

THE 2009 BROAD PRIZE FOR URBAN EDUCATION

Summary of District Data Report for School District of Philadelphia

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 School District of Philadelphia in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. 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 Pennsylvania student achievement data: The Broad Prize typically includes data for the last four years (2005 – 2008) when analyzing average change over time. However, in 2006, additional grades were tested at the elementary and middle school levels; as a result, 2005 data were not comparable to later years and were not used in change calculations. Test data for the non-low income subgroup were not available.

KEY STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

- Average graduation rates increased for all subgroups from 2003 to 2006.
- Between 2005 and 2008, participation rates on ACT and Advanced Placement exams increased for all student groups.
- From 2006-2008, of 14 possible opportunities to improve faster than the rest of the state in reading, the district does so in 13 instances.
- 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.
- The district is only beating expectations in performance and improvement given the district's poverty level, at the high school level in reading and math.

ACHIEVEMENT GAPS

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

- Of 17 potential gap closures in reading (2006-2008) between Hispanic and white students, and African-American and white students at the elementary, middle and high school levels, 9 gaps are closing (53%). In addition, 0% of internal reading achievement gaps in 2008 are among the smallest (top two deciles) in the state of Pennsylvania and 0% of internal reading gaps are among the largest in the state (bottom two deciles).

- Of the 17 potential gap closures in math (2006-2008) between Hispanic and white students and African-American and white students at the elementary, middle and high school levels, 11 gaps are closing (65%). In addition, 0% of internal math achievement gaps in 2008 are among the smallest (top two deciles) in the state of Pennsylvania while 33% 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 14 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 2006-2008, of 14 possible opportunities to *improve faster than the rest of the state* in reading, the district does so in 13 instances (93%). The only instance in which the district is not improving faster relative to the state is in middle school reading with Hispanic students.
- Of 14 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 2006-2008, of 14 possible opportunities to *improve faster than the rest of the state* in math, the district does so in 7 instances (50%).

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 rest of the state* in reading, the district does so in 0 instances in 2008 (0%).
- From 2006-2008, 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 8 instances (57%). The district demonstrates faster improvement in reading relative to the state primarily at the high school level (4 of the 8 instances).
- Of 14 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 2006-2008, 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 5 instances (36%).

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

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 white students (5 percentage points per year), African American students (1 percentage point per year), and for Hispanic students (4 percentage points per year).
- Using the average for all three graduation rates, the district is graduating an estimated 59% of its students overall, 79% of its white students, 57% of its African-American students, and 60% 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, 66% 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 802. Between 2005 and 2008, participation rates as well as average scores for the district overall have simultaneously exhibited average annual increases.
- In 2008, 9% 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 18 (22 for white students and 16 for African-American students, representing a 6 point gap, and 17 for Hispanic students, representing a 5 point gap). Between 2005 and 2008, only Asian test-takers showed an average annual increase; however, participation rates have increased every year on average for all subgroups.
- In 2008, 11% of the district's juniors and seniors took an AP exam (18% of white students and 7% of African-American students, representing an 11 point gap, and 8% of Hispanic students, representing a 10 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 24% (43% for white test-takers and 9% for African-American test takers, representing a 34 point gap, and 16% for Hispanic test takers, representing a 27 point gap). Between 2005 and 2008, the participation rates for all student groups have increased every year on average while passing rates for all student groups have decreased every year on average.

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 43% vs. 91% of schools in the state.