

THE 2009 BROAD PRIZE FOR URBAN EDUCATION

Summary of District Data Report for Indianapolis 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. Five 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 Indianapolis Public Schools in Indianapolis, Indiana. 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 Indiana student achievement data: The Broad Prize typically includes data for the last four years (2005 – 2008) when analyzing average change over time. However, due to changes in testing policies for English language learners which were enacted in 2007, proficiency results for 2005 and 2006 were not comparable and are not included in change calculations.

KEY STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

- In 2008, 67% of internal reading gaps were among the smallest in the state of Indiana, and 83% of internal math gaps were among the smallest in the state.
- From 2007 to 2008, of 28 possible opportunities to improve faster than the rest of the state in reading and math, the district did so in 22 instances (79%).
- Of 30 possible opportunities to demonstrate higher proficiency rates than the rest of the state in reading and math, the district only did so in only 3 instances in 2008 (10%).
- Between 2005 and 2007, the district showed lower-than-expected improvement compared to other districts in Indiana that serve students with similar family income levels in reading and math at the elementary and high school levels.
- Using the average for all three graduation rates, the district graduated an estimated 40% of its students overall in 2006. 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 20 potential gap closures in reading (2007-2008) 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, 10 gaps are closing (50%). In addition, 67% of

- internal reading achievement gaps in 2008 are among the smallest (top two deciles) in the state of Indiana and 0% of internal reading gaps are among the largest in the state (bottom two deciles).
- Of the 20 potential gap closures in math (2007-2008) 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, 83% of internal math achievement gaps in 2008 are among the smallest (top two deciles) in the state of Indiana 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 15 possible opportunities to *demonstrate higher proficiency rates than the rest of the state* in reading, the district only does so in only 1 instance in 2008 (7%). The district's strongest performance relative to the state is in elementary school reading with African American students.
- From 2007 to 2008, of 14 possible opportunities to *improve faster than the rest of the state* in reading, the district does so in 10 instances (71%). The district's strongest improvement relative to the state is in elementary school reading (5 of the 10 instances). Other areas of strong improvement relative to the state are in middle school reading for all students overall and white and Hispanic students, and in high school reading for white and low-income students.
- Of 15 possible opportunities to *demonstrate higher proficiency rates than the rest of the state* in math, the district only does so in 2 instances in 2008 (13%). The district's strongest performance relative to the state is in elementary school math with African American and Hispanic students.
- From 2007 to 2008, of 14 possible opportunities to *improve faster than the rest of the state* in math, the district does so in 12 instances (86%). The two areas where the district is *not* improving faster than the state are in elementary and high school math for Hispanic students.

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 15 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 2007-2008, of 14 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 (29%).
- Of 15 possible opportunities to *demonstrate higher rates at the highest achievement level than the rest of the state* in math, the district does so in 3 instances in 2008 (20%).
- From 2007-2008, of 14 possible opportunities to *improve faster than the rest of the state at the highest achievement level* in math, the district does so in 8 instances (57%).

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 2007) 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 (elementary, middle and high school) is positive (33%).
- In math, 1 of 3 improvement residuals (elementary, middle and high school) is positive (33%).

Residuals for 2008 could not be calculated due to unreliable data on low-income populations.

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 1 percentage point 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 (1 percentage point per year), but graduation rates did not change for white students and declined for Hispanic students (-2 percentage points per year).
- Using the average for all three graduation rates, the district is graduating an estimated 40% of its students overall, 36% of its white students, 41% of its African American students, and 48% of its Hispanic students.

COLLEGE READINESS

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

- From 2005 to 2007, the participation rate on the SAT exam for all students overall decreased 4 percentage points per year on average, while the mean total score on the SAT decreased by 19 points per year on average.
- From 2005 to 2007, the percentage of the district's students who took an AP exam increased 1 percentage point per year on average, while the percent of tests taken with scores of 3 or above for all test-takers in the district decreased by 3 percentage points per year on average.

Indianapolis Public Schools did not authorize the release of 2007 and 2008 ACT data or 2008 SAT and AP data.

ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS

The Broad Prize reviews district AYP status each year.

- The district did not meet AYP in 2006, 2007 or 2008.
- The percent of schools in the district meeting AYP targets in 2008 was 26% vs. 50% of schools in the state.