

THE 2009 BROAD PRIZE FOR URBAN EDUCATION

Summary of District Data Report for Bridgeport Public Schools

The Broad Prize for Urban Education uses student achievement data across several elements to identify urban school systems that are attaining high levels of performance as well as improving over time. Six elements are considered when determining the winner and finalists for the annual \$2 million Broad Prize:

1. Progress in closing achievement gaps between subgroups.
2. Absolute proficiency rates and growth in proficiency rates vs. the state.
3. Residuals that indicate whether a district is outperforming expectations given its poverty rate.
4. Graduation rates.
5. Performance on college readiness tests.
6. Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP).

The information that follows represents a summary of The 2009 Broad Prize data for Bridgeport Public Schools in Bridgeport, Connecticut. Additional details on the data described below may be found in the 2009 district data report available at www.broadprize.org.

A special note regarding Connecticut student achievement data: The Broad Prize typically includes data for the last four years (2005 – 2008) when analyzing average change over time. However, due to changes in the state test at the elementary, middle, and high school levels, 2005 proficiency results for these school levels were not comparable and therefore, are not included in some analyses. In addition, there was a change in the state test at the high school level for 2006; those data are also not included in the analyses.

KEY STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

- In 2008, the district outperformed other districts in Connecticut that serve students with similar family income levels in reading and math at all school levels (elementary, middle and high school).
- Both participation rates and scores on the SAT increased for African American students from 2007 to 2008.
- In 2008, no student group in the district performed at higher absolute proficiency rates in reading or in math than their peers in the rest of the state.
- Between 2005 and 2008, there were no instances in which the district showed better than expected improvement than other Connecticut school districts that serve students with similar family income levels.
- Between 2005 and 2008, AP passing rates as well as participation rates demonstrated an average annual decrease for all student subgroups except for white students.

ACHIEVEMENT GAPS

The Broad Prize analysis looks at whether or not a district is closing achievement gaps among income and ethnic groups.

- Of 21 potential gap closures in reading (2006-2008) between African-American and white students, Hispanic and white students, and low-income and non-low-income students at the elementary and middle school levels, 7 gaps are closing (33%), all at the high school level. In addition, 17% of internal reading achievement gaps in 2008 are among the smallest in the state of Connecticut (top two deciles) and 0% of internal reading gaps are among the largest in the state (bottom two deciles).
- Of the 21 potential gap closures in math (2006-2008) between African-American and white students, Hispanic and white students, and low-income and non-low-income students at the elementary, middle and high school levels, 7 gaps are closing (33%). However, 17% of internal math achievement gaps in 2008 are among the smallest in the state of Connecticut (top two deciles) and 17% of internal math gaps are among the largest in the state (bottom two deciles).

PROFICIENCY RATES VS. THE STATE

The Broad Prize analysis looks at whether or not a district is demonstrating higher proficiency rates than the rest of the state and whether or not the district is improving proficiency rates faster than the rest of the state.

- Of 15 possible opportunities to *demonstrate higher proficiency rates than the rest of the state* in reading, the district does so in 0 instances in 2008 (0%).
- From 2006-2008, of 15 possible opportunities to *improve faster than the rest of the state* in reading, the district does so in 7 instances (47%). All subgroups with available data at the high school level are improving faster than the state (5 of the 7 instances).
- Of 15 possible opportunities to *demonstrate higher proficiency rates than the rest of the state* in math, the district does so in 0 instances in 2008 (0%).
- From 2006-2008, of 15 possible opportunities to *improve faster than the rest of the state* in math, the district does so in only 4 instances (27%).

The Broad Prize analysis also looks at whether or not a higher percentage of a district's students is performing at the highest achievement level on the state assessment than their peers in the rest of the state and whether or not the district is improving rates at the highest achievement level faster than the rest of the state. This analysis is particularly relevant for states where ceiling effects may be a factor.

- Of 15 possible opportunities to *demonstrate higher rates at the highest achievement level than the rest of the state* in reading, the district does so in 0 instances in 2008 (0%).
- From 2006-2008, of 15 possible opportunities to *improve faster than the rest of the state at the highest achievement level* in reading, the district does so in 4 instances (27%). The district's strongest improvement in reading relative to the state is at the high school level (all 4 instances).
- Of 15 possible opportunities to *demonstrate higher rates at the highest achievement level than the rest of the state* in math, the district does so in 0 instances in 2008 (0%).
- From 2006-2008, of 15 possible opportunities to *improve faster than the rest of the state at the highest achievement level* in math, the district does so in 0 instances (0%).

STANDARDIZED RESIDUALS

The Broad Prize runs regressions for all districts in the state to determine whether or not a district is demonstrating greater-than-expected performance (2008 proficiency levels) and/or greater-than-expected improvement (trend data from 2005 to 2008) given the district's poverty level. A positive residual signifies that the district is beating expectations given its level of poverty.

- In reading, 3 of 3 performance residuals (elementary, middle and high school) are positive (100%) and 0 of 3 improvement residuals are positive (0%).

- In math, 3 of 3 performance residuals (elementary, middle and high school) are positive (100%) and 0 of 3 improvement residuals are positive (0%).

GRADUATION RATES

The Broad Prize uses three national definitions to determine an estimated graduation rate for the district. The calculations used are the Averaged Freshman Graduation Rate, the Urban Institute Method, and the Manhattan Institute Method.

- Using the average for all three graduation rates, the district demonstrated no change in the graduation rate for the period 2003-2006 (the most recent publicly available data) for all students. Similarly, no change can be seen for Hispanic students. African American students had an average annual decrease in graduation rates (-1 percentage point per year) while white students had an average annual increase of 2 percentage points per year.
- Using the average for all three graduation rates, in 2006 the district graduated an estimated 57% of its students overall, 69% of its African-American students, 47% of its Hispanic students, and 63% of its white students.

COLLEGE READINESS

The Broad Prize analyzes SAT, ACT and Advanced Placement (AP) scores and participation rates as proxies for college readiness.

- In 2008, 48% of the district's seniors took the SAT exam. The mean total SAT score for all senior test-takers in 2008 in the district was 799 (926 for white students and 783 for African-American students, representing a 143 point gap, and 785 for Hispanic students, representing a 141 point gap). From 2007 to 2008, mean total scores demonstrated average annual increases for African American, Asian, and white students, but decreased for Hispanic students. African American students were the only subgroup that increased SAT scores as well as participation rates from 2007 to 2008.
- In 2008, 11% of the district's juniors and seniors took an AP exam (9% of white students, African-American, and Hispanic students, representing no gap). The percent of tests taken with scores of 3 or above for all junior and senior test-takers in the district in 2008 was 22% (44% for white students and 11% for African-American students, representing a 33 point gap, and 23% for Hispanic students, representing an 21 point gap). Between 2005 and 2008, the percent of tests taken with a score of 3 or above as well as participation rates demonstrated an average annual decrease for all student subgroups except for white students.

ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS

The Broad Prize reviews district AYP status each year.

- The district did not meet AYP in 2005, 2006, 2007 or 2008.
- The percent of schools in the district meeting AYP targets in 2008 was 16%. No state data were available to make a comparison.