

## THE 2009 BROAD PRIZE FOR URBAN EDUCATION

### Summary of District Data Report for Salt Lake City 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 Salt Lake City School District in Salt Lake City, Utah. Additional details on the data described below may be found in the 2009 district data report available at [www.broadprize.org](http://www.broadprize.org).

**A special note regarding Utah student achievement data:** The Broad Prize typically includes data for the last four years (2005 – 2008) when analyzing average change over time. However, 2006 non-low income data were unreliable and were not included in the change calculation.

#### KEY STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

- Between 2005 and 2008, the district narrowed 67% of its achievement gaps in reading. In particular, it narrowed all of its achievement gaps in reading between Hispanic and white students.
- In 2008, the district outperformed other districts in Utah that serve students with similar family income levels in reading at the elementary and middle school levels. Between 2005 and 2008, the district also showed better than expected improvement compared to other similar districts in Utah in reading at all school levels.
- Between 2005 and 2008, the district narrowed only 2 of its 20 achievement gaps in math. In 2008, 93% of the district's internal achievement gaps were among the largest in the state of Utah.
- In 2008, Hispanic and low-income students in the district did not demonstrate higher proficiency rates than their peers in the state in reading or in math at any school level.
- In 2008, the district showed lower than expected performance compared to other districts in Utah that serve students with similar family income levels in math at all school levels. Between 2005 and 2008, the district also showed lower-than-expected improvement compared to other similar districts in Utah in math at all school levels.
- Between 2003 and 2006, the average graduation rate for all students overall and for white and Hispanic students declined every year on average. The average graduation rate declined 5 percentage points per year on average; this is one of the largest declines among the eligible districts.

- In 2008, 29% of white juniors and seniors took at least one Advanced Placement exam, compared to only 7% for Hispanic juniors and seniors.

### ACHIEVEMENT GAPS

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

- Of 18 potential gap closures in reading (2005-2008) between Hispanic and white students, and low-income and non-low-income students at the elementary, middle and high school levels, 12 gaps are closing (67%). However, 0% of internal reading achievement gaps in 2008 are among the smallest (top two deciles) in the state of Utah while 100% of internal reading gaps are among the largest in the state (bottom two deciles).
- Of the 20 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, 2 gaps are closing (10%). In addition, 0% of internal math achievement gaps in 2008 are among the smallest (top two deciles) in the state of Utah while 88% 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 15 possible opportunities to *demonstrate higher proficiency rates than the state* in reading, the district does so in 4 instances in 2008 (27%).
- From 2005-2008, of 15 possible opportunities to *improve faster than the state* in reading, the district does so in 7 instances (47%). All students overall, Hispanic students, and low income students are improving faster relative to the state in elementary and middle school reading.
- Of 15 possible opportunities to *demonstrate higher proficiency rates than the state* in math, the district does so in 3 instances in 2008 (20%).
- From 2005-2008, of 15 possible opportunities to *improve faster than the state* in math, the district does so in only 2 instances (13%). Both instances occur at the high school level.

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 15 possible opportunities to *demonstrate higher rates at the highest achievement level than the state* in reading, the district does so in 5 instances in 2008 (33%). Only white and non-low-income students are demonstrating higher rates in reading than their peers in the rest of the state.
- From 2005-2008, of 15 possible opportunities to *improve faster than the state at the highest achievement level* in reading, the district does so in 7 instances (47%).
- Of 15 possible opportunities to *demonstrate higher rates at the highest achievement level than the state* in math, the district does so in only 2 instances in 2008 (13%).
- From 2005-2008, of 15 possible opportunities to *improve faster than the state at the highest achievement level* in math, the district does so in 2 instances (13%). Both instances occur at the high 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, 2 of 3 performance residuals (elementary, middle and high school) are positive (67%) and 3 of 3 improvement residuals are positive (100%).
- 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 decrease of -5 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 white students (-3 percentage points per year) and Hispanic students (-6 percentage points per year).
- Using the average for all three graduation rates, the district is graduating an estimated 59% of its students overall, 72% of its white students and 36% 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, 48% 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 22 (23 for white students and 17 for Hispanic students, representing a 6 point gap). Between 2005 and 2008, there was no increase in the average score for the district; participation rates increased for all subgroups except for Hispanic students.
- In 2008, 21% of the district's juniors and seniors took an AP exam (29% of white students and 7% of Hispanic students, representing a 22 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 64% (68% for white test-takers and 59% for Hispanic test takers, representing a 9 point gap). Between 2005 and 2008, passing rates increased for both white and Hispanic students; however, during this period participation rates increased for white students but decreased for Hispanic students.

## **ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS**

The Broad Prize reviews district AYP status each year.

- The district did not meet AYP in 2005, 2006, or 2007. AYP data were unavailable in 2008.