

THE 2009 BROAD PRIZE FOR URBAN EDUCATION

Summary of District Data Report for Long Beach 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 Long Beach Unified School District in Long Beach, 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, African-American, Hispanic, and low-income students demonstrated higher proficiency rates than their peers in the rest of the state at all school levels in reading and math.
- Of 14 possible opportunities to demonstrate higher rates at the highest achievement level than the state in math, the district does so in 10 instances in 2008.
- 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.
- Between 2005 and 2008, participation rates on the SAT, ACT, and Advanced Placement exams increased for nearly all subgroups. During this same period, mean total SAT scores simultaneously increased for Hispanic senior test-takers.
- Between 2005 and 2008, the district narrowed most of its math achievement gaps at the elementary and high school levels.
- Between 2005 and 2008, the district is narrowing few of its achievement gaps in reading at the elementary and middle school levels and in math at the middle school level.

ACHIEVEMENT GAPS

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

- Of 27 potential gap closures in reading (2005–2008) 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, 8 gaps are closing (30%). In addition, 0% of internal reading achievement gaps in 2008 are among the smallest in the state of California (top two deciles) and 44% of internal reading gaps are among the largest in the state (bottom two deciles).
- Of the 27 potential gap closures in math (2005-2008) 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, 15 gaps are closing (56%). In addition, 0% of internal math achievement gaps in 2008 are among the smallest in the state of California (top two deciles) and 22% 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 rates than the rest of the state and whether or not the district is improving proficiency rates faster than the rest of the state. *Separate categories for the proficient and advanced categories are not reported for the California High School Exit Exam.*

- Of 21 possible opportunities to *demonstrate higher proficiency rates than the state* in reading, the district does so in 13 instances in 2008 (62%). African-American, Hispanic, white, and low-income students at all school levels in the district are demonstrating higher proficiency rates than their peers in the state in reading.
- From 2005-2008, of 21 possible opportunities to *improve faster than the state* in reading, the district does so in 7 instances (33%). The district is primarily demonstrating faster improvement compared to the state at the high school level (5 of 7 instances).
- Of 21 possible opportunities to *demonstrate higher proficiency rates than the state* in math, the district does so in 15 instances in 2008 (71%). African-American, Hispanic, white, and low income students at all school levels are demonstrating higher proficiency rates than their peers in the state in math. Non-low-income students are demonstrating higher rates in math than their peers at the elementary and middle school levels.
- From 2005-2008, of 21 possible opportunities to *improve faster than the rest of the state* in math, the district does so in 14 instances (67%). All subgroups at the elementary level are improving faster than the state.

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 state* in reading, the district does so in 6 instances in 2008 (43%).
- From 2005-2008, of 14 possible opportunities to *improve faster at the highest achievement level than the state* in reading, the district does so in only 1 instance (7%). Only white students at the middle school level are improving faster at the highest achievement level than their peers in the state in reading.
- Of 14 possible opportunities to *demonstrate higher rates at the highest achievement level than the state* in math, the district does so in 10 instances in 2008 (71%).
- From 2005-2008, of 14 possible opportunities to *improve faster than the state at the highest achievement level* in math, the district does so in 7 instances (50%). All but one instance occurred at the elementary school level.

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 is positive (33%).
- In math, 3 of 3 performance residuals (elementary, middle and high school) are positive (100%) and 2 of 3 improvement residuals are positive (67%).

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. During the same period, average graduation rates for Hispanic, African-American, and white students remained flat.
- Using the average for all three graduation rates, in 2006 the district graduated an estimated 64% of its students overall, 61% of its African-American students, 54% of its Hispanic students, and 78% of its white students.

COLLEGE READINESS

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

- In 2008, 35% of the district's seniors took the SAT exam. The mean total SAT score for all senior test-takers in 2008 in the district was 969 (1,077 for white students and 865 for African-American students, representing a 212 point gap, and 933 for Hispanic students, representing a 144 point gap). Between 2006 and 2008, participation rates demonstrated an average annual increase for all student groups. During this same period, mean total scores simultaneously increased for Hispanic senior test-takers only.
- In 2008, 11% 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 21 (24 for white students and 18 for African-American students, representing a 6 point gap, and 20 for Hispanic students, representing a 4 point gap). Between 2005 and 2008, participation rates increased for all subgroups except for Hispanic students, who experienced no change. Average ACT scores remained stable over this period.
- In 2008, 19% of the district's juniors and seniors took an AP exam (26% of white students and 9% of African-American students, representing a 17 point gap, and 15% of Hispanic students, representing an 11 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 51% (61% for white students and 35% for African-American students, representing a 26 point gap, and 47% for Hispanic students, representing a 14 point gap). From 2005 to 2008, the participation rate for all student groups exhibited an average annual increase. Both African-American and white students showed a simultaneous increase in both passing rates and participation rates over this 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 2008 was 49% vs. 52% of schools in the state.