

THE 2009 BROAD PRIZE FOR URBAN EDUCATION

Summary of District Data Report for District of Columbia Public Schools

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 District of Columbia Public Schools in Washington, D. C. 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 District of Columbia student achievement data: State-level test data is not applicable as the District of Columbia Public Schools is the only local education authority in D.C.

KEY STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

- Between 2006 and 2008, the district closed internal achievement gaps in reading and math between white students and African American students and white students and Hispanic students at the elementary school level.
- Average graduation rates for all students overall and for white, African American, and Hispanic students separately have all increased from 2003 to 2006.
- The gap in Advanced Placement exam scores between white students and African American students and white students and Hispanics is extremely large. Sixty-four percent of AP exams taken by white students score a 3 or above, compared to 7% of exams taken by African-American students and 13% of exams taken by Hispanic students.
- Between 2005 and 2008, the percent of AP exams taken with scores of 3 or above decreased for nearly all student subgroups.

ACHIEVEMENT GAPS

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

- Of 5 potential gap closures in reading (2006-2008) between African-American and white students, Hispanic and white students, and low-income and non-low-income students at the elementary and middle school levels, 2 gaps are closing (40%).
- Of the 5 potential gap closures in math (2006-2008) 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, 2 gaps are closing (40%).

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. *State-level test data is not applicable; therefore, outperformance could not be measured.*

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. *Residuals could not be calculated because District of Columbia Public Schools is the sole local education authority in D.C.*

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 about 3 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 (4 percentage points per year) and Hispanic students (3 percentage points per year).

Diploma counts for 2006 were not available for this district; therefore, graduation rates could not be calculated.

COLLEGE READINESS

The Broad Prize analyzes SAT, ACT and Advanced Placement (AP) scores and participation rates as proxies for college readiness. The data for the SAT are not disaggregated by subgroup because more than 10% of test takers did not indicate their race/ethnicity, making the data unreliable.

- In 2008, 67% 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 802. From 2005 to 2008, mean total scores for all senior test-takers decreased while participation rates increased.
- In 2008, 21% 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 16 (26 for white students and 15 for African-American students, representing an 11 point gap, and 16 for Hispanic students, representing a 10 point gap). From 2005 to 2008, there was no change in the average ACT score for the district in any student subgroup. Participation rates decreased for students overall and for African American students, but increased for Hispanic students.
- In 2008, 27% of the district's juniors and seniors took an AP exam (19% of African-American students and 55% of Hispanic students). The percent of tests taken with scores of 3 or above for all junior and senior test-takers in the district in 2008 was 22% (64% for white students and 7% for African-American students, representing a 57 point gap, and 13% for Hispanic students, representing a 51 point gap). From 2005 to 2008, the participation rate increased for all available subgroups while the percent of tests taken with scores of 3 or above primarily decreased.

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 33% vs. 32% of schools in the state.