

THE 2009 BROAD PRIZE FOR URBAN EDUCATION

Summary of District Data Report for Northside Independent 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 Northside Independent School District in San Antonio, Texas. 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, nearly all student groups at all school levels performed at higher absolute proficiency rates in reading and math than their peers in the rest of the state. In addition, from 2005-2008, of 18 possible opportunities to improve faster than the state at the highest achievement level in reading, the district did so in 12 instances (67%).
- In 2008, the district outperformed other districts in Texas that serve students with similar family income levels in reading and math at all school levels.
- Using the average for all three graduation rates, the district is graduating an estimated 72% of its African-American students and 66% of its Hispanic students. These are among the highest graduation rates for these subgroups of the eligible districts.
- In 2008, 25% of Hispanic juniors and seniors took the at least one AP exam. This is one of the highest participation rates for Hispanic students among the eligible districts.
- Between 2005 and 2008, the district did not narrow any of its internal district vs. internal state gaps. That is, the district did not make any better progress with its internal gaps than the state made with its internal gaps.
- From 2005-2008, of 36 possible opportunities to improve proficiency rates faster than the rest of the state in math, the district did so in only 1 instance (3%).
- Average graduation rates for all students overall, African-American, Hispanic, and white students decreased from 2003 to 2006.

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, 12 gaps are closing (44%). In addition, 0% of internal reading achievement gaps in 2008 are among the smallest (top two deciles) in the state of Texas while 0% 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, 9 gaps are closing (33%). In addition, 0% of internal math achievement gaps in 2008 are among the smallest (top two deciles) in the state of Texas 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 18 instances in 2008 (100%). All student groups are performing at higher absolute proficiency rates in reading than their peers in the rest of the state.
- From 2005-2008, of 18 possible opportunities to *improve faster than the state* in reading, the district only does so in 0 instances (0%). No students are improving 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 17 instances in 2008 (94%). Only non-low-income students at the middle school level did not demonstrate higher proficiency rates in math.
- From 2005-2008, of 18 possible opportunities to *improve faster than the state* in math, the district does so in only 1 instance (6%). Only white students at the middle school level are improving faster than the state in math.

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 18 possible opportunities to *demonstrate higher rates at the highest achievement level than the state* in reading, the district does so in 16 instances in 2008 (89%).
- From 2005-2008, of 18 possible opportunities to *improve faster than the state at the highest achievement level* in reading, the district does so in 12 instances (67%). The district is primarily improving faster at the middle and high school levels (11 of the 12 instances).
- Of 18 possible opportunities to *demonstrate higher rates at the highest achievement level than the state* in math, the district does so in 15 instances in 2008 (83%).
- From 2005-2008, of 18 possible opportunities to *improve faster than the state at the highest achievement level* in math, the district does so in 3 instances (17%). Only white students at the middle and high school levels and African-American students at the high school level are improving faster than the state.

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 2 of 3 improvement residuals are positive (67%).
- 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 Hispanic students (-2 percentage points per year), African-American students (-4 percentage points per year), and white students (-1 percentage point per year).
- Using the average for all three graduation rates, the district is graduating an estimated 72% of its students overall, 80% of white students, 72% of African-American students and 66% 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, 59% of the district's seniors took the SAT exam. The mean composite SAT score for all senior test-takers in 2008 in the district was 984 (1,047 for white students and 918 for African-American students, representing a 129 point gap, and 951 for Hispanic students, representing a 96 point gap). Between 2005 and 2008, average scores decreased for nearly all student groups while participation rates increased for nearly all student groups.
- In 2008, 24% 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 (23 for white students and 19 for African-American and Hispanic students, representing a 4 point gap). Between 2005 and 2008, average scores increased only for Asian students while participation rates only increased for all students overall and African-American students.
- In 2008, 29% of the district's juniors and seniors took an AP exam (28% for white students and 25% for African-American students and Hispanic students). The percent of tests taken with scores of 3 or above for all junior and senior test-takers in the district in 2008 was 36% (43% for white students and 22% for African-American students, representing a 21 point gap, and 28% for Hispanic test takers, representing a 15 point gap). Between 2005 and 2008, all student groups decreased their passing rates while all student groups increased participation rates.

ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS

The Broad Prize reviews district AYP status each year.

- The district met AYP in 2005, 2006, 2007, and 2008.
- The percent of schools in the district meeting AYP targets in 2008 was 93% vs. 85% of schools in the state.