

## THE 2009 BROAD PRIZE FOR URBAN EDUCATION

### Summary of District Data Report for San Francisco Unified 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 San Francisco Unified School District in San Francisco, California. 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 California student achievement data:** Separate categories for the proficient and advanced categories are not reported for the California High School Exit Exam. Therefore, some analyses could not be completed.

#### KEY STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

- In 2008, the district outperformed other districts in California that serve students with similar family income levels in math at all school levels and in reading at the elementary and middle school levels.
- Participation rates on the SAT and Advanced Placement exams increased for nearly all student groups from 2005 to 2008.
- From 2005 to 2008, the district only closed 11% of its achievement gaps in reading and math (6 of the 54 instances). In addition, 67% of its internal achievement gaps in reading and math are among the largest in the state of California.
- From 2005-2008, of 42 possible opportunities to improve faster than the rest of the state in math, the district did so in only 2 instances. Only white students at the high school level improved faster than their peers in the rest of the state in reading and math.
- Between 2005 and 2008, the district showed lower-than-expected improvement compared to other similar districts in California in reading and math at all school levels.
- Average graduation rates between 2003 and 2006 decreased an average of 6 percentage points per year for African-American and Hispanic students. In 2006 the district graduated an estimated 73% of its students overall, but only 49% of its African-American students, and 55% of its Hispanic students.

## 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, only 3 gaps are closing (11%). In addition, 0% of internal reading achievement gaps in 2008 are among the smallest in the state of California (top two deciles) while 67% 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, only 3 gaps are closing (11%). In addition, 11% of internal math achievement gaps in 2008 are among the smallest in the state of California (top two deciles) while 67% 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 rates than the rest of the state and whether or not the district is improving proficiency rates faster than the rest of the state. Separate categories for the proficient and advanced categories are not reported for the California High School Exit Exam.

- Of 21 possible opportunities to *demonstrate higher proficiency rates than the state in reading*, the district does so in 8 instances in 2008 (38%). White and low-income students at all school levels are demonstrating higher proficiency rates than their peers in the rest of the state in reading.
- From 2005-2008, of 21 possible opportunities to *improve faster than the state in reading*, the district does so in only 1 instance (5%). Only white students at the high school level are improving faster than their peers in the rest of the state.
- Of 21 possible opportunities to *demonstrate higher proficiency rates than the state in math*, the district does so in 11 instances in 2008 (52%). All students overall, and white and low-income students at all school levels are demonstrating higher proficiency rates than the state in math.
- From 2005-2008, of 21 possible opportunities to *improve faster than the rest of the state in math*, the district does so in only 1 instance (5%). Only white students at the high school level are improving faster than the state.

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 state in reading*, the district does so in 7 instances in 2008 (50%). All students overall, and white and low-income students at the elementary and middle school levels are demonstrating higher rates than the state in reading.
- From 2005-2008, of 14 possible opportunities to *improve faster than the state at the highest achievement level in reading*, the district does so in only 2 instances (14%).
- Of 14 possible opportunities to *demonstrate higher rates at the highest achievement level than the state in math*, the district does so in 8 instances in 2008 (57%). All students

overall, and white and low-income students at the elementary and middle school levels are demonstrating higher rates than the state in math.

- From 2005-2008, of 14 possible opportunities to *improve faster than the state at the highest achievement level* in math, the district does so in 5 instances (36%). All five instances occur at the middle 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 0 of 3 improvement residuals are positive (0%).
- 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 African-American students (-6 percentage points per year) and Hispanic students (-6 percentage points per year) while there was no change for white students.
- Using the average for all three graduation rates, in 2006 the district graduated an estimated 73% of its students overall, 49% of its African-American students, 55% of its Hispanic students, and 87% of its white students.

### **COLLEGE READINESS**

The Broad Prize analyzes SAT, ACT and Advanced Placement (AP) scores and participation rates as proxies for college readiness.

- In 2008, 74% of the district's seniors took the SAT exam. The mean total SAT score for all senior test-takers in 2008 in the district was 1,019 (1,137 for white students and 804 for African-American students, representing a 333 point gap, and 881 for Hispanic students, representing a 256 point gap). Between 2005 and 2008, Asian students and all students overall simultaneously increased average scores and participation rates. For the remaining subgroups, increases in participation rates were paired with decreases in average scores.
- In 2008, 23% of the district's seniors took the ACT exam. The mean total ACT score for all senior test-takers in 2008 in the district was 22 (25 for white students and 16 for African-American students, representing a 9 point gap, and 19 for Hispanic students, representing a 6 point gap). Between 2005 and 2008, mean total scores and participation rates largely demonstrated little or no average annual change.
- In 2008, 33% of the district's juniors and seniors took an AP exam (37% of white students and 7% of African-American students, representing a 30 point gap, and 19% of Hispanic students, representing an 18 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 69% (80% for white students and 36% for African-American, representing a 44 point gap, and 53% for Hispanic students, representing a 27 point gap). From 2005 to 2008, the participation rate increased

for all student groups except African-American students while passing scores increased for all student groups except for Hispanic students.

### **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 50% vs. 52% of schools in the state.