
SIX-SIX MAGNET SCH	48	56	241.5	244.1	45	58	248.5	243.3	50	39	245.4	237.8
WINTERGREEN MAGNET	48	61	236.1	245.6	51	56	243.5	249.0	43	67	236.9	263.3
MULTICULTURAL	47	39	239.1	230.6	56	55	242.7	244.4	36	61	231.6	255.5
JUMOKE ACADEMY	24	18	222.1	194.2	29	21	224.5	204.4	29	14	218.6	203.0
INTEGRATED DAY	64	52	252.8	244.5	61	58	262.4	245.3	63	52	264.4	253.5
SIDE BY SIDE	47	32	251.5	221.9	68	22	266.1	228.4	74	42	256.9	229.5
BREAKTHROUGH CHARTER	21	35	217.4	224.0	35	50	223.7	234.9	35	30	224.8	230.9
HIGHVILLE	0	15	184.7	207.5	6	19	195.9	216.2	6	31	204.2	229.0
UNIFIED SCH DIST #2		40		225.4		100		297.0		100		260.0
ERG A	87	88	277.6	278.7	87	88	281.7	279.8	83	88	278.9	291.1
ERG B	81	82	271.9	272.3	79	80	272.6	271.1	76	80	270.1	277.9
ERG C	74	77	263.7	265.1	75	79	268.2	269.2	68	77	260.7	274.8
ERG D	69	72	259.3	259.5	68	70	259.3	260.2	67	71	257.2	267.0
ERG E	67	72	256.5	259.0	65	72	258.6	261.7	61	70	253.7	266.8
ERG F	66	69	255.1	255.6	62	66	254.6	255.7	61	68	253.0	261.4
ERG G	56	62	245.9	249.9	52	60	244.0	251.2	50	64	242.7	259.0

NAME	% At/Above Goal Mathematics		Average Mathematics Scale Score		% At/Above Goal Reading		Average Reading Scale Score		% At/Above Goal Writing		Average Writing Scale Score	
	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
ERG H	56	59	247.0	247.4	50	52	243.8	243.4	53	58	245.3	252.8
ERG I	32	35	222.9	223.7	25	28	219.3	221.1	38	40	230.6	235.2
STATE	64	66	253.9	254.6	60	63	253.6	254.2	61	66	253.6	262.6

GRADE 6
2000 AND 2001

COMPARISON OF RESULTS BY DISTRICT NOT INCLUDING SCORES OF SPECIAL
EDUCATION STUDENTS AND STUDENTS IN BILINGUAL EDUCATION AND ESL
PROGRAMS

NAME	% At/Above Goal Mathematics		Average Mathematics Scale Score		% At/Above Goal Reading		Average Reading Scale Score		% At/Above Goal Writing		Average Writing Scale Score	
	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
ANDOVER	74	73	265.5	262.7	94	79	277.9	274.3	68	62	251.4	249.6
ANSONIA	43	49	237.2	245.8	57	50	243.8	238.8	43	58	232.9	245.2
ASHFORD	71	79	262.8	273.2	78	68	259.9	255.3	74	57	261.9	241.9
AVON	87	89	281.9	282.1	95	95	293.8	292.9	89	90	284.7	288.3
BARKHAMSTED	79	85	270.9	278.6	82	91	271.7	274.3	75	88	262.7	279.1
BERLIN	74	83	263.6	273.8	82	85	266.6	274.9	74	74	256.3	267.3
BETHANY	69	71	262.5	272.7	80	92	267.7	283.5	86	75	272.7	265.3
BETHEL	72	79	266.4	275.5	73	83	258.9	274.0	65	73	252.5	261.9
BLOOMFIELD	37	35	231.4	234.7	43	49	233.4	232.5	52	45	237.3	234.1
BOLTON	77	80	265.0	271.8	83	90	276.5	283.8	85	85	275.8	283.8
BOZRAH	65	75	257.0	256.6	74	90	255.7	268.0	65	70	244.2	252.8
BRANFORD	74	77	267.4	269.0	82	90	269.7	282.4	73	78	260.0	264.6
BRIDGEPORT	25	31	217.4	228.6	25	30	213.7	218.6	31	30	221.6	222.3
BRISTOL	62	63	251.5	256.6	59	62	245.0	250.1	57	62	244.6	250.6
BROOKFIELD	73	74	264.9	269.5	78	81	265.6	271.4	73	73	265.2	259.9
BROOKLYN	72	71	263.5	262.6	66	70	254.0	259.4	61	75	254.0	262.0
CANAAN	85	93	274.3	289.1	92	100	276.6	297.9	75	93	261.8	280.6
CANTERBURY	67	63	262.0	257.5	78	61	264.0	252.6	72	62	256.7	247.0
CANTON	87	83	280.3	278.3	93	84	281.1	278.8	94	82	295.0	285.7
CHAPLIN	55	62	238.1	260.5	38	70	229.0	255.4	41	50	228.2	243.3
CHESHIRE	88	92	281.5	288.5	87	89	276.7	280.4	91	91	284.2	288.7
CHESTER	75	72	273.8	261.8	91	85	282.1	277.4	94	85	282.1	289.6
CLINTON	61	66	254.2	265.6	69	81	256.6	271.4	70	80	254.6	265.5

NAME	% At/Above Goal Mathematics		Average Mathematics Scale Score		% At/Above Goal Reading		Average Reading Scale Score		% At/Above Goal Writing		Average Writing Scale Score	
	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
COLCHESTER	71	73	263.5	267.4	77	72	262.7	262.3	83	67	267.2	259.6
COLEBROOK	50	84	244.1	276.5	85	84	274.2	293.6	75	68	255.8	274.6
COLUMBIA	75	79	270.5	272.1	83	83	265.4	273.6	80	61	259.2	248.9
CORNWALL	42	79	241.5	273.6	63	86	258.4	272.9	58	79	256.4	256.4
COVENTRY	58	58	249.6	251.7	73	76	255.8	262.4	59	66	248.9	249.5
CROMWELL	75	75	268.3	268.1	78	78	267.3	272.5	73	77	266.6	272.4
DANBURY	56	59	248.5	253.5	54	56	240.8	242.6	48	50	235.3	238.3
DARIEN	84	89	276.1	279.8	86	83	273.2	276.5	89	84	278.8	275.0
DEEP RIVER	65	89	260.8	271.7	72	89	267.0	272.1	70	75	262.0	270.8
DERBY	46	60	240.7	253.3	57	67	242.7	255.8	61	71	251.7	254.6
EASTFORD	71	59	253.7	252.4	93	76	277.4	274.5	71	59	268.0	243.5
EAST GRANBY	83	88	274.2	286.0	78	82	267.4	271.0	74	60	255.6	247.8
EAST HADDAM	55	71	249.1	266.9	70	82	257.5	278.6	66	77	252.9	268.7
EAST HAMPTON	75	79	262.6	270.8	78	82	266.2	272.6	76	71	258.9	256.7
EAST HARTFORD	37	31	230.7	228.1	51	44	237.6	232.0	52	53	239.9	241.1
EAST HAVEN	44	60	239.6	252.6	54	66	240.7	254.4	53	56	238.3	246.5
EAST LYME	80	88	270.6	288.7	78	90	263.1	282.6	79	85	267.9	279.0
EASTON	83	90	274.0	284.3	91	93	276.4	280.5	71	86	265.3	279.8
EAST WINDSOR	60	62	251.3	260.8	54	68	246.9	254.7	47	59	234.3	245.3
ELLINGTON	72	81	265.0	272.4	81	84	262.8	270.0	88	89	276.5	279.3
ENFIELD	65	67	255.7	258.7	71	72	258.4	257.7	70	65	257.5	253.0
ESSEX	75	86	268.8	280.7	84	97	276.2	299.1	79	92	269.4	284.9
FAIRFIELD	79	81	275.2	279.9	84	85	274.4	283.6	82	82	266.5	276.1
FARMINGTON	85	84	281.7	284.3	86	87	278.9	286.8	83	87	269.9	285.9
FRANKLIN	60	57	257.3	253.3	55	57	250.5	244.9	55	48	251.1	235.8
GLASTONBURY	78	90	273.8	288.0	85	92	271.7	283.8	84	89	274.1	276.9

NAME	% At/Above Goal Mathematics		Average Mathematics Scale Score		% At/Above Goal Reading		Average Reading Scale Score		% At/Above Goal Writing		Average Writing Scale Score	
	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
GRANBY	80	83	271.4	276.0	87	78	272.6	270.4	89	83	278.6	273.8
GREENWICH	72	80	265.9	277.1	82	85	274.1	279.5	79	81	269.1	277.4
GRISWOLD	50	67	245.0	258.9	64	78	247.6	260.9	56	66	241.8	252.6
GROTON	52	64	245.2	255.9	61	65	248.1	252.4	50	48	238.7	238.6
GUILFORD	74	77	265.3	271.1	86	91	275.1	285.3	83	76	267.7	262.6
HAMDEN	46	52	243.5	248.3	64	63	253.8	255.1	67	59	254.4	247.8
HAMPTON	45	71	248.4	269.3	72	82	257.7	269.9	55	82	249.3	273.9
HARTFORD	36	45	230.3	239.7	33	35	221.7	224.7	39	43	228.7	234.0
HARTLAND	89	67	277.7	264.4	86	76	274.4	273.5	97	91	283.4	286.1
HEBRON	83	86	278.7	279.7	89	89	279.3	289.5	86	81	284.1	276.7
KENT	61	54	251.6	253.3	85	81	272.3	270.2	80	81	269.8	264.4
KILLINGLY	60	67	253.6	258.4	58	68	245.1	256.0	58	55	244.7	245.1
LEBANON	74	81	262.2	273.9	74	83	262.2	272.0	77	80	263.3	257.8
LEDYARD	75	76	268.3	270.3	78	82	270.8	275.8	78	76	271.9	266.0
LISBON	78	84	269.8	278.2	80	78	273.0	278.8	73	78	269.4	271.7
LITCHFIELD	67	67	262.2	268.5	79	82	269.8	273.6	79	61	261.9	253.8
MADISON	77	85	271.6	276.7	85	91	277.2	279.8	83	85	269.4	269.4
MANCHESTER	54	61	247.6	257.2	61	65	250.9	254.5	64	63	249.1	252.9
MANSFIELD	72	82	263.4	276.3	78	80	267.0	274.2	72	76	264.5	270.5
MARLBOROUGH	72	84	261.4	281.7	81	90	267.9	281.1	72	76	255.1	264.7
MERIDEN	40	50	234.8	244.4	46	49	233.0	238.8	49	48	236.8	241.4
MIDDLETOWN	57	67	248.4	263.0	52	60	237.4	251.7	49	57	240.8	247.4
MILFORD	72	80	263.0	271.3	74	76	260.1	264.6	68	73	254.9	262.3
MONROE	74	74	265.7	265.2	87	85	273.4	275.8	78	79	268.2	267.5
MONTVILLE	64	74	260.9	267.8	68	76	259.2	264.9	77	81	264.3	267.3
NAUGATUCK	47	59	239.7	252.8	56	65	244.0	252.6	56	64	244.3	251.4

NAME	% At/Above Goal Mathematics		Average Mathematics Scale Score		% At/Above Goal Reading		Average Reading Scale Score		% At/Above Goal Writing		Average Writing Scale Score	
	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
NEW BRITAIN	29	37	222.8	233.3	33	36	222.5	223.8	36	39	227.0	230.1
NEW CANAAN	87	88	278.8	287.8	93	92	285.0	289.9	88	81	275.6	267.7
NEW FAIRFIELD	81	89	277.0	287.4	78	86	265.9	276.4	74	76	258.5	264.8
NEW HARTFORD	74	87	264.9	278.2	78	89	265.5	276.2	75	91	261.4	281.7
NEW HAVEN	24	28	213.4	221.5	26	28	214.3	217.2	30	31	219.7	221.9
NEWINGTON	65	69	258.6	260.9	66	72	252.8	261.8	75	63	262.8	252.0
NEW LONDON	33	44	228.4	239.1	37	45	224.7	234.8	31	41	223.1	227.5
NEW MILFORD	79	77	268.5	270.1	74	78	261.5	265.0	75	75	260.8	261.6
NEWTOWN	85	92	278.3	284.1	86	92	272.7	284.2	83	85	273.7	275.4
NORFOLK	53	100	258.4	292.4	56	77	245.2	262.7	76	91	261.4	273.8
NORTH BRANFORD	74	81	263.0	274.6	82	85	270.0	272.8	81	79	265.2	261.0
NORTH CANAAN	47	68	242.8	257.5	66	68	255.2	255.9	67	43	248.9	237.6
NORTH HAVEN	70	76	262.7	272.5	80	82	267.5	276.5	75	72	265.0	261.2
NORTH STONINGTON	73	62	257.2	256.4	71	72	254.1	259.9	54	53	246.2	244.6
NORWALK	43	42	235.6	238.9	51	51	236.5	239.5	47	45	235.6	234.1
NORWICH	59	60	251.0	254.8	64	62	249.5	251.5	71	62	262.6	253.8
OLD SAYBROOK	63	79	257.4	270.3	77	87	265.5	275.9	86	92	280.1	287.2
ORANGE	77	88	275.8	286.3	79	93	268.1	287.3	87	85	281.9	285.5
OXFORD	66	75	257.4	267.5	75	77	260.9	265.5	70	74	257.1	258.9
PLAINFIELD	48	44	238.6	243.3	56	58	241.1	245.7	48	59	237.2	245.6
PLAINVILLE	59	61	251.1	257.9	71	65	254.3	255.9	74	68	255.1	257.5
PLYMOUTH	68	62	260.0	256.4	69	61	252.2	253.0	66	62	252.3	250.3
POMFRET	74	79	268.6	272.6	79	87	274.2	281.2	77	85	270.7	286.7
PORTLAND	81	73	271.9	262.9	81	81	266.3	268.8	79	58	266.2	245.3
PRESTON	56	69	256.0	257.1	77	78	260.0	258.7	64	47	247.3	231.7

NAME	% At/Above Goal Mathematics		Average Mathematics Scale Score		% At/Above Goal Reading		Average Reading Scale Score		% At/Above Goal Writing		Average Writing Scale Score	
	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
PUTNAM	62	57	247.7	252.9	65	53	244.7	244.9	57	52	242.1	243.9
REDDING	87	91	285.3	291.3	85	93	271.1	288.2	84	91	278.7	289.8
RIDGEFIELD	88	87	279.5	280.2	91	91	278.8	282.9	89	87	280.7	278.2
ROCKY HILL	79	72	272.7	270.1	81	74	267.8	265.2	89	73	277.6	262.3
SALEM	66	73	255.5	267.9	79	80	258.5	269.5	66	63	250.5	252.2
SALISBURY	84	97	283.9	295.2	89	100	282.1	295.2	84	90	257.5	279.2
SCOTLAND	70	82	247.1	271.1	75	94	249.8	274.8	60	71	253.4	265.0
SEYMOUR	67	69	262.8	262.5	74	79	262.6	264.2	77	82	261.3	270.1
SHARON	81	75	267.0	267.0	81	79	276.5	265.9	90	57	279.6	255.3
SHELTON	76	78	267.6	275.5	77	74	264.9	269.4	81	71	266.2	266.6
SHERMAN	73	84	268.9	279.3	80	79	268.0	277.9	80	79	269.4	269.2
SIMSBURY	89	92	284.4	286.9	94	93	284.4	286.1	95	96	297.7	290.1
SOMERS	77	69	266.3	261.5	87	75	275.2	266.3	81	62	267.1	253.4
SOUTHINGTON	66	73	260.1	265.0	76	84	261.4	273.2	70	72	256.2	258.9
SOUTH WINDSOR	85	84	276.5	281.0	82	86	267.2	279.3	80	83	268.1	272.4
SPRAGUE	60	57	253.4	254.8	66	66	258.3	254.0	71	55	263.2	246.5
STAFFORD	71	88	263.0	278.8	61	73	254.2	265.0	69	75	262.4	261.7
STAMFORD	53	60	243.7	254.2	60	65	247.9	254.2	47	50	234.3	241.6
STERLING	50	53	241.6	242.5	53	53	241.3	248.8	58	39	253.3	231.0
STONINGTON	65	73	257.5	265.5	73	73	260.7	269.9	70	70	258.2	261.6
STRATFORD	68	76	260.6	270.9	67	71	256.6	261.9	72	73	258.9	261.6
SUFFIELD	72	88	270.0	281.5	86	90	272.9	283.0	86	90	284.0	288.9
THOMASTON	66	68	260.5	263.1	74	84	258.1	273.5	72	77	255.3	266.1
THOMPSON	35	48	232.3	243.9	49	66	237.4	248.5	55	47	244.0	235.8
TOLLAND	77	84	266.2	275.1	84	89	269.6	279.6	74	78	256.9	264.5
TORRINGTON	65	69	255.5	262.8	61	70	250.6	260.7	65	71	255.3	260.7

NAME	% At/Above Goal Mathematics		Average Mathematics Scale Score		% At/Above Goal Reading		Average Reading Scale Score		% At/Above Goal Writing		Average Writing Scale Score	
	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
TRUMBULL	79	81	270.6	271.3	87	84	274.7	276.4	82	81	274.9	273.1
UNION	89	67	283.4	269.3	89	83	285.8	272.5	100	100	303.2	296.5
VERNON	63	74	256.3	269.5	69	73	258.5	263.2	73	73	256.5	259.3
VOLUNTOWN	72	78	265.0	273.1	79	63	261.3	258.8	69	67	263.7	272.1
WALLINGFORD	61	61	252.1	256.4	75	75	262.6	263.9	68	73	256.1	259.8
WATERBURY	26	33	218.0	229.8	34	41	220.9	227.8	42	40	232.5	230.1
WATERFORD	77	90	270.3	286.8	76	86	267.8	279.1	81	88	271.7	280.0
WATERTOWN	67	59	260.1	257.1	76	76	264.0	267.5	74	68	262.2	254.3
WESTBROOK	74	72	271.2	271.5	78	83	266.3	274.4	75	66	256.1	263.7
WEST HARTFORD	81	87	277.5	284.0	82	83	274.3	277.7	79	84	271.6	277.9
WEST HAVEN	50	64	243.1	256.8	51	62	238.0	251.7	48	53	237.6	241.2
WESTON	86	90	276.8	280.6	94	92	280.6	285.1	92	90	277.5	279.2
WESTPORT	81	93	274.9	292.3	92	94	279.9	287.9	91	85	278.2	275.8
WETHERSFIELD	79	79	270.4	270.7	79	75	267.8	264.1	76	75	262.9	270.6
WILLINGTON	65	88	266.7	281.3	81	90	266.4	283.6	65	66	245.7	261.2
WILTON	96	90	289.6	289.8	94	94	284.3	293.7	91	88	279.7	278.6
WINCHESTER	62	61	250.8	256.6	55	63	243.9	251.6	55	44	246.5	238.1
WINDHAM	28	32	217.1	228.6	28	32	214.6	218.0	33	33	220.9	223.5
WINDSOR	57	63	249.2	259.8	55	60	244.3	249.5	54	58	241.3	249.6
WINDSOR LOCKS	61	64	254.2	259.9	62	67	244.9	254.9	65	61	247.5	247.2
WOLCOTT	64	72	255.2	264.7	71	73	256.0	260.3	61	64	248.4	249.3
WOODBIDGE	71	85	268.5	276.9	84	89	276.8	279.9	84	86	278.2	283.7
WOODSTOCK	65	65	258.7	261.6	82	68	268.8	260.6	72	57	251.8	247.1
REG SCH DIST 06	76	78	269.0	277.8	77	90	266.5	276.8	76	89	263.4	275.9

NAME	% At/Above Goal Mathematics		Average Mathematics Scale Score		% At/Above Goal Reading		Average Reading Scale Score		% At/Above Goal Writing		Average Writing Scale Score	
	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
REG SCH DIST 10	82	84	271.4	278.6	89	80	272.1	270.4	82	85	269.3	278.8
REG SCH DIST 12	67	70	258.3	260.8	75	74	261.9	261.6	76	81	266.0	271.6
REG SCH DIST 13	84	84	279.1	279.1	81	86	269.6	271.4	85	83	272.0	272.6
REG SCH DIST 14	72	81	264.5	277.4	79	89	269.7	276.9	74	76	267.6	271.1
REG SCH DIST 15	85	89	276.0	285.9	86	92	279.5	287.8	72	84	258.0	272.7
REG SCH DIST 16	63	66	254.7	257.6	75	77	260.9	265.2	75	73	264.1	257.7
REG SCH DIST 17	81	85	273.5	279.1	81	87	265.3	276.9	86	82	269.4	267.8
REG SCH DIST 18	88	91	281.9	284.5	87	94	277.6	287.6	79	82	264.5	278.1
E HRTFD/GLASTON BURY	53	39	241.3	246.7	59	56	244.8	250.1	76	39	244.4	239.2
MONTESSORI MAGNET		33		220.2		50		253.7		83		279.0
METRO LEARNING CTR	48	45	244.0	241.0	58	59	245.2	246.5	67	54	248.1	240.8
SIX-SIX MAGNET SCH	52	45	245.0	246.5	67	41	253.4	242.1	58	34	246.0	229.4
WINTERGREEN MAGNET	68	60	257.6	253.7	77	70	267.2	258.5	82	71	273.7	253.6
THOMAS EDISON		61		255.2		62		250.9		49		239.7
JUMOKE ACADEMY	0	16	197.8	207.0	25	26	209.5	218.3	30	22	221.0	217.9
ODYSSEY COMMUNITY	57	61	242.4	254.1	57	50	244.4	242.8	54	56	244.6	236.8
INTEGRATED DAY	67	55	257.5	260.1	90	72	267.4	269.2	77	69	257.9	255.0
ISAAC	43	52	237.8	248.3	62	59	248.2	251.5	41	45	236.0	235.6

NAME	% At/Above Goal Mathematics		Average Mathematics Scale Score		% At/Above Goal Reading		Average Reading Scale Score		% At/Above Goal Writing		Average Writing Scale Score	
	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
SIDE BY SIDE	27	61	224.4	258.1	67	43	244.6	247.4	40	30	232.6	230.1
BROOKLAWN ACAD	13	31	213.4	221.5	35	38	218.6	234.1	9	46	198.7	245.8
CHARTER OAK PREP	0	11	175.8	204.3	11	26	209.9	200.5	11	26	168.9	205.5
BREAKTHROUGH CHARTER	64	53	251.1	251.9	47	26	229.1	223.8	47	53	240.0	242.8
HIGHVILLE	23	19	211.7	217.2	18	23	211.0	206.9	36	30	223.0	210.1
TRAILBLAZERS ACADEMY	10	19	200.0	202.9	15	3	205.2	182.1	13	6	197.8	179.4
AMISTAD ACADEMY	26	37	218.3	232.8	26	39	216.7	223.0	38	45	228.0	232.9
UNIFIED SCH DIST #2	0	0	181.3	201.0	0	0	168.7	173.0	0	0	185.3	151.0
ERG A	86	90	279.8	285.1	91	92	281.1	286.3	89	88	281.1	279.7
ERG B	79	84	273.1	279.5	83	87	272.4	280.0	81	82	270.2	274.4
ERG C	76	81	269.0	275.7	82	85	270.8	276.8	78	78	266.9	269.9
ERG D	69	73	261.7	267.3	75	77	262.1	268.0	74	71	260.7	260.8
ERG E	68	70	259.9	263.5	76	77	262.7	267.5	72	71	261.1	259.3
ERG F	61	68	253.9	262.4	67	71	254.9	259.8	66	68	253.5	256.7
ERG G	55	61	247.8	256.4	60	67	247.1	255.4	59	60	246.2	249.4
ERG H	51	55	242.9	249.8	55	57	241.1	246.2	51	53	239.7	242.8
ERG I	28	35	220.3	230.5	30	34	217.9	222.1	35	36	225.1	227.0
STATE	61	66	253.9	261.3	66	69	253.7	259.4	65	65	253.4	255.6

APPENDIX A-3**GRADE 8
2000 AND 2001****COMPARISON OF RESULTS BY DISTRICT NOT INCLUDING SCORES OF SPECIAL
EDUCATION STUDENTS AND STUDENTS IN BILINGUAL EDUCATION AND ESL
PROGRAMS**

NAME	% At/Above Goal Mathematics		Average Mathematics Scale Score		% At/Above Goal Reading		Average Reading Scale Score		% At/Above Goal Writing		Average Writing Scale Score	
	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
ANSONIA	46	44	241.3	242.6	60	54	243.8	241.1	61	66	244.0	258.3
ASHFORD	81	63	278.0	260.3	79	70	264.2	251.5	67	54	267.2	244.1
AVON	86	92	288.0	290.7	95	95	284.0	288.5	88	88	291.1	288.6
BERLIN	64	74	259.7	267.3	77	88	254.7	270.5	64	78	254.9	266.8
BETHEL	69	63	261.4	262.8	79	88	258.5	268.1	71	70	261.9	259.7
BLOOMFIELD	30	26	229.2	220.3	57	38	236.5	221.1	43	34	234.6	224.0
BOLTON	78	59	268.9	264.6	86	86	267.8	268.8	76	66	272.1	248.7
BOZRAH	65	69	265.1	276.6	91	69	264.0	256.7	48	69	240.4	274.2
BRANFORD	70	71	266.7	265.4	89	88	274.3	272.2	78	74	265.2	255.0
BRIDGEPORT	18	19	211.6	214.3	31	30	213.2	214.0	31	32	220.6	224.3
BRISTOL	52	56	250.6	250.4	65	68	247.7	249.4	54	62	243.0	250.8
BROOKFIELD	65	69	262.9	265.2	84	84	266.6	265.6	72	67	259.2	257.0
BROOKLYN	61	64	257.6	256.0	69	68	250.5	253.6	65	73	256.8	251.5
CANAAN	80	100	266.5	316.3	90	100	263.4	318.9	50	100	243.9	305.4
CANTERBURY	65	58	257.6	254.8	68	81	254.2	267.2	63	72	256.9	255.6
CANTON	74	79	275.6	273.6	88	86	272.0	272.1	70	79	265.4	266.5
CHESHIRE	79	85	275.6	280.4	88	89	274.8	271.8	83	89	278.5	290.4
CLINTON	58	70	256.0	262.7	79	80	262.0	268.8	71	81	265.0	269.7
COLCHESTER	61	54	256.2	254.5	82	79	264.1	257.5	71	61	260.0	255.1
COLUMBIA	74	73	264.3	276.0	88	95	265.4	279.3	61	76	253.1	260.7
CORNWALL	53	40	251.2	238.9	87	75	267.9	254.3	53	55	239.7	240.2
COVENTRY	55	45	249.3	242.8	76	81	259.9	262.7	60	66	246.8	254.9

NAME	% At/Above Goal Mathematics		Average Mathematics Scale Score		% At/Above Goal Reading		Average Reading Scale Score		% At/Above Goal Writing		Average Writing Scale Score	
	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
CROMWELL	73	83	269.0	274.6	88	92	270.5	276.9	79	81	270.0	269.3
DANBURY	44	44	242.5	240.7	59	57	242.0	241.1	55	44	243.6	233.4
DARIEN	92	92	294.3	294.8	94	93	284.9	279.5	91	90	289.2	279.6
DERBY	44	41	243.3	240.3	39	42	222.8	229.0	45	48	233.4	237.6
EASTFORD	44	58	245.1	246.8	81	75	280.8	261.1	56	42	260.8	248.9
EAST GRANBY	68	83	261.5	279.2	74	90	256.4	274.1	70	88	261.7	267.2
EAST HADDAM	60	62	254.9	256.4	67	70	254.5	248.1	65	62	251.3	251.5
EAST HAMPTON	84	77	275.5	267.1	85	86	265.0	268.1	74	86	266.4	267.5
EAST HARTFORD	33	35	229.9	230.0	51	52	233.6	230.1	49	38	239.5	231.0
EAST HAVEN	43	53	240.0	249.0	59	65	239.9	246.6	44	46	231.4	234.5
EAST LYME	72	73	271.6	271.4	82	89	272.9	273.6	78	75	272.2	262.0
EASTON	92	85	284.4	276.7	92	87	274.3	273.2	96	91	292.6	278.4
EAST WINDSOR	47	54	246.2	249.6	75	80	256.7	261.6	49	66	241.1	253.3
ELLINGTON	77	73	269.0	266.2	86	81	266.8	262.5	77	75	273.4	266.7
ENFIELD	58	61	254.5	256.1	73	68	255.2	249.5	68	71	256.6	262.5
FAIRFIELD	82	78	277.9	272.8	87	87	272.1	269.7	82	73	272.6	261.2
FARMINGTON	82	82	282.8	279.6	94	87	286.2	275.0	87	81	283.4	274.9
FRANKLIN	70	91	268.4	278.4	81	82	260.5	271.3	70	82	246.9	266.2
GLASTONBURY	82	85	281.7	285.5	90	88	275.6	273.5	76	79	263.7	268.8
GRANBY	81	80	270.5	275.3	88	91	266.1	273.7	74	79	255.5	273.4
GREENWICH	84	85	281.4	284.6	86	87	275.1	274.4	78	77	264.8	268.2
GRISWOLD	57	55	250.6	252.3	61	77	244.5	260.6	42	51	231.1	238.3
GROTON	57	55	254.0	251.0	72	70	253.5	253.1	62	56	250.2	245.7
GUILFORD	82	80	273.6	276.1	92	90	279.5	275.6	80	87	268.9	276.2
HAMDEN	54	46	248.3	243.4	64	65	248.1	247.1	51	54	238.3	243.7

NAME	% At/Above Goal Mathematics		Average Mathematics Scale Score		% At/Above Goal Reading		Average Reading Scale Score		% At/Above Goal Writing		Average Writing Scale Score	
	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
HARTFORD	25	29	219.5	225.0	32	35	213.9	221.0	42	44	230.3	233.9
HARTLAND	74	76	273.3	271.7	94	86	277.4	265.5	77	76	275.3	273.6
KENT	85	66	280.5	256.1	89	86	290.4	271.1	81	69	278.9	263.2
KILLINGLY	51	59	244.4	252.3	59	66	239.7	247.8	56	57	243.2	242.8
LEBANON	67	63	263.1	260.9	76	89	262.4	267.0	63	64	258.1	251.4
LEDYARD	72	69	268.9	261.1	81	78	265.1	258.3	72	54	258.9	243.7
LISBON	81	80	276.1	277.8	85	92	267.6	271.2	67	75	256.8	267.0
LITCHFIELD	68	85	267.8	272.0	87	93	270.3	281.2	78	92	271.1	293.6
MADISON	91	92	290.8	287.0	94	94	288.2	273.8	95	92	290.5	283.7
MANCHESTER	48	50	242.9	243.8	62	57	247.5	240.3	50	45	238.7	233.6
MANSFIELD	72	78	274.5	277.9	85	85	276.3	275.3	76	84	266.1	278.4
MERIDEN	36	37	231.9	231.5	51	50	232.2	233.9	50	52	237.1	240.4
MIDDLETOWN	52	57	248.5	251.1	62	67	243.2	247.0	64	60	251.9	252.6
MILFORD	70	69	264.6	264.5	77	78	259.8	261.4	69	65	258.4	252.5
MONROE	76	69	269.1	263.8	88	84	272.1	269.9	82	79	276.5	267.8
MONTVILLE	56	64	252.6	259.6	56	74	242.0	254.9	60	65	248.0	255.0
NAUGATUCK	54	57	248.2	251.9	67	69	249.6	249.9	58	66	245.4	254.0
NEW BRITAIN	17	24	211.4	222.8	35	44	216.9	230.3	33	39	221.4	228.3
NEW CANAAN	89	91	288.6	287.1	93	94	282.9	276.9	88	79	272.8	268.1
NEW FAIRFIELD	74	77	272.2	273.2	85	83	271.0	269.8	82	77	266.7	266.7
NEW HAVEN	18	22	213.0	217.1	33	33	216.5	217.3	31	34	221.9	225.2
NEWINGTON	67	67	264.4	264.3	80	83	260.3	266.6	71	72	259.6	258.5
NEW LONDON	24	32	220.4	228.8	42	48	221.0	233.7	38	47	225.7	233.9
NEW MILFORD	75	80	269.4	276.4	77	76	259.5	259.7	67	66	256.6	249.0
NEWTOWN	77	81	273.9	274.3	89	89	270.9	272.5	82	86	278.2	279.7
NORTH BRANFORD	65	77	261.0	270.3	85	85	266.7	267.4	66	62	254.4	252.4

NAME	% At/Above Goal Mathematics		Average Mathematics Scale Score		% At/Above Goal Reading		Average Reading Scale Score		% At/Above Goal Writing		Average Writing Scale Score	
	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
NORTH CANAAN	67	61	266.4	258.9	79	91	261.9	267.5	67	60	264.0	263.5
NORTH HAVEN	63	77	257.6	272.8	84	87	265.2	272.8	82	76	267.8	264.8
NORTH STONINGTON	68	51	258.6	246.7	91	80	269.8	256.2	77	62	270.0	251.4
NORWALK	48	48	242.8	246.8	62	62	244.0	246.0	56	53	241.3	242.0
NORWICH	50	58	245.1	254.5	63	71	246.4	251.5	62	65	250.0	254.6
OLD SAYBROOK	83	84	273.6	283.0	89	88	273.4	275.3	90	92	285.6	296.9
OXFORD	71	75	264.5	269.1	85	85	256.5	272.0	70	78	258.4	265.3
PLAINFIELD	35	41	233.2	236.4	59	67	243.9	247.4	45	55	235.2	239.1
PLAINVILLE	56	62	254.4	257.0	76	74	257.3	257.7	66	67	252.4	251.5
PLYMOUTH	58	58	250.1	256.8	75	76	255.5	261.2	69	70	260.9	260.4
POMFRET	83	71	270.2	267.6	95	94	280.1	274.0	93	90	305.6	276.6
PORTLAND	72	56	263.3	258.6	84	75	264.6	259.8	71	65	254.7	257.4
PRESTON	71	70	267.6	267.3	89	80	269.7	267.8	73	86	260.0	269.5
PUTNAM	41	54	240.5	250.2	65	59	248.2	244.0	49	52	238.3	237.1
REDDING	89	86	283.5	284.3	90	95	279.0	286.1	88	94	269.1	293.0
RIDGEFIELD	87	90	284.0	290.1	90	93	274.6	277.8	92	87	282.0	276.4
ROCKY HILL	71	79	270.2	276.6	88	89	270.3	265.1	83	80	269.8	269.9
SALEM	79	79	270.5	267.3	82	87	265.3	266.7	74	68	259.9	257.3
SALISBURY	83	73	267.4	274.4	81	91	277.0	281.1	78	80	283.6	291.3
SEYMOUR	67	60	263.3	255.9	74	76	262.7	258.9	77	62	263.1	249.1
SHARON	64	74	268.7	271.8	76	87	261.2	263.0	72	71	265.0	254.0
SHELTON	61	68	255.9	264.4	77	79	258.4	264.9	70	71	255.3	259.8
SHERMAN	71	74	271.1	266.7	79	84	265.0	271.0	90	93	292.7	288.3
SIMSBURY	89	91	288.4	286.3	94	91	285.8	279.7	95	92	299.7	293.8
SOMERS	75	77	268.2	269.6	75	93	266.2	280.2	76	82	262.8	275.9

NAME	% At/Above Goal Mathematics		Average Mathematics Scale Score		% At/Above Goal Reading		Average Reading Scale Score		% At/Above Goal Writing		Average Writing Scale Score	
	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
SOUTHINGTON	69	69	262.7	263.0	87	84	269.9	265.9	79	74	260.2	259.0
SOUTH WINDSOR	79	77	272.9	274.2	81	87	262.7	273.9	71	77	256.0	266.6
SPRAGUE	65	54	259.6	246.9	71	71	250.9	255.7	65	66	252.4	251.9
STAFFORD	76	73	268.0	272.1	84	87	265.8	263.6	87	81	280.5	275.1
STAMFORD	40	45	235.3	241.4	59	65	242.0	249.9	52	49	243.1	238.3
STERLING	45	60	238.9	245.2	71	90	247.4	265.1	81	63	259.1	251.1
STONINGTON	77	76	268.6	273.2	88	84	269.6	269.7	81	82	276.1	273.1
STRATFORD	53	59	249.2	252.3	69	73	251.7	254.8	60	58	249.6	245.1
SUFFIELD	71	70	269.5	270.6	88	91	270.0	271.9	84	81	274.9	266.6
THOMASTON	53	41	247.6	244.0	69	76	253.3	261.2	69	81	252.2	273.0
THOMPSON	55	57	252.4	254.4	75	59	253.5	248.1	56	54	243.2	242.3
TOLLAND	79	87	273.0	279.8	87	87	271.7	270.5	84	80	270.9	264.6
TORRINGTON	64	68	260.1	263.9	70	72	255.7	255.4	66	68	252.9	258.8
TRUMBULL	79	85	272.3	281.7	87	92	273.1	276.6	88	87	283.3	279.4
UNION	71	100	278.7	304.1	71	100	283.7	302.3	100	100	287.3	307.3
VERNON	68	63	259.6	259.2	75	68	256.4	250.5	71	68	255.1	258.8
VOLUNTOWN	81	58	272.0	249.4	88	61	269.5	239.1	72	47	256.4	234.8
WALLINGFORD	65	66	262.4	261.1	81	80	261.7	260.2	73	66	257.4	253.1
WATERBURY	16	18	207.9	212.2	35	37	218.5	223.5	33	31	224.1	223.8
WATERFORD	73	79	267.3	274.0	78	85	264.1	271.9	83	80	273.2	262.4
WATERTOWN	62	66	258.6	260.0	83	86	261.9	269.7	74	73	257.1	262.3
WESTBROOK	73	74	266.9	263.5	74	74	255.3	257.7	70	54	264.2	242.0
WEST HARTFORD	74	77	270.8	276.7	81	85	266.6	271.1	78	78	271.8	271.9
WEST HAVEN	59	53	250.8	248.8	64	69	247.4	251.5	52	57	241.4	243.8
WESTON	86	85	282.5	282.7	96	96	286.8	282.4	93	85	279.4	266.1

NAME	% At/Above Goal Mathematics		Average Mathematics Scale Score		% At/Above Goal Reading		Average Reading Scale Score		% At/Above Goal Writing		Average Writing Scale Score	
	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
WESTPORT	86	91	281.9	292.0	94	93	281.1	284.6	90	90	284.3	286.0
WETHERSFIELD	77	70	269.4	261.0	81	79	264.3	260.8	81	79	265.6	263.0
WILLINGTON	70	60	263.8	261.6	87	86	273.5	278.8	86	69	267.9	265.8
WILTON	94	92	294.1	290.9	98	96	285.4	286.2	93	88	292.2	288.1
WINCHESTER	59	47	251.5	245.0	63	61	247.2	243.8	80	64	276.8	257.3
WINDHAM	28	35	220.0	225.3	37	47	218.3	225.8	35	38	222.6	229.1
WINDSOR	52	48	248.2	245.4	65	61	251.5	246.6	59	57	248.5	241.7
WINDSOR LOCKS	57	58	253.7	256.6	62	67	242.6	248.3	54	54	239.5	247.2
WOLCOTT	42	65	243.5	261.4	69	77	251.9	258.6	61	68	247.7	258.5
WOODSTOCK	80	81	269.2	276.3	85	87	266.4	273.5	60	63	249.8	247.4
REG SCH DIST 04	78	76	266.8	269.8	89	82	271.0	266.7	87	86	284.3	281.9
REG SCH DIST 05	82	80	279.0	276.3	88	87	273.8	271.0	83	83	268.0	270.7
REG SCH DIST 06	57	75	250.9	268.5	80	83	253.4	267.4	67	83	257.3	278.8
REG SCH DIST 07	67	78	263.1	272.9	70	89	253.7	268.3	67	72	255.6	265.1
REG SCH DIST 08	78	74	269.6	269.3	87	86	271.3	269.1	74	75	260.4	263.9
REG SCH DIST 10	77	78	269.4	271.4	89	91	276.3	273.1	81	63	269.2	250.1
REG SCH DIST 11	42	57	239.9	251.7	58	81	243.0	261.8	39	43	232.0	239.1
REG SCH DIST 12	65	68	258.1	261.8	69	82	253.1	264.3	61	58	246.5	245.5
REG SCH DIST 13	83	80	276.6	276.4	88	85	267.9	262.7	82	87	272.4	278.9
REG SCH DIST 14	64	77	258.1	272.7	78	88	260.1	269.8	74	78	258.2	267.4

NAME	% At/Above Goal Mathematics		Average Mathematics Scale Score		% At/Above Goal Reading		Average Reading Scale Score		% At/Above Goal Writing		Average Writing Scale Score	
	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
REG SCH DIST 15	80	81	274.0	271.1	93	90	279.2	276.5	86	82	272.7	272.4
REG SCH DIST 16	61	66	256.8	255.3	82	84	262.0	264.5	65	71	250.5	254.3
REG SCH DIST 17	72	76	266.4	270.8	86	85	267.5	265.8	83	78	264.9	263.3
REG SCH DIST 18	73	82	269.0	276.0	89	92	270.4	277.7	82	86	270.1	275.5
METRO LEARNING CTR	37	50	238.3	246.0	57	63	242.6	247.8	50	43	237.3	238.1
SIX-SIX MAGNET SCH		43		242.0		43		235.6		57		239.3
WINTERGREEN MAGNET	51	55	242.7	258.5	68	70	251.3	261.6	59	74	251.8	265.8
THOMAS EDISON		45		240.8		60		241.8		47		236.4
EASTCONN ALT DESIGN		17		202.8		15		190.5		8		192.2
ODYSSEY COMMUNITY	53	49	242.6	244.7	77	61	255.7	246.5	57	59	242.9	240.6
INTEGRATED DAY	82	41	275.1	251.8	91	76	264.8	255.6	64	88	255.1	270.6
ISAAC	43	19	236.6	211.2	67	54	249.6	235.0	47	26	238.4	218.2
SIDE BY SIDE	27	9	218.8	207.2	73	55	251.3	234.2	27	27	218.1	224.7
BROOKLAWN ACAD	21	38	220.0	235.6	50	50	230.4	232.3	29	42	213.3	227.8
CHARTER OAK PREP	0	4	175.2	191.3	4	11	176.8	191.2	3	4	184.5	193.9
BREAKTHROUGH CHARTER		44		244.2		75		246.9		81		258.6
HIGHVILLE		58		251.8		67		246.8		54		253.2
TRAILBLAZERS ACADEMY	18	3	193.7	186.4	19	11	190.0	179.5	0	6	181.7	180.1
AMISTAD ACADEMY		50		252.3		60		244.0		70		251.7

NAME	% At/Above Goal Mathematics		Average Mathematics Scale Score		% At/Above Goal Reading		Average Reading Scale Score		% At/Above Goal Writing		Average Writing Scale Score	
	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
UNIFIED SCH DIST #2	8	0	191.0	176.6	21	0	186.1	169.3	0	0	181.3	169.9
ERG A	89	90	287.4	288.7	94	93	282.3	281.4	91	88	286.2	282.5
ERG B	79	80	275.2	276.7	87	88	272.6	272.3	81	80	271.3	271.6
ERG C	74	75	268.4	270.2	85	86	268.1	270.2	77	76	266.6	266.6
ERG D	67	69	261.7	264.2	80	81	262.7	264.4	72	71	259.2	258.5
ERG E	65	64	260.2	258.7	79	82	262.1	263.4	66	67	256.2	255.9
ERG F	59	61	254.5	256.4	71	71	254.2	253.6	65	63	252.4	251.6
ERG G	53	55	249.0	251.5	69	72	250.9	254.5	59	61	248.6	249.9
ERG H	46	48	241.4	243.8	59	62	241.7	244.4	54	53	242.5	242.2
ERG I	20	23	213.3	218.5	33	36	215.7	220.5	34	36	223.7	227.3
STATE	59	60	254.0	256.3	70	72	253.9	255.4	65	64	254.0	254.1