

THE 2009 BROAD PRIZE FOR URBAN EDUCATION

Summary of District Data Report for Columbus 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 Columbus Public Schools in Columbus, 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.

KEY STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

- Between 2005 and 2008, the district narrowed 67% of its achievement gaps between low-income and non-low-income students.
- From 2005 to 2008, of 30 possible opportunities to demonstrate better improvement rates than the rest of the state in reading and math, the district did so in 27 instances (90%). In addition, during this period, of 30 possible opportunities to demonstrate better improvement rates at the highest achievement level than the state in reading and math, the district did so in 19 instances (63%).
- Between 2005 and 2008, the district did not narrow any of its achievement gaps in reading or in math at the high school level.
- Nearly all student groups in the district are not performing at higher absolute proficiency rates in reading or in math than their peers in the rest of the state.
- In 2008, 17% of the district's white juniors and seniors took an Advanced Placement exam compared with 8% of the district's African-American juniors and seniors, representing a 9 point gap. The passing rate for white junior and senior test-takers in the district in 2008 was 30% for white test-takers compared with 9% for African-American test takers, representing a 21 point gap.

ACHIEVEMENT GAPS

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

- Of 20 potential gap closures in reading (2005-2008) between Hispanic and white students, African-American and white students, and low-income and non-low-income students at the elementary, middle and high school levels, 11 gaps are closing (55%). In addition, 0% of internal reading achievement gaps in 2008 are among the smallest (top two deciles) in the state of Ohio while 20% of internal reading gaps are among the largest in the state (bottom two deciles).
- Of the 20 potential gap closures in math (2006-2008) between Hispanic and white students, African-American and white students, and low-income and non-low-income students at the elementary, middle and high school levels, 9 gaps are closing (45%). In addition, 0% of internal math achievement gaps in 2008 are among the smallest (top two deciles) in the state of Ohio and 0% 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 12 possible opportunities to *demonstrate higher proficiency rates than the state* in reading, the district does so in 3 instances in 2008 (25%).
- From 2005-2008, of 15 possible opportunities to *demonstrate better improvement rates than the state* in reading, the district only does so in 14 instances (93%). Only non-low income students at the high school level are not demonstrating better improvement rates relative to their peers in the state.
- Of 12 possible opportunities to *demonstrate higher proficiency rates than the state* in math, the district does so in 4 instances in 2008 (33%). African-American students in the district at all school levels are performing at higher absolute proficiency rates in math than their peers in the rest of the state.
- From 2006-2008, of 15 possible opportunities to *demonstrate better improvement rates than the state* in math, the district does so in 13 instances (87%). All students overall and non-low income students at the high school level are the only students not demonstrating better improvement rates than their peers in the state.

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 12 possible opportunities to *demonstrate higher rates at the highest achievement level than the state* in reading, the district does so in 2 instances in 2008 (17%). Both instances occur at the high school level.
- From 2005-2008, of 15 possible opportunities to *improve faster than the state at the highest achievement level* in reading, the district does so in 10 instances (67%). All students overall, and white and low-income students separately, showed better improvement rates than their peers in the rest of the state at all school levels.
- Of 12 possible opportunities to *demonstrate higher rates at the highest achievement level than the state* in math, the district does so in 4 instances in 2008 (33%). African-American

- and low-income students at the elementary and high school levels are demonstrating higher rates than their peers in the rest of the state.
- From 2006-2008, of 15 possible opportunities to *improve faster than the state at the highest achievement level* in math, the district does so in 9 instances (60%). Nearly all subgroups at the elementary and high school levels demonstrate faster improvement in math relative to their peers in the state.

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 2 improvement residuals are positive (100%).
- In math, 1 of 2 improvement residuals is positive (50%).

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 (-2 percentage points per year), while there was an increase for white students (1 percentage point per year).
- Using the average for all three graduation rates, the district is graduating an estimated 51% of its students overall, 53% of its white students, and 51% of its African-American students.

COLLEGE READINESS

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

- In 2008, 12% 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 956 (1,073 for white students and 865 for African-American students, representing a 208 point gap, and 942 for Hispanic students, representing a 131 point gap). Between 2005 and 2008, average scores experienced an average annual decrease for all subgroups, while participation rates remained flat or declined.
- In 2008, 56% 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 18 (21 for white students and 16 for African-American students, representing a 5 point gap, and 17 for Hispanic students, representing a 4 point gap). Between 2005 and 2008, only Asian students increased their average scores while participation rates increased for all students overall and African-American students.
- In 2008, 12% of the district's juniors and seniors took an AP exam (17% of white students and 8% of African-American students, representing a 9 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 21% (30% for white test-takers and 9% for African-American test takers, representing

a 21 point gap). Between 2005 and 2008, most student groups experienced an average annual decrease in passing rates; only white students experienced an average annual increase in participation rates.

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 40% vs. 64% of schools in the state.