

THE 2009 BROAD PRIZE FOR URBAN EDUCATION

Summary of District Data Report for Pasadena 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 Pasadena Independent School District in Pasadena, 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

- Between 2005 and 2008, participation rates on the SAT and Advanced Placement exams increased for Hispanic and African-American students.
- Between 2005 and 2008, the district did not narrow any of its achievement gaps in math. Overall, the district narrowed about one-third of its achievement gaps during this period.
- From 2005-2008, of 36 possible opportunities to improve faster than the state in reading and in math, the district does so in 0 instances (0%). No student groups improved faster than their peers in the state in reading or in math.
- Between 2005 and 2008, there were no instances in which the district showed better than expected improvement than other Texas school districts that serve students with similar family income levels.
- Between 2003 and 2006, the district's average graduation rate demonstrating an average annual decrease of -2 percentage points for all students overall. This is one of the largest average annual declines 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 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, 9 gaps are closing (33%). 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, 10 gaps are closing (37%). 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 5 instances in 2008 (28%).
- From 2005-2008, of 18 possible opportunities to *improve faster than the state in reading*, the district does so in 0 instances (0%). No student groups 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 6 instances in 2008 (33%). Low-income students at all school levels are performing at higher absolute proficiency rates in math than their peers in the rest of the state.
- From 2005-2008, of 18 possible opportunities to *improve faster than the state in math*, the district does so in 0 instances (0%). No student groups 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 1 instance in 2008 (6%).
- 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 0 instances (0%). No student groups are improving faster than the state in reading.
- Of 18 possible opportunities to *demonstrate higher rates at the highest achievement level than the state in math*, the district does so in 5 instances in 2008 (28%).
- 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 0 instances (0%). No student groups are improving faster than the state in math.

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, 2 of 3 performance residuals (elementary, middle and high school) are positive (67%) and 0 of 3 improvement residuals are positive (0%).
- In math, 2 of 3 performance residuals (elementary, middle and high school) are positive (67%) 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 (-3 percentage points per year) and African-American students (-6 percentage points per year) while there was no change for white students.
- Using the average for all three graduation rates, the district is graduating an estimated 61% of its students overall, 71% of white students, 50% of African-American students and 55% 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, 34% 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 928 (996 for white students and 829 for African-American students, representing a 167 point gap, and 903 for Hispanic students, representing a 93 point gap). Between 2005 and 2008, average scores decreased for all student groups while participation rates increased for all students overall, and African-American and Hispanic students separately.
- In 2008, 14% of the district's juniors and seniors took an AP exam (13% of white students, 8% of African-American students and 13% of 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 31% (38% for white students and 27% for African-American students, representing a 11 point gap, and 26% for Hispanic test takers, representing a 12 point gap). Between 2005 and 2008, passing rates decreased for all student groups; however, all student groups increased participation rates during this period.

ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS

The Broad Prize reviews district AYP status each year.

- The district met AYP in 2005, 2006, and 2007, but did not meet AYP in 2008.
- The percent of schools in the district meeting AYP targets in 2008 was 90% vs. 85% of schools in the state.