

THE 2009 BROAD PRIZE FOR URBAN EDUCATION

Summary of District Data Report for Detroit 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 Detroit Public Schools in Detroit, Michigan. 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 Michigan student achievement data: The Broad Prize typically includes data for the last four years (2005 – 2008) when analyzing average change over time. At the time of analysis, 2005 test data were not available. High school data prior to 2007 were not comparable and, as a result, were not used in change calculations. Test data for the non-low income subgroup were not available.

KEY STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

- Of 5 potential gap closures in math (2006-2008), all 5 gaps are narrowing.
- Of 18 possible opportunities to demonstrate higher proficiency rates than the rest of the state in reading, the district does so in only 2 instances in 2008.
- In 2008, the district showed lower-than-expected performance compared to other districts in Michigan that serve students with similar family income levels in reading and math at all school levels.
- Between 2006 and 2008, the district showed lower-than-expected improvement compared to other similar districts in Michigan in reading and math at all school levels.
- Using the average for all three graduation rates, the district is graduating an estimated 41% of its students overall. This is the third lowest graduation rate among the eligible districts.
- In 2008, only 7% of the district's seniors took an AP exam.

ACHIEVEMENT GAPS

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

- Of 5 potential gap closures in reading (2006-2008) between Hispanic and white students, and African-American and white students at the elementary, middle and high school levels, only 1 gap is closing (20%).

- Of the 5 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, all 5 gaps are closing (100%).

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 9 possible opportunities to *demonstrate higher proficiency rates than the rest of the state* in reading, the district does so in only 1 instance in 2008 (11%). Only African-American students at the high school level are performing at higher absolute proficiency rates in reading than their peers in the rest of the state.
- From 2006-2008, of 9 possible opportunities to *improve faster than the rest of the state* in reading, the district only does so in 2 instances (22%). Both instances occur at the high school level with all students overall and African-American students.
- Of 9 possible opportunities to *demonstrate higher proficiency rates than the rest of the state* in math, the district does so in only 1 instance in 2008 (11%). Only African-American students at the high school level are performing at higher absolute proficiency rates in math than their peers in the rest of the state.
- From 2006-2008, of 9 possible opportunities to *improve faster than the rest of the state* in math, the district does so in 4 instances (44%).

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 9 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 9 possible opportunities to *improve faster than the rest of the state at the highest achievement level* in reading, the district does so in 0 instances (0%).
- Of 9 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 9 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, 0 of 3 performance residuals (elementary, middle and high school) are positive (0%) and 0 of 3 improvement residuals are positive (0%).
- In math, 0 of 3 performance residuals (elementary, middle and high school) are positive (0%) 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 is demonstrating an average annual increase of 3 percentage points per year for the period 2003-2006 (the most recent publicly available data) for all students. A similar positive trend can be seen for African-American students (4 percentage points per year), but no change can be seen for Hispanic students.
- Using the average for all three graduation rates, the district is graduating an estimated 41% of its students overall, 48% of its African-American students, and 44% 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. *Data for the SAT and ACT were unavailable for 2008.*

- In 2007 (the most recently data available), 77% 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 (17 for white students and 16 for African-American and Hispanic students, representing a 1 point gap). Between 2005 and 2007, participation rates for African-American students increased an average of 6 percentage points per year while passing rates remained stable.
- In 2008, 7% of the district's seniors took an AP exam (6% of African-American students). The percent of tests taken with scores of 3 or above for all senior test-takers in the district in 2008 was 23% (58% for white test-takers and 19% for African-American test takers, representing a 39 point gap, and 33% for Hispanic test takers, representing a 25 point gap). Between 2005 and 2008, the participation rate for African-American students increased 1 percentage point per year on average, while the percent of tests scoring 3 or higher decreased 2 percentage points per year on average.

ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS

The Broad Prize reviews district AYP status each year.

- The district did not meet AYP in 2005, 2007 or 2008.
- The percent of schools in the district meeting AYP targets in 2008 was 69% vs. 80% of schools in the state.