

THE 2009 BROAD PRIZE FOR URBAN EDUCATION

Summary of District Data Report for Garden Grove Unified 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 Garden Grove Unified School District in Garden Grove, California. 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 California student achievement data: Separate categories for the proficient and advanced categories are not reported for the California High School Exit Exam. Therefore, some analyses could not be completed.

KEY STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

- In 2008, all of the district's student groups achieved higher proficiency rates than their counterparts statewide in math at the high school level.
- In 2008, the district outperformed other districts in California that serve students with similar family income levels in reading and math at all school levels (elementary, middle, high). Between 2005 and 2008, the district only narrowed one of 18 achievement gaps in math.
- From 2005 to 2008, AP participation rates for all student subgroups increased every year, on average.
- Between 2005 and 2008, the district's students improved proficiency rates in reading and math faster than their peers in the rest of the state in only 2 of 26 comparisons.
- Average graduation rates for all student groups decreased from 2003 to 2006.
- In 2008, AP participation rates for white and Hispanic juniors and seniors were equivalent. However, AP passing rates were 72% for white test-takers and 47% for Hispanic test takers, representing a 25 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 18 potential gap closures in reading (2005-2008) between Hispanic and white students, and low-income and non-low-income students at the elementary, middle and high school

- levels, 7 gaps are closing (39%). In addition, 0% of internal reading achievement gaps in 2008 are among the smallest (top two deciles) in the state of California and 0% of internal reading gaps are among the largest in the state (bottom two deciles).
- Of the 18 potential gap closures in math (2005-2008) between Hispanic and white students, and low-income and non-low-income students at the elementary, middle and high school levels, only 1 gap is closing (6%). In addition, 0% of internal math achievement gaps in 2008 are among the smallest (top two deciles) in the state of California 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 18 possible opportunities to *demonstrate higher proficiency rates than the state in reading*, the district does so in 10 instances in 2008 (56%). Low income students at all school levels are performing at higher absolute proficiency rates in reading than their peers in the state. All available subgroups except for white and non-low income students at the middle and high school levels are outperforming the state in reading.
- From 2005-2008, of 18 possible opportunities to *improve faster than the state in reading*, the district does so in 2 instances (11%). Only non-low income students at the elementary and middle school levels are improving proficiency rates faster than the state in reading.
- Of 18 possible opportunities to *demonstrate higher proficiency rates than the state in math*, the district does so in 13 instances in 2008 (72%). Only Asian students and low income students are performing at higher absolute proficiency rates in math than their peers in the state across all three school levels. All subgroups at the high school level are outperforming their peers in the state.
- From 2005-2008, of 18 possible opportunities to *improve faster than the rest of the state in math*, the district does so in 0 instances (0%).

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 rest of the state in reading*, the district does so in 5 instances in 2008 (42%). Four of the five instances occur at the middle school level.
- From 2005-2008, of 12 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 (33%). All four instances occur at the middle school level.
- Of 12 possible opportunities to *demonstrate higher rates at the highest achievement level than the state in math*, the district does so in 6 instances in 2008 (50%).
- From 2005-2008, of 12 possible opportunities to *improve faster than the rest of the state at the highest achievement level in math*, the district does so in only 1 instance (8%). Only non-low-income students at the elementary school level in the district improved faster than their peers in the rest of the state at the highest achievement level in math.

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 1 of 3 improvement residuals are positive (33%).
- 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 is demonstrating an average annual decrease of 2 percentage points per year for the period 2003-2006 (the most recent publicly available data) for all students. A similar negative trend can be seen for white students (-2 percentage points per year) and for Hispanic students (-2 percentage points per year).
- Using the average for all three graduation rates, the district is graduating an estimated 73% of its students overall, 75% of its white students and 61% 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, 37% of the district's seniors took the SAT exam. The mean composite SAT score for all test-takers in 2008 in the district was 1,001 (1,065 for white students and representing a 64 point gap, and 894 for Hispanic students, representing a 171 point gap). Over the last four years, average scores for Asian and white student subgroups have shown an average annual increase while average scores for Hispanic student subgroups have shown an average annual decrease. During this period, participation rates have increased for Hispanic and white students and remained flat for Asian students.
- In 2008, 22% of the district's juniors and seniors took an AP exam (11% of white students and 12% of Hispanic students, representing a -1 point gap). The percent of tests taken with scores of 3 or above for all test-takers in the district in 2008 was 54% (72% for white test-takers and 47% for Hispanic test takers, representing a 25 point gap). From 2005 to 2008, the participation rate for all student subgroups has increased every year, on average. During this period, passing rates for Asian and white test takers also increased every year, on average, while passing rates for Hispanic test takers decreased every year, on average.

ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS

The Broad Prize reviews district AYP status each year.

- The district did not meet AYP in 2007 and 2008, but met AYP in 2005 and 2006.
- The percent of schools in the district meeting AYP targets in 2008 was 48% vs. 52% of schools in the state.