

THE 2009 BROAD PRIZE FOR URBAN EDUCATION

Summary of District Data Report for Hartford 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 Hartford Public Schools in Hartford, Connecticut. Additional details on the data described below may be found in the 2009 district data report available at www.broadprize.org.

KEY STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

- In 2008, 81% of the district's seniors took the SAT exam, the second highest participation rate among the 100 eligible districts.
- In 2008, 100% of the district's internal gaps in reading and math were among the largest in the state of Connecticut.
- Of 28 possible opportunities to demonstrate higher proficiency rates than the rest of the state in reading and math, the district did so in 0 instances in 2008 (0%).
- Between 2005 and 2008, the district showed lower-than-expected improvement compared to other similar districts in Connecticut in reading and math at the elementary and middle school levels.
- Using the average for all three graduation rates, in 2006 the district graduated an estimated 43% of its students overall. This is one of the lowest graduation rates among the eligible districts.

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, 6 gaps are closing (29%). However, 0% of internal reading achievement gaps in 2008 were among the smallest in the state of Connecticut (top two deciles); 100% of internal reading gaps were 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, 10 gaps are closing (48%). However, 0% of internal math achievement gaps in 2008 were among the smallest in the state of Connecticut (top two deciles) and 100% of internal math gaps were 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 14 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 16 possible opportunities to *improve faster than the rest of the state* in reading, the district does so in 6 instances (38%).
- Of 14 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 16 possible opportunities to *improve faster than the rest of the state* in math, the district does so in 8 instances (50%). Overall, the district is improving faster than the state in all three grade levels in math. In addition, African-American and low-income students in Hartford are improving faster than the state in elementary and middle school math.

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 14 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 16 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 14 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 16 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, 1 of 3 improvement residuals is positive (33%).
- In math, 1 of 3 improvement residuals is positive (33%).

In 2008, the percent of low-income test takers was unreliable; therefore, 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) and Hispanic students (-1 percentage point per year).
- Using the average for all three graduation rates, in 2006 the district graduated an estimated 43% of its students overall, 54% of its African-American students, and 33% 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, 81% of the district's seniors took the SAT exam, the second highest participation rate among the 100 eligible districts. The mean total SAT score for all senior test-takers in 2008 in the district was 785 (910 for white students and 774 for African-American students, representing a 136 point gap, and 782 for Hispanic students, representing a 128 point gap). From 2005 to 2008, mean total scores for all senior test-takers stayed flat while participation rates increased 8 percentage points per year on average.
- In 2008, 10% of the district's juniors and seniors took an AP exam (13% of white students and 8% of African-American students, representing a 5 point gap, and 9% 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 22% (51% for white students and 8% for African-American students, representing a 43 point gap, and 20% for Hispanic students, representing a 31 point gap). From 2005 to 2008, the participation rate increased by 2 percentage points per year on average, while the percent of tests scoring 3 or higher declined by 4 percentage points per year on average over the same period.

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 2007 was 10% vs. 68% of schools in the state (2008 data for the state's percentage of schools meeting AYP was not available).