

# No Child Left Behind (NCLB) School Report: 2005-06 School Year



## Connecticut Technical High School System

### A. I. Prince Technical High School



The federal No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001 requires a statewide school accountability system. As part of this system, school districts receiving federal dollars based on the percentage of district students in poverty (referred to as Title I funds) must prepare and disseminate annual accountability reports for each school in the district. In Connecticut, the report for high schools presents the performance of students in mathematics and reading on the Connecticut Academic Performance Test (CAPT), as well as information about the qualifications of teachers based on the federal definition of "highly qualified" teachers.

#### Adequate Yearly Progress

The state is required to determine annually if every school is making adequate yearly progress (AYP) toward reaching the goal, by 2014, of having 100 percent of its students scoring at or above the Proficient level in mathematics and reading on the CAPT. For a school to have made AYP, the following criteria must have been met by all students in the school and by each subgroup (major racial and ethnic groups, students in poverty, students with disabilities and English language learners): (1) 95 percent participation on both the mathematics and reading CAPT; (2) achievement of the AYP target percentage at or above Proficient in mathematics and reading on the CAPT; and (3) achievement of the AYP target for an additional academic indicator, 70 percent graduation rate or improvement from the previous year. If a school does not make AYP for two consecutive years, it will be identified as "in need of improvement." More information about AYP can be found on Page 2 of this report.

**Adequate Yearly Progress Status for A. I. Prince Technical High School = Safe Harbor**

**This school remains identified as in need of improvement; Year Improvement = 3**

#### **CAPT Two Year Trend Data: % At or Above Proficient**

The table below presents the percent at or above proficient for the last two years of the CAPT. More information about the academic achievement of this school can be found on Page 3 of this report.

<b>CAPT Trend Data: % At or Above Proficient</b>				
<b>Subject</b>	<b>2002-03</b>	<b>2003-04</b>	<b>2004-05</b>	<b>2005-06</b>
Mathematics	24	32	28	43
Reading	42	55	55	53

#### **Contents of NCLB School Report:**

Page 2: Adequate Yearly Progress Data

Page 3: Connecticut Academic Performance Test (CAPT) Achievement Data

Page 4: Qualifications of Teachers Teaching in the Core Academic Areas



# Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Status Data for the 2005-06 School Year



Based on the spring 2006 Connecticut Academic Performance Test (CAPT)

## Connecticut Technical High School System, A. I. Prince Technical High School

The tables below show this school's performance on the AYP indicators. A "No" under the AYP Target Met column indicates an area in which the AYP criteria was not met. Only students who were enrolled in this school for the full academic year were included in these calculations.

Subgroup*	Participation Rate (95 % participation needed)**							% At or Above Proficient			
	Mathematics			Reading			AYP Target Met?	Mathematics (69 % proficient needed)		Reading (72 % proficient needed)	
	Current	2 Year Avg.	3 Year Avg.	Current	2 Year Avg.	3 Year Avg.		Adjusted	AYP Target Met?	Adjusted	AYP Target Met?
<b>Whole School</b> (n = 144)	100	99	99	100	98	99	Yes	55	Safe Harbor	81	Yes
<b>American Indian</b> (n = 0)	Fewer than 40 students in this subgroup							Fewer than 40 students in this subgroup		Fewer than 40 students in this subgroup	
<b>Asian American</b> (n = 0)	Fewer than 40 students in this subgroup							Fewer than 40 students in this subgroup		Fewer than 40 students in this subgroup	
<b>Black</b> (n = 64)	100	100	100	100	100	100	Yes	51	Safe Harbor	82	Yes
<b>Hispanic</b> (n = 77)	100	98	99	100	98	98	Yes	62	Safe Harbor	83	Yes
<b>White</b> (n = 3)	Fewer than 40 students in this subgroup							Fewer than 40 students in this subgroup		Fewer than 40 students in this subgroup	
<b>Students with Disabilities</b> (n = 13)	Fewer than 40 students in this subgroup							Fewer than 40 students in this subgroup		Fewer than 40 students in this subgroup	
<b>English Language Learners</b> (n = 37)	Fewer than 40 students in this subgroup							Fewer than 40 students in this subgroup		Fewer than 40 students in this subgroup	
<b>Economically Disadvantaged</b> (n = 90)	100	99	99	100	99	99	Yes	63	Safe Harbor	87	Yes
<b>Additional Academic Indicator: Graduation Rate (70 % or annual improvement needed)</b>								<b>AYP Target Met?</b>	<b>Yes</b>		

\* It is possible for a subgroup to be of sufficient size (40 or greater) for the calculation of the participation rate, but not of sufficient size (fewer than 40) for the calculation of the percent at or above proficient. This is due to the omission of absent students from the calculation of the percent at or above proficient. If a school does not have the required 95 percent participation with 40 or more students, it will not have made AYP, regardless of the subgroup size for the percent at or above proficient calculation.

\*\* For any school or subgroup that did not meet the 95 percent participation rate criterion, a two- and three-year average participation rate using 2006, 2005, and 2004 CAPT is calculated. If the two-year or three-year average was greater than the current participation rate, it was used for the AYP analysis.

# 2006 Connecticut Academic Performance Test (CAPT) Achievement Data

## A. I. Prince Technical High School

NCLB requires assessment data to be reported by different achievement levels. The table below shows the percentage of students scoring at or above the Basic, Proficient, and Advanced levels on the spring 2006 CAPT. The numbers on this page were calculated only for groups of 20 or more. The percentage at or above Proficient will not be the same number as on the previous page. The number on the previous page is based on a federally approved AYP calculation used to analyze the adequate yearly progress of schools and districts. In addition, it includes only those students who were in the school for a full academic year; the number on this page includes all students, regardless of their length of time in the school.

	Math						Reading						Graduation Rate
	Total # Students	# Students Tested in Subject	% Students Tested in Subject	% of Students Scoring At or Above			Total # Students	# Students Tested in Subject	% Students Tested in Subject	% of Students Scoring At or Above			
				Basic	Proficient	Advanced				Basic	Proficient	Advanced	
Whole School	144	144	100	74	43	<5%	144	144	100	89	53	<5%	99
<b>Subgroup Achievement</b>													Graduation rate by subgroup will not be available until the class of 2010
American Indian	0	0	Fewer than 20 students in this subgroup				0	0	Fewer than 20 students in this subgroup				
Asian American	0	0	Fewer than 20 students in this subgroup				0	0	Fewer than 20 students in this subgroup				
Black	64	64	100	67	36	<5%	64	64	100	89	52	<5%	
Hispanic	77	77	100	78	47	<5%	77	77	100	88	53	<5%	
White	3	3	Fewer than 20 students in this subgroup				3	3	Fewer than 20 students in this subgroup				
Students with Disabilities	13	13	Fewer than 20 students in this subgroup				13	13	Fewer than 20 students in this subgroup				
English Language Learners	37	37	100	73	41	<5%	37	37	100	86	51	<5%	
Economically Disadvantaged	90	90	100	76	49	<5%	90	90	100	89	59	<5%	
Migrant	0	0	Fewer than 20 students in this subgroup				0	0	Fewer than 20 students in this subgroup				
Male	69	69	100	71	43	<5%	69	69	100	81	51	<5%	
Female	75	75	100	76	43	<5%	75	75	100	96	55	<5%	
District Achievement	2605	2594	100	93	75	6	2605	2598	100	95	76	5	97
State Achievement	44596	43405	97	89	76	19	44598	43433	97	90	78	20	91

## A. I. Prince

**General Note:**

In the 2005-2006 school year, the Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) was audited by the federal government and required to report teacher quality data differently than it had done on the previous report cards. The CSDE had reported the percentage of full-time equivalents (FTEs) that were highly qualified and not highly qualified. Starting with the 2005-2006 report card, the CSDE will report the percentage of classes taught by highly qualified and not highly qualified teachers.

**Table 1. General School Information**

These data are provided to describe your school because the NCLB law requires that poor or minority students are not taught by inexperienced, unqualified, or out-of-field teachers at a higher rate than other students. In the CSDE teacher quality analysis, each public school was assigned to a quartile based on the percentage of students in poverty, the percentage of minority students, and the percentage of teachers with two or less years of experience. The state percentage of inexperienced teachers is 16.6 while the percentage in high poverty/minority schools is approximately 22. The percentage in low poverty/minority schools is approximately 15.

Is this school in the high poverty quartile?:	Yes
Is this school in the low poverty quartile?:	No
Is this school in the high minority quartile?:	Yes
Is this school in the low minority quartile?:	No
Is this school in the high inexperience quartile?:	No
Is this school in the low inexperience quartile?:	No
School Percent Poverty:	61.8
School Percent Minority:	96.1
Percent of Teachers 2 or less years of experience:	9.7

**Table 2. General Teacher and Class Information**

These data are your highly qualified and not highly qualified teacher FTEs as well as the number of classes taught by highly qualified and not highly qualified teachers.

Total Teacher FTE:	41.2
Highly Qualified Teacher FTE:	36.2
Not Highly Qualified FTE:	5
Total Number of Classes:	206
Number of Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers:	181
Number of Classes Taught by Not Highly Qualified Teachers:	25

**Table 3. School Classes Taught by Highly and Not Highly Qualified Teachers, 2005-06**

From 2001 to 2004, the CSDE reported highly qualified and not highly qualified percentages based on FTEs. Starting with the 2005-2006 report card, the CSDE will report the percentage of classes taught by highly qualified and not highly qualified teachers. Therefore, there are no comparison years for 2005-2006 data. According to the NCLB law, your school must reach the goal of 100% highly qualified by the end of the 2006-2007 school year.

Percent of Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers	Percent of Classes Taught by Not Highly Qualified Teachers
87.9	12.1

**Table 4. Connecticut Classes Taught by Highly and Not Highly Qualified Teachers**

<p>From 2001 to 2004, the CSDE reported highly qualified and not highly qualified percentages based on FTEs. Starting with the 2005-2006 report card, the CSDE will report the percentage of classes taught by highly qualified and not highly qualified teachers. Therefore, there are no comparison years for 2005-2006 data. The CSDE also did not report minority data in 2001 through 2004. In 2005-2006, on average it was found that students in the high poverty or high minority quartile schools were more than three times as likely to be in classes taught by NHQ teachers than in low poverty or low minority quartile schools. If your school falls into the high poverty or high minority quartile, you must ensure that poor or minority students are not taught by inexperienced, unqualified, or out-of-field teachers at a higher rate than other students.</p>		Percent of Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers	Percent of Classes Taught by Not Highly Qualified Teachers
	State Overall	96.8	3.2
	State High Poverty Schools	93.4	6.6
	State Low Poverty Schools	98.1	1.9
	State High Minority Schools	93.1	6.9
	State Low Minority Schools	97.9	2.1