

THE 2009 BROAD PRIZE FOR URBAN EDUCATION

Summary of District Data Report for Milwaukee 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 Milwaukee Public Schools in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. 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 Wisconsin 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 grades tested at the elementary and middle school levels, 2005 proficiency results for these school levels were not comparable and are not included in change calculations.

KEY STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

- Average graduation rates, for all students overall and for white, African American, and Hispanic students separately, increased between 2003 and 2006.
- Between 2005 and 2008, participation rates on ACT and Advanced Placement exams increased for nearly all student groups.
- Between 2006 and 2008, the district did not narrow any of its achievement gaps in reading, and only narrowed 20% of its gaps in math.
- In 2008, no student group in the district performed at higher absolute proficiency rates in reading or in math than their peers in the rest of the state.
- In 2008, the district showed lower-than-expected performance compared to other districts in Wisconsin that serve students with similar family income levels in reading and math at all school levels. Between 2005 and 2008, the district also showed lower-than-expected improvement compared to other similar districts in Wisconsin in reading and math at all school levels.

ACHIEVEMENT GAPS

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

- Of 25 potential gap closures in reading (2005-2008) 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, no gaps are closing (0%). In addition, 0% of internal reading achievement gaps in 2008 are among the smallest (top two deciles) in the state of Wisconsin while 22% of internal reading gaps are among the largest in the state (bottom two deciles).
- Of the 25 potential gap closures in math (2005-2008) 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, 5 gaps are closing (20%). In addition, 0% of internal math achievement gaps in 2008 are among the smallest (top two deciles) in the state of Wisconsin while 44% 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 16 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%). No subgroup in the district is performing at higher absolute proficiency rates in reading than their peers in the rest of the state.
- From 2005-2008, of 16 possible opportunities to *improve faster than the rest of the state* in reading, the district only does so in 1 instance (6%). The district is only improving faster relative to the state in elementary school reading with Hispanic students.
- Of 16 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%). No subgroup in the district is performing at higher absolute proficiency rates in math than their peers in the rest of the state.
- From 2005-2008, of 16 possible opportunities to *improve faster than the rest of the state* in math, the district does so in 9 instances (56%). The district's strongest improvement relative to the state is in elementary school math (5 of the 9 instances). Other areas of strong improvement relative to the state are in middle school math for all students overall and Hispanic students, and in high school math for white and low-income 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 16 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%).
- Of 16 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 2005-2008, 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 2 instances (13%). The district demonstrates faster improvement in math relative to the state at the elementary school level with white and Hispanic students.

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 2 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 white students (2 percentage points per year), African American students (3 percentage points per year), and for Hispanic students (1 percentage point per year).
- Using the average for all three graduation rates, the district is graduating an estimated 53% of its students overall, 66% of its white students, 50% of its African American students, and 49% 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, 45% of the district's students took the ACT exam. The mean composite ACT score for all test-takers in 2008 in the district was 18 (21 for white students and 16 for African-American students, representing a 5 point gap, and 18 for Hispanic students, representing a 3 point gap). Over the last four years, there has been no increase in the average score for the district; however, participation rates have increased 3 percentage points per year on average.
- In 2008, 7% of the district's students took an AP exam (10% of white students and 4% of African-American students, representing a 6 point gap, and 9% of Hispanic students, representing a 1% gap). The percent of tests taken with scores of 3 or above for all test-takers in the district in 2008 was 27% (42% of white test-takers and 11% for African-American test takers, representing a 31 point gap, and 39% for Hispanic test takers, representing a 2 point gap). Over the last four years, the participation rate for all students overall has increased by about 1 percentage point per year on average, while the percent of tests scoring 3 or higher has stayed steady.

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 60% vs. 93% of schools in the state.