

THE 2009 BROAD PRIZE FOR URBAN EDUCATION

Summary of District Data Report for Santa Ana 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 Santa Ana Unified School District in Santa Ana, California. 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 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 reading and math at all school levels.
- Both participation rates and average scores on the SAT exam increased for all available student groups from 2005 to 2008.
- Almost no student groups are improving proficiency rates faster than the state in reading and math.
- From 2005 to 2008, almost none of the district's gaps at the middle and high school levels in reading and math narrowed.
- Of 13 possible opportunities to demonstrate higher proficiency rates than the state in reading, the district did so in only 1 instance in 2008.
- Using the average for all three graduation rates, the district is demonstrating an average annual decrease of -3 percentage points per year for the period 2003-2006 (the most recent publicly available data) for all students overall. This rate of decrease is one of the highest among the eligible districts.
- In 2008, the percent of tests taken with scores of 3 or above was 67% for white junior and senior test-takers in the district and 27% for Hispanic junior and senior test-takers, representing a 40 point gap.

ACHIEVEMENT GAPS

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

- Of 14 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, 6 gaps are closing (43%). In addition, 0% of internal reading achievement gaps in 2008 are among the smallest in the state of California (top two deciles) while 25% of internal reading gaps are among the largest in the state (bottom two deciles).
- Of the 14 potential gap closures in math (2005-2008) between Hispanic and white students, and low-income and non-low-income students at the elementary, middle and high school levels, 5 gaps are closing (36%). In addition, 0% of internal math achievement gaps in 2008 are among the smallest in the state of California (top two deciles) while 25% 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 13 possible opportunities to *demonstrate higher proficiency rates than the state* in reading, the district does so in only 1 instance in 2008 (8%). Only white students at the high school level are demonstrating higher proficiency rates than the state in reading.
- From 2005-2008, of 13 possible opportunities to *improve faster than the state* in reading, the district does so in 6 instances (46%).
- Of 13 possible opportunities to *demonstrate higher proficiency rates than the state* in math, the district does so in 5 instances in 2008 (38%).
- From 2005-2008, of 13 possible opportunities to *improve faster than the rest of the state* in math, the district does so in 9 instances (69%). All student groups with available data at the elementary and middle school levels are improving faster than the state in math (8 of the 9 instances).

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 8 possible opportunities to *demonstrate higher rates at the highest achievement level than the state* in reading, the district does so in 0 instances in 2008 (0%).
- From 2005-2008, of 8 possible opportunities to *improve faster than the state at the highest achievement level* in reading, the district does so in only 1 instance (13%). Only non-low income students at the elementary school level are improving faster than the state.
- Of 8 possible opportunities to *demonstrate higher rates at the highest achievement level than the state* in math, the district does so in 2 instances in 2008 (25%).
- From 2005-2008, of 8 possible opportunities to *improve faster than the state at the highest achievement level* in math, the district does so in 7 instances (88%). Only non-low income students at the middle school level are not 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, 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 2 of 3 improvement residuals are positive (67%).

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 -3 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 (-4 percentage points per year).
- Using the average for all three graduation rates, in 2006 the district graduated an estimated 50% of its students overall and 48% 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, 33% 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 894 (1,077 for white students and 853 for Hispanic students, representing a 224 point gap). Between 2005 and 2008, all available subgroups increased both their participation rates and their mean scores.
- In 2008, 14% 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 20 (24 for white students and 19 for Hispanic students, representing a 5 point gap). Between 2005 and 2008, only Asian students increased their mean total scores and only white students increased their participation rates.
- In 2008, 22% of the district's juniors and seniors took an AP exam (21% of white students and 20% of Hispanic students, representing a 1 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 31% (67% for white students and 27% for Hispanic students, representing a 40 point gap). From 2005 to 2008, the participation rate increased for all available student groups while passing scores simultaneously increased for Asian and white students only.

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 39% vs. 52% of schools in the state.