

THE 2009 BROAD PRIZE FOR URBAN EDUCATION

Summary of District Data Report for Stockton 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 Stockton Unified School District in Stockton, 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, half of the district's internal achievement gaps in reading and math were among the smallest in the state of California.
- Between 2005 and 2008, participation rates on the SAT exam increased for nearly all student groups.
- From 2003 to 2006, graduation rates increased for all students overall, African-American, Hispanic, and white students. Specifically, the average annual increases for all students overall, and for African-American, Hispanic, and white students separately, were among the highest of the eligible districts.
- In 2008, no student groups improved proficiency rates faster than their peers in the rest of the state in reading or in math.
- In 2008, the district showed lower-than-expected performance compared to other districts in California that serve students with similar family income levels in reading and math at all school levels.
- In 2008, only 5% of the district's juniors and seniors took at least one Advanced Placement exam. This is one of the lowest percentages 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, 5 gaps are closing (19%). However, 56% of internal reading achievement gaps in 2008 are among the smallest in the state of California (top two deciles) 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, 8 gaps are closing (30%). However, 44% of internal math achievement gaps in 2008 are among the smallest in the state of California (top two deciles) while 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 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 0 instances in 2008 (0%). No student groups are demonstrating higher proficiency rates than the state in reading.
- From 2005-2008, of 21 possible opportunities to *improve faster than the state in reading*, the district does so in 8 instances (38%). The majority of instances occur at the middle school level (5 of the 8 instances).
- Of 21 possible opportunities to *demonstrate higher proficiency rates than the state in math*, the district does so in 0 instances in 2008 (0%). No students 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 4 instances (19%).

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 0 instances in 2008 (0%).
- 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 0 instances (0%).
- Of 14 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 (14%).
- 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 only 1 instance (7%). Only non-low income students at the middle school level 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, 0 of 3 performance residuals (elementary, middle and high school) are positive (0%) and 1 of 3 improvement residuals is positive (33%).
- In math, 0 of 3 performance residuals (elementary, middle and high school) are positive (0%) 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 9 percentage points per year for the period 2003-2006 (the most recent publicly available data) for all students. A similar positive trend can be seen for African-American students (11 percentage points per year), Hispanic students (10 percentage points per year), and white students (8 percentage points per year).
- Using the average for all three graduation rates, in 2006 the district graduated an estimated 69% of its students overall, 70% of its African-American students, 62% of its Hispanic students, and 61% 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, 22% 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 858 (976 for white students and 829 for African-American students, representing a 147 point gap, and 823 for Hispanic students, representing a 153 point gap). Between 2005 and 2008, nearly all subgroups increased their participation rates while only African-American and white students simultaneously increased their average scores.
- In 2008, 5% of the district's juniors and seniors took an AP exam (2% of white students and 2% of African-American students, representing no gap, and 4% of Hispanic students, representing a -2 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 23% (20% for white students and 6% for African-American, representing a 14 point gap, and 39% for Hispanic students, representing a -19 point gap). From 2005 to 2008, there was no change in participation rates for most subgroups while passing scores decreased for most subgroups.

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 14% vs. 52% of schools in the state.