

THE 2009 BROAD PRIZE FOR URBAN EDUCATION

Summary of District Data Report for Cleveland Metropolitan School District

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 Cleveland Metropolitan School District in Cleveland, Ohio. 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 Ohio student achievement data: The Broad Prize typically includes data for the last four years (2005 – 2008) when analyzing average change over time. However, in 2006, the middle school level reading test and all levels of the math test changed. As a result, 2006 data were not comparable to previous years. Test data for the district's non-low income subgroup were not available prior to 2008.

KEY STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

- Between 2005 and 2008, the district showed better than expected improvement than other Ohio school districts that serve students with similar family income levels in reading and math at the middle and high school levels.
- Between 2005 and 2008, the district only narrowed two out of 36 achievement gaps in reading and math.
- In 2008, no student groups in the district performed at higher absolute proficiency rates in reading or in math than their peers in the rest of the state.
- Using the average for all three graduate rates, the district graduated an estimated 42% of its students overall in 2006. This is one of the lowest graduation rates among the Broad Prize districts.
- In 2008, 6% of the district's juniors and seniors took at least one Advanced Placement exam. This is one of the lowest participation rates among the Broad Prize districts.

ACHIEVEMENT GAPS

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

- Of 18 potential gap closures in reading (2005-2008) between Hispanic and white students, and African-American and white students at the elementary, middle and high school levels, no gaps are closing (0%). In addition, 0% of internal reading achievement gaps in 2008 are among the smallest (top two deciles) in the state of Ohio while 11% of internal reading gaps are among the largest in the state (bottom two deciles).
- Of the 18 potential gap closures in math (2006-2008) between Hispanic and white students, and African-American and white students at the elementary, middle and high school levels, 2 gaps are closing (11%). In addition, 0% of internal math achievement gaps in 2008 are among the smallest (top two deciles) in the state of Ohio while 11% 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 gains 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 state* in reading, the district does so in 0 instances in 2008 (0%). No subgroup in the district is performing at higher absolute proficiency rates in reading than their peers in the rest of the state.
- From 2005-2008, of 12 possible opportunities to *demonstrate better improvement rates than the state* in reading, the district does so in 6 instances (50%). The rest of the state is primarily demonstrating decreases in proficiency rates, while the district is maintaining its proficiency rates.
- Of 15 possible opportunities to *demonstrate higher proficiency rates than the state* in math, the district does so in 0 instances in 2008 (0%). No subgroup in the district is performing at higher absolute proficiency rates in math than their peers in the rest of the state.
- From 2006-2008, of 12 possible opportunities to *improve faster than the state* in math, the district does so in 7 instances (58%). At the high school level, the district is demonstrating increases in proficiency rates, while the rest of the state is demonstrating decreases in proficiency rates.

The Broad Prize analysis also looks at whether or not a higher percentage of a district's students are 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 state* in reading, the district does so in 0 instances in 2008 (0%).
- From 2005-2008, of 12 possible opportunities to *improve faster than the state at the highest achievement level* in reading, the district does so in 6 instances (50%).
- Of 15 possible opportunities to *demonstrate higher rates at the highest achievement level than the state* in math, the district does so in 0 instances in 2008 (0%).
- From 2006-2008, of 12 possible opportunities to *improve faster than the state at the highest achievement level* in math, the district does so in 4 instances (33%). All four instances occur at the high school level.

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, 2 of 3 improvement residuals are positive (67%).
- In math, 2 of 3 improvement residuals are positive (67%).

Note: The percent of low-income test takers reported in 2008 at all levels was unreliable and residual results were suppressed.

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 is demonstrating an average annual decrease of -1 percentage point per year for the period 2003-2006 (the most recent publicly available data) for all students. A similar negative trend can be seen for African-American students (-1 percentage point per year), while there was no change for Hispanic and white students (0 percentage points per year).
- Using the average for all three graduation rates, the district is graduating an estimated 42% of its students overall, 43% of its white students, 42% of its African-American students, and 46% of its Hispanic students.

COLLEGE READINESS

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

- In 2008, 17% of the district's seniors took the SAT exam. The mean composite SAT score for all senior test-takers in 2008 in the district was 835 (926 for white students and 807 for African-American students, representing a 119 point gap, and 859 for Hispanic students, representing a 67 point gap). Between 2005 and 2008, average scores increased for all subgroups except for Asian students, while participation rates remained flat or declined.
- In 2008, 44% of the district's seniors took the ACT exam. The mean composite ACT score for all senior test-takers in 2008 in the district was 16 (20 for white students and 16 for African-American students, representing a 4 point gap, and 17 for Hispanic students, representing a 3 point gap). Between 2005 and 2008, there was no increase in the average score for the district; however, participation rates increased 2 percentage points per year on average for all students overall and for African-American students.
- In 2008, 6% of the district's juniors and seniors took an AP exam (9% of white students and 4% of African-American students, representing a 5 point gap, and 13% of Hispanic students, representing a -4 point 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 7% (14% for white test-takers and 5% for African-American test takers, representing a 9 point gap, and 9% for Hispanic test takers, representing a 5 point gap). Between 2005 and 2008, the participation rate and percent of tests scoring 3 or higher increased for all available student groups.

ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS

The Broad Prize reviews district AYP status each year.

- The district did not meet AYP in 2005, 2006, or 2008, but met AYP in 2007.

- The percent of schools in the district meeting AYP targets in 2008 was 11% vs. 64% of schools in the state.