



2012-13 School and District Performance Reports: Computational Guide

The *Computational Guide* is intended for use by accountability personnel at schools and districts, which may include District Test Coordinators, research staff, and other individuals with access to student-level data. The guide is designed to provide users with the detailed steps taken by Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) staff to prepare assessment files and run the analyses necessary to generate the 2012-13 School and District Performance Reports issued in fall 2013 as required by the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Table of Contents

CALCULATING INDEX SCORES.....	3
OVERVIEW	3
FILE PREPARATION.....	4
DEMOGRAPHIC CLASSIFICATIONS.....	4
GROUP SIZE	5
PARTICIPATION AND ACHIEVEMENT CALCULATIONS.....	5
THE 3% RULE FOR MAS AND SKILLS CHECKLIST	6
ANNUAL TARGETS	10
GRADUATION RATES IN CONNECTICUT’S ACCOUNTABILITY MODEL	11
CALCULATING GRADUATION RATES.....	11
CALCULATING GRADUATION RATE TARGETS.....	11
CLASSIFYING SCHOOLS	12
STEPS FOR IDENTIFYING TURNAROUND SCHOOLS	12
STEPS FOR IDENTIFYING FOCUS SCHOOLS	13
REVIEW SCHOOL CRITERIA.....	14
MAJORITY SUBGROUPS.....	14
EXCELLING SCHOOL CRITERIA	15
PROGRESSING SCHOOL CRITERIA	15
TRANSITIONING SCHOOL CRITERIA	15
STEPS FOR IDENTIFYING SCHOOLS OF DISTINCTION	16
I. <i>Highest Performing Subgroups</i>	16
II. <i>Highest Progress</i>	17
III. <i>Highest Performing</i>	17
CLASSIFYING SCHOOLS WITHOUT REPORTABLE DATA.....	18

CALCULATING INDEX SCORES

Overview

Indices can be calculated at the student-, subject-, school- and district-levels. To calculate an index, a student's achievement level in each subject on the Connecticut Mastery Test (CMT) or the Connecticut Academic Performance Test (CAPT) must first be transformed into an index score using the tables below.

Standard CMT/CAPT

Achievement Levels	Index score
Goal (4) and Advanced (5)	100
Proficient (3)	67
Basic (2)	33
Below Basic (1)	0

Alternate Assessments

Achievement Levels		Index score
Modified Assessment	Skills Checklist	
Goal (3)	Independent (3)	100
Proficient (2)	Proficient (2)	50
Basic (1)	Basic (1)	0

A **Student Individual Performance Index (Student IPI)** is calculated by averaging all of a given student's valid and non-excluded subject index scores. For example, a 3rd grade student who attains the Proficient level in Math, Goal level in Reading, and Advanced level in Writing would have a Student IPI of 89 (i.e., $67 + 100 + 100 / 3 = 89$). Note that a student's IPI may be the average of one, two, three, or four tests, depending upon which tests are valid and not excluded.

A **School Performance Index (SPI)** is calculated by averaging all of a given school's valid and non-excluded Student IPIs.

A **District Performance Index (DPI)** is calculated by averaging all of a given district's valid and non-excluded Student IPIs. Note that students who are enrolled in 'Programs' or are outplaced are included in a given district's DPI.

Subject-level indexes may also be calculated for schools and districts. A **Subject School Performance Index (Subject SPI)** is calculated by averaging all valid and non-excluded Student IPIs for a given subject, for a given school (e.g., Mathematics SPI or Reading SPI).

File Preparation

Information from the following files is needed to calculate performance indices for any single year (Y): CMT, CAPT, Modified Assessment System (MAS), and Skills Checklist (SKCK).

- Year Y CMT and CAPT data files:
 - These files contain current demographic data and student achievement data. Grade 11 and 12 students who are CAPT retesters are not included in index calculations.

- Year (Y₋₁) and (Y₋₂) CMT files:
 - These files allow for the identification of the students who will be classified in the English language learner (ELL) and the students with disabilities (SWD) flexibility subgroups.
 - As part of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), students who do not belong to the ELL or SWD subgroups in Year Y but who are in the same district during Year (Y₋₁) or Year (Y₋₂) and had been members of the ELL or SWD subgroups in either Year (Y₋₁) or Year (Y₋₂) are reacquired into those subgroups in Year Y as members of the ELL flexibility subgroup or the SWD flexibility subgroup.

- Year Y MAS and SKCK Files for CMT and CAPT (4 files total):
 - The CMT and CAPT alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, also known as the CMT or CAPT Skills Checklist, is administered to students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.
 - The CMT and CAPT alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards (MAS) is an assessment for a small group of students with disabilities. This assessment is appropriate for students whose disabilities do not allow them to achieve grade-level proficiency at the same rate as their nondisabled peers but whose disabilities are not so significant that they require the Skills Checklist.
 - Indices are calculated separately for CAPT and CMT. Indices for the CMT are calculated across all tested grades in the district or school.

Demographic Classifications

There are five demographic subgroup accountability classifications:

- 1) Students with disabilities (SWD);
- 2) English language learners (ELL);
- 3) Black/ African-American students;
- 4) Hispanic/ Latino students; and
- 5) students who are eligible for free or reduced price lunch.

In addition to these five subgroups, there is a consideration for members of an amalgam of subgroups that comprise the 'High Needs' group. A student is a member of the High Needs group if that student is a member of any of the following subgroups: students with disabilities,

English language learners or students who are eligible for free or reduced price lunch. The High Needs group was used to identify Focus schools in 2012, but High Needs achievement data is reported for every school and district.

Group Size

The minimum number of students needed to publish an index is 20. Index scores will not be published unless the group or subgroup is comprised of at least 20 students.

Participation and Achievement Calculations

Unlike traditional state assessment reporting, accountability reporting requires a series of decision rules that specify whether a student is included in achievement and participation calculations at the school and/or district level. The table below provides a comprehensive list of the rules used by CSDE for accountability calculations.

	Participation		Achievement	
	Numerator	Denominator	In SPI	In DPI
Absent	Yes: Non-Participant	Yes	No	No
Void	Yes: Participant	Yes	No	No
No Longer in CT PSD	No	No	No	No
Medically Exempt	No	No	No	No
Left Blank	Yes: Participant	Yes	Yes (Score = BB)	Yes (Score = BB)
Invalid Score	Yes: Participant	Yes	No	No
Writing Non-Scorable	Yes: Participant	Yes	No	No
Response to Literature Non-Scorable (CAPT Reading)	Yes: Participant	Yes	No	No
ELL Exempt (MA)	Yes: Participant	Yes	No	No
ELL Exempt (RD/WR/SC)	Yes: Participant, IF Left Blank or Achievement = 1 - 5 Else: No, not applicable		No	No
CAPT ReTester	No	No	No	No
CAPT Withdrew	No	No	No	No
Grade Repeaters	Yes: Participant	Yes	Yes	Yes

	Participation	Achievement
In School Oct. 1st	No effect on the calculation of Participation.	If 'In School' = Yes, include in SPI Calculation; Else exclude
In District Oct. 1st	No effect on the calculation of Participation.	If 'In District' = Yes, include in DPI Calculation; Else exclude

SWD Flexibility (CMT only)	Include Students with Disabilities from the current test file or either of the 2 previous years, IF in the same district.
ELL Flexibility (CMT only)	Include English Language Learners from the current test file or either of the 2 previous years, IF in the same district.

MAS Test Takers	If a student takes either a Reading or Math MAS exam; their scores for the standard Writing and Science tests are NOT included in any SPI or DPI calculation; however, these students are included in participation rate calculations for all four subjects using the standard rules outlined above.
-----------------	--

For the purposes of calculating DPIs please note the following:

- Pursuant to C.G.S. Section 10-223f if a charter school enters into a formal agreement with the local board of education where the charter school is located, and that agreement is approved by the State Board of Education, then the data for the charter school may be used toward the local district's accountability status. In these instances, the district variable must be recoded for the charter school students so that their IPIs are included in the local school district's DPI.
- Students tested at any of the three Endowed and Incorporated Academies count in the test site SPI but are recoded back to their resident town for the DPI calculation.

The 3% Rule for MAS and Skills Checklist

Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)/NCLB regulations allow states to administer alternate assessments to students with disabilities, provided certain criteria are met. This enables states, districts and schools to get credit within the accountability system for student performance on alternate assessments; however, federal regulations limit the number of students who may be considered 'proficient' and 'advanced' based on alternate assessment scores when making accountability determinations.

The limit or cap imposed by the regulations is often called 'the 3% rule'. Per federal guidance, the 3% rule remains in effect with the new accountability system approved under Connecticut's ESEA Flexibility Request. Note that there are two important changes to application of the 3% rule:

- Rather than applying the rule at the 'proficient' level, Connecticut's new accountability system applies the 3% rule at the 'goal' level on MAS and Skills Checklist. (The Skills Checklist does not have a 'goal' level. Instead, the highest performance level is called 'independent'. References to 'goal' on the Skills Checklist throughout this document should be interpreted as 'independent'.)
- Since Connecticut's new accountability system is school-focused, the 3% rule is applied to school- and district-level performance rather than district-level only. As a result, the 3% rule has the potential to impact calculation of the District Performance Index (DPI) and the School Performance Index (SPI).

While districts may administer MAS or Skills Checklist to as many students as they deem appropriate, the 3% rule establishes the limit that no more than a number equal to 3% of all students tested may be counted toward 'goal' at the district level based on alternate assessment performance (MAS and Skills Checklist). Specifically, the 3% rule establishes limits of 2% for MAS and 1% for Skills Checklist. The 3% rule applies only to Mathematics and Reading because MAS and Skills Checklist include subtests in both of these content areas. MAS does not

include a Science or Writing component; therefore the 2% rule cannot be applied. Skills Checklist does include a Science component and the equivalent of a Writing component, called 'Communication'; therefore the 1% rule can and is applied. Skills Checklist has a Science component and the Communication subtest of the Skills Checklist is used for Writing index calculations.

The analyses for determining compliance with the 3% and 1% caps are conducted at the district-level and caps for CMT and CAPT are handled separately since different indices are calculated for each assessment program. For every district, the 3% cap limits the number of students achieving at the 'goal' level on alternate assessments (MAS and Skills Checklist) for Mathematics and Reading. Again, it is important to establish the 2% limit for MAS and the 1% limit for Skills Checklist. To determine the maximum number of allowable 'goal' level scores for accountability purposes across content areas, several calculations must be performed.

- Determine the number equal to 3% of all test records (CMT or CAPT, standard and alternate versions) for every district regardless of whether the students were enrolled in the same district or school since October 1 of the previous calendar year. This value is found by multiplying the count of test records for every district by .03. This **3% cap** value represents the maximum number overall of students taking an alternate assessment (**MAS and Checklist**) whose performance at 'goal' level in **Mathematics and Reading** can remain in accountability calculations with full credit.
- Determine the number that represents 2% of all test records (CMT or CAPT, standard and alternate versions) for every district regardless of whether the students were enrolled in the same district or school since October 1 of the previous calendar year. This value is found by multiplying the count of test records for every district by .02. This **2% cap** value represents the maximum number of students taking the **MAS** whose performance at 'goal' level in **Mathematics and Reading** can remain in accountability calculations with full credit.
- Determine the number that represents 1% of all test records (CMT or CAPT, standard and alternate versions) for every district regardless of whether the students were enrolled in the same district or school since October 1 of the previous calendar year. The 1% cap value is found by multiplying the count of test records for every district by .01. This **1% cap** value represents the maximum number of students taking the **Skills Checklist** whose performance at 'goal' level in **Writing** can remain in accountability calculations with full credit. In the case of a **CAPT** analysis, the 1% cap value also represents the maximum number of **Grade 10** students whose performance at 'goal' level in **Science** can remain in accountability calculations with full credit.
- If conducting a CMT analysis, the 1% cap in Science must be determined in a different manner since Science is not assessed at every CMT Grade. In this case, determine the number that represents 1% of all **Grade 5 and 8** test records (standard and alternate versions). This is the number of students represented in the test file in Grades 5 and 8

regardless of whether the students were enrolled in the same district or school since October 1 of the previous calendar year. The 1% cap value is found by multiplying the count of test records by .01. This **1% cap** value represents the maximum number of students taking the **CMT Skills Checklist** whose performance at 'goal' level in **Science** can remain in accountability calculations with full credit.

It should be noted that all calculated limits are rounded up. For example, in a district with 411 students in the test file, one percent is 4.1 students ($411 * .01$), which rounds up to a limit of 5 students.

When a district exceeds the 1% Skills Checklist limits for Writing and/ or Science, the number of alternate assessment students who achieved goal in excess of the limits, is changed at the Subject IPI level and it is changed only for students enrolled in the same school since October 1 of the previous calendar year. (Note: If none of the district's students were enrolled in the same school since October 1 of the previous calendar year, the Subject IPI will be changed for students who were enrolled in the same district since October 1.) The credit for the student is changed from a Subject IPI of 100 points to a Subject IPI of 0 points. The selection of students for Subject Level IPI point reduction is conducted as follows:

- Sort in ascending order SASIDs of all students who participated in the Skills Checklist and earned a score of Goal/ Independent for the affected district.
- Moving down from top to bottom on the sorted list of SASIDs, select one student SASID per school within the district (this includes students who are outplaced; School code = 89 in CMT/CAPT file), until you reach the affected number of students required to be recoded.
- After one student from each of the district's schools in the test file has been selected, return to the top of the list and begin selecting a second student from each school when possible. Continue this process until the identified number of SASIDs necessary for recode has been selected.

Note: The intent of this methodology is to randomize the student selection in a way that is reproducible by the LEA and to be as fair as possible to schools. This approach to recoding avoids over selection in a single school when multiple schools are contributing to the district exceeding the cap.

In all cases, when IPIs are reduced, it should be applied to test records of students who meet the criteria to be included in both the DPI and SPI denominators. This means that the following student test records would **NOT** be eligible for recoding: ELL exempt, students not enrolled in the district or in the school on October 1 of the tested year, and any test record that had been voided.

When districts exceed the 3% limits for Mathematics and/ or Reading, the number of alternate assessment students who achieved goal in excess of the limits is changed at the Subject IPI level from 100 points to a Subject IPI of 0 points. The selection of students for Subject Level IPI point reduction is conducted as follows:

- First, determine if the 3% cap was exceeded for the 2% limit (MAS), for the 1% limit (Skills Checklist) or for both alternate assessment limits.
- If the cap was exceeded for *only* the 2% rule (MAS), only students who took the MAS could be eligible for recoding. Similarly, if the cap was exceeded for *only* the 1% rule (Skills Checklist), only Skills Checklist records would be eligible for IPI recoding.
 - Example: District A has the following caps (i.e., number of allowable students) in place based on the total number of test records district-wide: 3% cap = 15 students; 2% cap = 10 students; 1% cap = 5 students. The testing file shows that District A had 16 students perform at the 'goal' level on alternate assessments. This number exceeds the overall 3% cap because 4 Skills Checklist students performed at the goal level (below 1% cap) and 12 students taking the MAS performed at the goal level (above the 2% cap). The resolution in this case is to recode 1 MAS record from a Subject IPI of 100 to an IPI of 0.
- The student(s) are selected for recoding using the sorting rules outlined in the 1% example above.

If a district exceeds the 3% limit because both the 2% and 1% limits were exceeded, then IPIs are reduced for students who took both types of alternate assessments.

- First, determine the number of IPIs that require recoding by assessment type.
- Reductions are made until the total number of students who achieved 'goal' is brought under the 3% limit, beginning with the limit that was most greatly exceeded. Take for example a district with 411 student test records district-wide. 3% of 411 is 12.33 students, which rounds up to 13 students total. The 3% cap in this case is 13 students.
 - The 3% limit of 13 must be further delineated by MAS (2%) and Skills Checklist (1%). In this example with 411 test records district-wide, the 2% cap is 9 students (8.22) and the 1% cap is 5 students (4.11). If this district exceeded the limit with a total of 16 students at goal (10 on MAS, 6 on Skills Checklist), reducing IPIs for 1 MAS student and 1 Skills Checklist would allow the district to reach compliance at the 1% and 2% limits, but NOT the federal 3% cap; therefore, 1 additional student would need to be selected for recoding so that the district receives credit for 'goal' level performance for no more than 13 students total.
 - To determine whether to recode a MAS record or a Skills Checklist record, identify the cap that was most greatly exceeded. In this example of 411 test records district-wide, the 10 MAS students are 2.42% of all test takers and the 6 Skills Checklist students are 1.45% of all test takers. Technically, the 6 Skills Checklist students at 'goal' have the greater 'overage' of .45% compared to the MAS students at .42%. For

this reason, the third student record recoded from 100 IPI points to zero IPI points should be a Skills Checklist record.

- Again, selection of the three students for recoding in this example should be conducted using the sorting rules outlined in the 1% example above.

It is important to recognize the possibility that a district could remain under the 3% cap for Mathematics or Reading while exceeding either the 2% cap (MAS) or the 1% cap (Skills Checklist) and, therefore, not have any of its students' IPIs reduced.

Annual Targets

The State's ultimate target for all schools is 88 SPI points on the 0–100 School Performance Index (SPI) scale by 2024. To determine annual school-level targets, the CSDE first calculated school-level baselines. Baselines are the mean of 2009-10, 2010-11, and 2011-12 SPIs. In instances where schools did not have three years of data, the CSDE used as much data as was available.

Schools with baselines greater than or equal to 88 must maintain an SPI greater than or equal to 88. Schools with baselines less than 88 must progress $1/12^{\text{th}}$ the distance from their baselines to 88 each year or alternatively stated, they must progress half the distance from their baselines to 88 in six years (2018). For example, if School B's baseline is 76, its distance to 88 is 12 SPI points; therefore, School B's target for 2012-2013 is 77 or a rate of 1 additional SPI point per year.

If a school's baseline is less than 52, its annual target rate exceeds 3 SPI points. Using historical data, the CSDE determined that rates above 3 SPI points per year were difficult to achieve; consequently, the CSDE caps annual targets at 3 SPI points. For example, if School C's baseline is 40, its distance to 88 is 48 SPI points or an annual target increment of 4 SPI points. If the annual target cap did not exist, School C's target for 2012-2013 would be 44. Because of the cap of 3 SPI points, School C's target is actually 43.

Published targets are *truncated* at the tenths place (e.g. $84.09999 = 84.0$) and all SPIs, DPIs and CPIs are *rounded* to the tenths place (e.g. $83.85111111 = 83.9$). Furthermore, groups must meet the truncated target (without any further rounding) to be considered to have met their target. Using the numbers above, a school with an overall truncated target of 84.0 that has a rounded SPI of 83.9 would not have met its target.

GRADUATION RATES IN CONNECTICUT'S ACCOUNTABILITY MODEL

Connecticut's current accountability system includes two proxy measures of college and career readiness: the four-year cohort graduation rate and the Holding Power Rate (formerly referred to as the extended graduation rate).

Calculating Graduation Rates

The four-year cohort graduation rate, introduced with the graduating class of 2009, is calculated by tracking an individual cohort, or group of students, from the initial entrance into 9th grade through to graduation. This approach to calculating graduation rates was created when Connecticut and 49 other states signed an agreement with the National Governors' Association to develop a uniform system for tracking students. The system gives credit to schools when students graduate within four years.

The four-year cohort graduation rate is calculated in the following manner:

[# of graduates (i.e., # of students in cohort who graduate with a regular high school diploma in four years or less)] / [# in cohort]

For more information regarding the four-year cohort graduation rate, please review: [Four-Year Cohort Graduation Rate Documentation \[PDF\]](#)

The Holding Power Rate (HPR) gives schools credit for students still enrolled after four years and for students with disabilities who earn a certificate of completion. This allows the State to accommodate IDEA requirements for students who remain enrolled beyond four years to ensure provision of post-secondary transition services.

The Holding Power Rate is calculated in the following manner:

{[# of graduates (i.e., # of students in cohort who graduate with a regular high school diploma in four years or less)] + [# of students in the cohort still enrolled in public education after four years] + [# of students in the cohort who earn a certificate of completion after four years]} / [# in cohort]

Calculating Graduation Rate Targets

The minimum N-size outlined in Connecticut's approved Flexibility Request to be applied when working with any subgroup performance for accountability purposes is an N of 20. This applies to both the four-year cohort graduation rates and Holding Power Rates.

The ultimate target for the four-year cohort graduation rate is 94% and the Holding Power Rate is 96%. The accountability system establishes targets by starting with the 2011 rates, which were reported in 2012. For schools with rates that are below these ultimate targets, the annual target is computed as follows:

- First, compute the annual target increment by subtracting the 2011 rate from the respective ultimate target and divide the difference by 12.
- Add the annual increment to the 2011 rate. This becomes the target for the 2012 cohort (i.e., the “2012 target” reported in 2013).
- To compute the 2013 target, add the annual increment to the “2012 target,” and so on for each subsequent year.

For schools with a 2011 four-year cohort graduation rate at or above 94%, the graduation rate target for all future years will be set at 94.0%. For schools with a 2011 actual Holding Power Rate at or above 96%, the Holding Power Rate target for all future years will be set as 96.0%.

If a school has a 2012 four-year cohort graduation rate ($N \geq 20$) but no target because there were fewer than 20 students in the 2011 cohort, then performance against a target cannot be determined.

Published targets are truncated at the tenths place (e.g. $84.09999 = 84.0$) and the four-year cohort graduation rates and Holding Power Rates are rounded up to the tenths place (e.g. $83.85111111 = 83.9$). Furthermore, groups must meet the truncated target (without any further rounding) to be considered to have met their target. Using the numbers above, a school with an overall truncated graduation rate target of 84.0 that has a rounded graduation rate of 83.9 would not have met its target.

CLASSIFYING SCHOOLS

When Connecticut was granted ESEA flexibility (i.e. waiver) in May 2012, the CSDE agreed to identify a set of Turnaround, Focus, Review, and Reward schools. The U.S. Department of Education (USED) provided states with specific guidance to be used when identifying Turnaround and Focus schools.

In the fall of 2012, CSDE identified 28 Turnaround schools and 55 Focus schools. The first step in the identification process was to determine the number of Title I schools in 2010-11. There were 541 Title I schools from 2010-11 that remained open in 2012-13. Federal guidance required that a *minimum* of 5% (or 28) of these schools be identified as Turnaround schools and 10% (or 55) be identified as Focus schools. The explanations that follow provide the steps used to establish the Turnaround and Focus school lists in 2012.

Steps for Identifying Turnaround Schools

1. All schools in 2011-12 receiving School Improvement Grants (SIG schools) were included in the Turnaround classification (required by USED). The 19 SIG schools in Connecticut were placed on the Turnaround list.

It was determined that the remaining nine schools required to meet the minimum requirement of 28 Turnaround schools should be schools that administer the CMT since many of the SIG schools were high schools. Identifying elementary and middle schools as the remaining nine schools ensured that the state could focus on improving both primary and secondary education.

2. The nine additional elementary and middle schools identified as Turnaround were the Title I schools with the lowest 2011 overall SPI values.

All schools identified as Turnaround in 2012 will remain Turnaround schools for the 2013-14 school year because Turnaround schools must meet annual performance targets for three consecutive years to exit Turnaround status.

Steps for Identifying Focus Schools

Only schools that were Title I in 2010-11 were eligible to be identified as Focus schools in 2012. Additionally, since Turnaround and Focus schools are mutually exclusive classifications, no Turnaround schools were included in the Focus school identification process. There were separate steps used to identify the 49 elementary and middle schools and the 6 high schools that were identified as Focus schools in 2012.

In order to identify the 49 elementary and middle Focus schools the following steps were used:

1. Using CMT 2011 data, the Black/ African-American subgroup SPI was calculated for all schools with 20 or more tested students in the subgroup.
2. Using CMT 2011 data, the Hispanic/ Latino subgroup SPI was calculated for all schools with 20 or more tested students in the subgroup.
3. Using CMT 2011 data, the High Needs subgroup SPI (F/R lunch and SWD and ELL, combined) was calculated for all schools with 20 or more tested students in the subgroup.
4. For every school, the lowest SPI value among the Black/ African-American, Hispanic/ Latino and High Needs groups was selected. This process created a “minimum SPI” for every school.
5. The minimum SPI values for all schools were sorted and the 49 schools with the lowest “minimum SPI” values were selected. These comprised the elementary and middle schools identified as Focus schools in 2012.

The CSDE was not required to identify additional Focus schools in 2013. If an elementary or middle Focus school met annual targets for two consecutive years (2012 and 2013) for the subgroup that led to the Focus school identification, the school exited Focus status.

High schools were identified as Focus schools based on the 2011 four-year cohort graduation rate. According to federal guidelines, any Title I high school with a four-year cohort graduation rate below 60% was identified as a Focus school. Using 2011 data, the CSDE identified 6 Focus high schools. Since the criteria for exiting Focus schools depends on meeting annual targets for two consecutive years, no high schools are eligible to exit Focus status in 2013.

Review School Criteria

The identification of Review schools does not include a consideration of Title I status, and the Review school list is not limited to a specific number of schools. Turnaround schools and Review schools are mutually exclusive categories. However, Focus schools are a subset of Review schools.

In 2012, Review schools were identified based on their baseline overall SPI, which was a three-year average of whole school SPIs (2009-10, 2010-11, and 2011-12). Any school with a baseline SPI below 64 that was not already identified as a Turnaround school was classified as a Review School.

In 2013, a new Review school list was established based on every school’s 2013 overall SPI. Schools with an SPI below 64 (i.e. < 63.95) were classified as Review. Additionally, any school with a CMT or CAPT participation rate below 95% and any high school with a four-year cohort graduation rate below 60% was classified as Review. The new Review school list also includes all Focus schools identified in 2012 that did not exit based on 2012 and 2013 performance since Focus schools are a subset of Review schools.

Majority Subgroups

One important rule when classifying Excelling, Progressing and Transitioning schools is whether a difference of at least 10 SPI/DPI points exists between the achievement of the majority of subgroups and the all students group in a school. Since the number of reportable subgroups (i.e., $N \geq 20$) can vary by school, the table below specifies what constitutes a majority. This rule excludes consideration of the High Needs group.

Number of reportable subgroups ($N \geq 20$)	At least how many subgroups must have SPI gap <10 in order to retain higher classification?
5	3
4	2
3	2
2	1
1	1

Excelling School Criteria

Excelling schools were identified for the first time in 2013.

For schools that administer CMT, an Excelling school has an overall SPI of 88 or above **and** more than 25% of students score “Advanced” in a majority of subjects tested **and** the majority of subgroup gaps are less than 10 SPI points **and** the CMT participation rate is at least 95%.

For schools that administer CAPT, an Excelling school has an overall SPI of 88 or above **and** more than 25% of students score “Advanced” in a majority of subjects tested **and** the majority of subgroup gaps are less than 10 SPI points **and** the CAPT participation rate is at least 95% **and** the four-year cohort graduation rate is at least 94% **and** the Holding Power Rate is at least 96%.

Progressing School Criteria

Progressing schools were identified for the first time in 2013.

Schools that administer CMT receive a Progressing classification in one of two ways:

- An overall SPI of 88 or above **and** a CMT participation rate of at least 95% **and** misses one or more of the Excelling criteria; or
- An overall SPI of 64 to 87 inclusive **and** a CMT participation rate of at least 95% **and** meets the SPI target for 2012-13 **and** the majority of subgroup gaps are less than 10 SPI points.

Schools that administer CAPT receive a Progressing classification in one of two ways:

- An overall SPI of 88 or above **and** a CAPT participation rate of at least 95% **and** misses one or more of the Excelling criteria; or
- An overall SPI of 64 to 87 inclusive **and** a CAPT participation rate of at least 95% **and** meets the SPI target for 2012-13 **and** the majority of subgroup gaps are less than 10 SPI points **and** has a four-year cohort graduation rate of at least 90% **and** a Holding Power Rate of at least 93%.

Transitioning School Criteria

Transitioning schools were identified for the first time in 2013.

For schools that administer CMT, a Transitioning school has an overall SPI of 64 to 87 inclusive **and** a CMT participation rate of at least 95% **and** misses one or more of the Progressing criteria. For schools that administer CAPT, a Transitioning school has an overall SPI of 64 to 87 inclusive **and** a CAPT participation rate of at least 95% **and** misses one or more of the Progressing criteria.

Steps for Identifying Schools of Distinction

The USED requires that a new list of Schools of Distinction be identified annually. Connecticut’s approved Flexibility Request describes three types of Schools of Distinction: Highest Performing Subgroups, Highest Progress (SPI < 88, SPI ≥ 88), and Highest Performing. The table below identifies the number of schools earning distinctions within each category among both Title I and non-Title I schools.

Distinction	Test	Title I		Non-Title I	
		Number Eligible	Number Awarded	Number Eligible	Number Awarded
1. Highest Performing Subgroup	CMT	5	5	5	5
	CAPT	5	4	5	5
2a. Highest Progress: SPI < 88	CMT	11	5	4	3
	CAPT	3	1	5	1
2b. Highest Progress: SPI ≥ 88	CMT	3	3	4	3
	CAPT	1	1	2	2
3. Highest Performing	CMT	49	26	31	17
	CAPT	7	2	13	7

Schools identified as Review, Focus or Turnaround Schools cannot be included as Schools of Distinction. No school can be identified as a School of Distinction unless the school has at least 95% participation on CMT/CAPT. The criteria used to select schools of distinction are detailed below.

I. Highest Performing Subgroups

Among 2012-13 Title I schools, one CMT school and one CAPT school were to be identified in each of the following five categories for a total of 10 Highest Performing Subgroup Title I schools:

- Highest 2013 SPI (among Title I schools) in the state for the subgroup of students with disabilities;
- Highest 2013 SPI (among Title I schools) in the state for the subgroup of English Language Learners;
- Highest 2013 SPI (among Title I schools) in the state for the subgroup of Black/ African-American students;
- Highest 2013 SPI (among Title I schools) in the state for the subgroup of Hispanic/ Latino students; and
- Highest 2013 SPI (among Title I schools) in the state for the subgroup of students eligible for free or reduced price lunch.

The same approach was used for non-Title I schools. In 2013, only 19 schools were identified as Schools of Distinction in the Highest Performing Subgroup category because no Title I CAPT schools qualified for the highest performing ELL designation.

II. Highest Progress

There are two types of *Highest Progress* schools—schools with an SPI less than 88 and schools that have an SPI of 88 or higher. All categories have to be run based on four school types: Title I CMT, non-Title I CMT, Title I CAPT, and non-Title I CAPT.

Highest Progress: SPI < 88

For schools with a 2013 SPI less than 88 (the majority of students are not yet at Goal), CMT schools must meet the first two criteria below and CAPT schools must meet all four of the criteria below:

1. From 2012 to 2013, the increase in the overall SPI must be greater than 3 points AND among the top 10% of Title I (or non-Title I) improvers.
2. Gaps between the **majority** of historically underperforming subgroups (ELLs, students with disabilities, students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch, Black/African-American students, Hispanic/Latino students) and the “all students” group are less than 10 SPI points.
3. High schools must meet their 2012 four-year cohort graduation rate target.
4. High schools must meet their 2012 Holding Power Rate target.

Note: If a new high school does not have graduation rate targets to meet, the high school will be identified based on criteria 1 and 2 only.

Highest Progress: SPI ≥ 88

The second group of *Highest Progress* schools is comprised of schools that have already met the state target of an SPI of 88 in 2013. For these schools where the majority of students have met or exceeded goal (SPI ≥ 88) and progress is being made, criteria 2-4 of the *Highest Progress: SPI < 88* group apply. In place of criterion 1, schools must show an increase in the percentage of students scoring Advanced in at least one subject from 2012 to 2013 that is among the top 10% of Title I (or non-Title I) improvers on this measure.

III. Highest Performing

Schools with the highest overall performance in 2013 were designated based on all of the following criteria:

- SPI for “all students” group in 2013 is greater than or equal to 88 and is among the highest 10% of all Title I (or non-Title I) schools;

- Gaps between the **majority** of historically underperforming subgroups (ELLs, students with disabilities, students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch, Black/African-American students, Hispanic/ Latino students) and the “all students” group is less than 10 SPI points;
- For high schools, the 2012 four-year cohort graduation rate is at least 94%; and
- The 2012 Holding Power Rate is at least 96%.

Classifying Schools without Reportable Data

The U.S. Department of Education expects that all schools, including those without any students in grades tested by either the CMT or the CAPT, will receive a school classification. To comply with this requirement, Connecticut analyzed district-wide data and applied the results of those analyses using the school classification criteria to schools without tested grades. The same rule was also applied in cases where the total number of reportable students in the tested grades within a school for either CMT or CAPT was less than 20. Statewide, there are 62 schools where this rule was applied.