The 2009 Broad Prize for Urban Education

St. Louis Public Schools

Missouri

PAGE	DATA
2	Background Information
3	Trends in Overall Reading and Mathematics Proficiency
4	Race/Ethnicity Trends in Reading Proficiency
5	Race/Ethnicity Trends in Mathematics Proficiency
6	Income Status Trends in Reading Proficiency
7	Income Status Trends in Mathematics Proficiency
8	Reading Proficiency Data Summary
9	Reading Proficiency Gaps
10	Mathematics Proficiency Data Summary
11	Mathematics Proficiency Gaps
12	Reading Outperformance by Proficiency Category: District vs. State
13	Mathematics Outperformance by Proficiency Category: District vs. State
14	Standardized Residuals for Reading
15	Standardized Residuals for Mathematics
16	High School Graduation Rates
17	College Readiness Data
18	Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)
19	Methodology and Technical Notes

© 2009 THE ELI AND EDYTHE BROAD FOUNDATION
PREPARED BY MPR ASSOCIATES, INC.

St. Louis Public Schools

MISSOURI

Background Information

Description of district: 2004–2007

	2004	2005	2006	2007
District characteristics				
Locale[1]	—	—	11	11
Number of schools	108	105	103	104
Student characteristics				
Enrollment	40,827	39,720	40,841	38,277
District size rank[2]	120	131	129	148
Percent low-income students[3]	81	81	74	74
Percent non-White students	83	81	85	87
Percent of students by race/ethnicity				
African American	80	77	80	82
Asian	1	2	2	2
Hispanic	1	2	2	2
White	15	14	14	13
American Indian/Alaska Native	0	0	0	0
Not reported[4]	1	5	2	0
Percent English language learners	7	7	7	7
Percent students with disabilities	17	20	17	17
District expenditures				
Total current expenditures per pupil	$10,492	$10,714	$10,770	$10,272
Instructional expenditures per pupil	$5,404	$5,714	$5,717	$5,215
State expenditures				
Total current expenditures per pupil	$7,542	$7,858	$8,273	$8,848
Instructional expenditures per pupil	$4,577	$4,774	$5,021	$5,349

SOURCE: Analysis of data from the U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data (CCD).
— Not available. † Data were suppressed due to unreliability. See methodology section.
[1] In 2006, the CCD began reporting a new 2-digit locale code based on urban clusters. As defined by the CCD, locale code 11 represents a large city, code 12 represents a midsize city, and code 21 represents a suburb of a large urban area.
[2] District size rank is based on enrollment in local school districts in the 50 states and DC, and does not include other district types or territories.
[3] Low-income students are eligible for Free or Reduced-Price School Lunch (FRSL).
[4] Not reported may include students with missing race/ethnicity information and/or students with race/ethnicities not recognized by the CCD.
NOTES: CCD data for 2008 were not available at time of report production. 2007 expenditures data were obtained from the U.S. Census Bureau and determined to be comparable to previous years' CCD figures. Some student demographic data were provided by the state or district education agency.

State test information: 2005–2008

		Grades included in analysis			
Subject/level	Most recent test included in analysis	2005	2006	2007	2008
Reading					
Elementary	Missouri Assessment Program (MAP)	*3*	3, 4, 5	3, 4, 5	3, 4, 5
Middle	Missouri Assessment Program (MAP)	*7*	6, 7, 8	6, 7, 8	6, 7, 8
High	Missouri Assessment Program (MAP)	*11*	11	11	11
Mathematics					
Elementary	Missouri Assessment Program (MAP)	*4*	3, 4, 5	3, 4, 5	3, 4, 5
Middle	Missouri Assessment Program (MAP)	*8*	6, 7, 8	6, 7, 8	6, 7, 8
High	Missouri Assessment Program (MAP)	*10*	10	10	10

SOURCE: State education agency.
— Not available.
NOTES: **Italics** indicate tests were not comparable to other years. **Test standards changed in 2006** at all levels; as a result, 2005 proficiency results were not comparable to subsequent years.

 © 2009 THE ELI AND EDYTHE BROAD FOUNDATION

St. Louis Public Schools
MISSOURI

Trends in Overall Reading and Mathematics Proficiency

Percentage of all students in the district and the state[1] scoring at or above proficient in reading and mathematics in elementary, middle, and high school: 2005–2008



SOURCE: Analysis of state test data.
[1] Unless otherwise indicated in the NOTES section below, state values exclude the district's results; see methodology section.
NOTES: **See tables** on pages 8 and 10 for details. **Gaps in lines** represent missing or noncomparable data.

© 2009 THE ELI AND EDYTHE BROAD FOUNDATION

St. Louis Public Schools

MISSOURI

Race/Ethnicity Trends in Reading Proficiency

Percentage of students scoring at or above proficient in reading, by race/ethnicity, for the district and the state[1]: 2005–2008



SOURCE: Analysis of state test data.

[1] Unless otherwise indicated in the NOTES section below, state values exclude the district's results; see methodology section.

NOTES: **See table** on page 8 for details. **Gaps in lines** represent missing or noncomparable data.

 © 2009 THE ELI AND EDYTHE BROAD FOUNDATION

St. Louis Public Schools
MISSOURI

Race/Ethnicity Trends in Mathematics Proficiency

Percentage of students scoring at or above proficient in mathematics, by race/ethnicity, for the district and the state[1]: 2005–2008



SOURCE: Analysis of state test data.
[1] Unless otherwise indicated in the NOTES section below, state values exclude the district's results; see methodology section.
NOTES: **See table** on page 10 for details. **Gaps in lines** represent missing or noncomparable data.

© 2009 THE ELI AND EDYTHE BROAD FOUNDATION

St. Louis Public Schools

MISSOURI

Income Status Trends in Reading Proficiency

Percentage of students scoring at or above proficient in reading, by income status, for the district and the state[1]: 2005–2008



SOURCE: Analysis of state test data.

[1] Unless otherwise indicated in the NOTES section below, state values exclude the district's results; see methodology section.

NOTES: **See table** on page 8 for details. **Gaps in lines** represent missing or noncomparable data.

 © 2009 THE ELI AND EDYTHE BROAD FOUNDATION

Income Status Trends in Mathematics Proficiency

Percentage of students scoring at or above proficient in mathematics, by income status, for the district and the state[1]: 2005–2008



SOURCE: Analysis of state test data.
[1] Unless otherwise indicated in the NOTES section below, state values exclude the district's results; see methodology section.
NOTES: **See table** on page 10 for details. **Gaps in lines** represent missing or noncomparable data.

© 2009 THE ELI AND EDYTHE BROAD FOUNDATION

St. Louis Public Schools

MISSOURI

Reading Proficiency Data Summary

Percentage of students in the district and the state[1] scoring at or above proficient in reading: 2005–2008

	2005	2006	2007	2008	Change 2005–2008	Change 2006–2008	Change 2007–2008	Average change
Elementary								
District								
All	*35*	23	23	24	‡	0	**1**	0
African American	*35*	20	20	21	‡	**1**	**2**	0
Asian	*†*	†	†	†	‡	†	†	†
Hispanic	*†*	†	†	†	‡	†	†	†
White	*36*	38	39	36	‡	-2	-3	-1
Low income	*33*	20	20	22	‡	**1**	**2**	**1**
Non-low income	—	—	32	29	—	—	-3	-3
State[1]								
All	*35*	45	47	46	‡	0	-1	0
African American	*19*	26	28	26	‡	0	-3	0
Asian	*†*	†	†	†	‡	†	†	†
Hispanic	*†*	†	†	†	‡	†	†	†
White	*39*	50	51	50	‡	**1**	-1	0
Low income	*23*	31	33	32	‡	**1**	-1	0
Non-low income	—	—	57	57	—	—	0	0
Middle								
District								
All	*11*	16	17	19	‡	**4**	**2**	**2**
African American	*8*	12	14	16	‡	**3**	**2**	**2**
Asian	*†*	†	†	†	‡	†	†	†
Hispanic	*†*	†	†	†	‡	†	†	†
White	*27*	32	32	37	‡	**5**	**5**	**2**
Low income	*8*	13	15	16	‡	**3**	**1**	**1**
Non-low income	—	—	23	27	—	—	**4**	**4**
State[1]								
All	*33*	44	45	49	‡	**5**	**4**	**3**
African American	*12*	21	22	26	‡	**6**	**4**	**3**
Asian	*†*	†	†	†	‡	†	†	†
Hispanic	*†*	†	†	†	‡	†	†	†
White	*38*	49	50	54	‡	**5**	**4**	**2**
Low income	*19*	29	30	34	‡	**5**	**5**	**3**
Non-low income	—	—	55	60	—	—	**5**	**5**
High								
District								
All	*6*	18	16	19	‡	**1**	**3**	0
African American	*3*	14	12	14	‡	0	**2**	0
Asian	*†*	†	†	†	‡	†	†	†
Hispanic	*†*	†	†	†	‡	†	†	†
White	*18*	37	36	42	‡	**5**	**5**	**2**
Low income	*4*	15	14	16	‡	**1**	**2**	0
Non-low income	—	—	19	22	—	—	**3**	**3**
State[1]								
All	*23*	43	43	40	‡	-4	-3	-2
African American	*8*	19	20	17	‡	-2	-3	-1
Asian	*†*	†	†	†	‡	†	†	†
Hispanic	*†*	†	†	†	‡	†	†	†
White	*26*	47	46	44	‡	-3	-2	-2
Low income	*11*	27	26	25	‡	-2	-1	-1
Non-low income	—	—	49	46	—	—	-2	-2

SOURCE: Analysis of state test data.

— Not available. † Data were suppressed due to unreliability or if the subgroup represented less than 5 percent of test takers at a level. See methodology section.

‡ Calculation could not be performed due to a change in the state test.

[1] Unless otherwise indicated in the NOTES section below, state values exclude the district's results; see methodology section.

NOTES: Details on the calculation of **average change** are found in the methodology section. **Positive change values** appear in color. **Italicized values** are not comparable to other years. Test data for the **non-low-income subgroup** were not available prior to 2007. **Test standards changed in 2006** at all levels; as a result, 2005 proficiency results were not comparable to subsequent years and were not included in change calculations.

 © 2009 THE ELI AND EDYTHE BROAD FOUNDATION

St. Louis Public Schools
MISSOURI

Reading Proficiency Gaps

Percentage-point gaps in reading proficiency rates between disadvantaged and advantaged groups: 2005–2008

	2005	2006	2007	2008	Change 2005–2008	Change 2006–2008	Change 2007–2008	Average change	2008 decile rank
Elementary									
Internal district gap									
African American vs. White	*-1*	-18	-19	-15	‡	3	4	1	**2**
Hispanic vs. White	*†*	†	†	†	‡	†	†	†	—
Low income vs. non-low income	—	—	-12	-7	—	—	5	5	**2**
Internal district vs. internal state[1] gap									
African American vs. White	*19*	6	4	10	‡	4	6	2	—
Hispanic vs. White	*†*	†	†	†	‡	†	†	†	—
Low income vs. non-low income	—	—	12	18	—	—	6	6	—
External gap: district disadvantaged vs. state[1] advantaged									
African American vs. White	*-3*	-29	-32	-29	‡	0	2	0	—
Hispanic vs. White	*†*	†	†	†	‡	†	†	†	—
Low income vs. non-low income	—	—	-37	-35	—	—	2	**2**	—
Middle									
Internal district gap									
African American vs. White	*-19*	-20	-18	-22	‡	-2	-4	-1	4
Hispanic vs. White	*†*	†	†	†	‡	†	†	†	—
Low income vs. non-low income	—	—	-8	-11	—	—	-3	-3	**2**
Internal district vs. internal state[1] gap									
African American vs. White	*7*	9	10	6	‡	-2	-4	-1	—
Hispanic vs. White	*†*	†	†	†	‡	†	†	†	—
Low income vs. non-low income	—	—	17	15	—	—	-3	-3	—
External gap: district disadvantaged vs. state[1] advantaged									
African American vs. White	*-30*	-37	-36	-39	‡	-2	-3	-1	—
Hispanic vs. White	*†*	†	†	†	‡	†	†	†	—
Low income vs. non-low income	—	—	-40	-44	—	—	-4	-4	—
High									
Internal district gap									
African American vs. White	*-15*	-22	-24	-28	‡	-5	-3	-3	6
Hispanic vs. White	*†*	†	†	†	‡	†	†	†	—
Low income vs. non-low income	—	—	-5	-6	—	—	-1	-1	3
Internal district vs. internal state[1] gap									
African American vs. White	*4*	6	3	-1	‡	-7	-3	-3	—
Hispanic vs. White	*†*	†	†	†	‡	†	†	†	—
Low income vs. non-low income	—	—	17	15	—	—	-2	-2	—
External gap: district disadvantaged vs. state[1] advantaged									
African American vs. White	*-22*	-33	-34	-30	‡	3	4	2	—
Hispanic vs. White	*†*	†	†	†	‡	†	†	†	—
Low income vs. non-low income	—	—	-35	-31	—	—	4	4	—

SOURCE: Analysis of state test data.
— Not available. † Data were suppressed due to unreliability or if the subgroup represented less than 5 percent of test takers at a level. See methodology section.
‡ Calculation could not be performed due to a change in the state test.
[1] Unless otherwise indicated in the NOTES section below, state values exclude the district's results; see methodology section.
NOTES: **In the first four columns,** negative numbers indicate an achievement gap, where the disadvantaged group performed lower than the advantaged group. (Positive numbers indicate the disadvantaged group performed higher than the advantaged group.) **In the "change" columns,** negative numbers indicate the achievement gap widened; positive numbers indicate the achievement gap narrowed. **Average change values** appear in color when the gap is closing; details on the definition of a gap closure are found in the methodology section. Details on the calculation of **average change** are also found in the methodology section. **2008 decile ranks** appear in color when the 2008 gap is among the 20 percent of districts with the smallest gaps in the state. **Italicized values** are not comparable to other years. Test data for the **non-low-income subgroup** were not available prior to 2007. **Test standards changed in 2006** at all levels; as a result, 2005 proficiency results were not comparable to subsequent years and were not included in change calculations.

© 2009 THE ELI AND EDYTHE BROAD FOUNDATION

St. Louis Public Schools

MISSOURI

Mathematics Proficiency Data Summary

Percentage of students in the district and the state[1] scoring at or above proficient in mathematics: 2005–2008

	2005	2006	2007	2008	Change 2005–2008	Change 2006–2008	Change 2007–2008	Average change
Elementary								
District								
All	*36*	22	18	18	‡	-4	0	-2
African American	*33*	18	15	15	‡	-3	0	-2
Asian	*†*	†	†	†	‡	†	†	†
Hispanic	*†*	†	†	†	‡	†	†	†
White	*46*	41	31	31	‡	-9	0	-5
Low income	*34*	20	15	17	‡	-3	**2**	-2
Non-low income	—	—	27	23	—	—	-4	-4
State[1]								
All	*43*	45	47	46	‡	**1**	-1	**1**
African American	*23*	22	25	23	‡	**1**	-2	0
Asian	*†*	†	†	†	‡	†	†	†
Hispanic	*†*	†	†	†	‡	†	†	†
White	*48*	50	52	51	‡	**1**	-1	**1**
Low income	*30*	31	33	32	‡	**1**	-1	0
Non-low income	—	—	57	57	—	—	0	0
Middle								
District								
All	*8*	13	16	16	‡	**4**	**1**	**2**
African American	*5*	9	13	12	‡	**3**	-1	**1**
Asian	*†*	†	†	†	‡	†	†	†
Hispanic	*†*	†	†	†	‡	†	†	†
White	*25*	32	33	38	‡	**7**	**5**	**3**
Low income	*6*	11	14	14	‡	**3**	-1	**2**
Non-low income	—	—	20	23	—	—	**3**	**3**
State[1]								
All	*16*	44	46	49	‡	**5**	**3**	**3**
African American	*4*	17	20	23	‡	**6**	**3**	**3**
Asian	*†*	†	†	†	‡	†	†	†
Hispanic	*†*	†	†	†	‡	†	†	†
White	*18*	50	52	55	‡	**5**	**3**	**2**
Low income	*7*	28	31	34	‡	**6**	**3**	**3**
Non-low income	—	—	57	60	—	—	**4**	**4**
High								
District								
All	*3*	13	15	15	‡	**2**	0	**1**
African American	*1*	9	11	12	‡	**2**	**1**	**1**
Asian	*†*	†	†	†	‡	†	†	†
Hispanic	*†*	†	†	†	‡	†	†	†
White	*13*	35	38	37	‡	**1**	-1	**1**
Low income	*2*	12	12	15	‡	**3**	**3**	**2**
Non-low income	—	—	20	16	—	—	-3	-3
State[1]								
All	*17*	43	42	47	‡	**3**	**5**	**2**
African American	*3*	15	15	18	‡	**3**	**4**	**2**
Asian	*†*	†	†	†	‡	†	†	†
Hispanic	*†*	†	†	†	‡	†	†	†
White	*20*	49	47	53	‡	**4**	**6**	**2**
Low income	*7*	26	25	30	‡	**4**	**5**	**2**
Non-low income	—	—	49	56	—	—	**6**	**6**

SOURCE: Analysis of state test data.

— Not available. † Data were suppressed due to unreliability or if the subgroup represented less than 5 percent of test takers at a level. See methodology section.

‡ Calculation could not be performed due to a change in the state test.

[1] Unless otherwise indicated in the NOTES section below, state values exclude the district's results; see methodology section.

NOTES: Details on the calculation of **average change** are found in the methodology section. **Positive change values** appear in color. **Italicized values** are not comparable to other years. Test data for the **non-low-income subgroup** were not available prior to 2007. **Test standards changed in 2006** at all levels; as a result, 2005 proficiency results were not comparable to subsequent years and were not included in change calculations.

 © 2009 THE ELI AND EDYTHE BROAD FOUNDATION

St. Louis Public Schools
MISSOURI

Mathematics Proficiency Gaps

Percentage-point gaps in mathematics proficiency rates between disadvantaged and advantaged groups: 2005–2008

	2005	2006	2007	2008	Change: 2005–2008	Change: 2006–2008	Change: 2007–2008	Change: Average change	2008 decile rank
Elementary									
Internal district gap									
African American vs. White	*-13*	-22	-16	-16	‡	6	0	3	**2**
Hispanic vs. White	*†*	†	†	†	‡	†	†	†	—
Low income vs. non-low income	—	—	-12	-6	—	—	5	5	**2**
Internal district vs. internal state[1] gap									
African American vs. White	*12*	5	10	11	‡	6	1	3	—
Hispanic vs. White	*†*	†	†	†	‡	†	†	†	—
Low income vs. non-low income	—	—	12	19	—	—	6	6	—
External gap: district disadvantaged vs. state[1] advantaged									
African American vs. White	*-14*	-31	-37	-36	‡	-5	1	-2	—
Hispanic vs. White	*†*	†	†	†	‡	†	†	†	—
Low income vs. non-low income	—	—	-42	-40	—	—	2	2	—
Middle									
Internal district gap									
African American vs. White	*-20*	-22	-21	-26	‡	-4	-6	-2	5
Hispanic vs. White	*†*	†	†	†	‡	†	†	†	—
Low income vs. non-low income	—	—	-6	-9	—	—	-3	-3	**2**
Internal district vs. internal state[1] gap									
African American vs. White	*-6*	11	12	6	‡	-5	-6	-3	—
Hispanic vs. White	*†*	†	†	†	‡	†	†	†	—
Low income vs. non-low income	—	—	20	17	—	—	-3	-3	—
External gap: district disadvantaged vs. state[1] advantaged									
African American vs. White	*-14*	-41	-39	-43	‡	-2	-4	-1	—
Hispanic vs. White	*†*	†	†	†	‡	†	†	†	—
Low income vs. non-low income	—	—	-42	-47	—	—	-4	-4	—
High									
Internal district gap									
African American vs. White	*-11*	-26	-27	-25	‡	1	2	**1**	3
Hispanic vs. White	*†*	†	†	†	‡	†	†	†	—
Low income vs. non-low income	—	—	-8	-2	—	—	6	6	**2**
Internal district vs. internal state[1] gap									
African American vs. White	*6*	7	5	9	‡	2	4	**1**	—
Hispanic vs. White	*†*	†	†	†	‡	†	†	†	—
Low income vs. non-low income	—	—	17	24	—	—	8	8	—
External gap: district disadvantaged vs. state[1] advantaged									
African American vs. White	*-18*	-39	-36	-41	‡	-1	-5	-1	—
Hispanic vs. White	*†*	†	†	†	‡	†	†	†	—
Low income vs. non-low income	—	—	-37	-41	—	—	-4	-4	—

SOURCE: Analysis of state test data.
— Not available. † Data were suppressed due to unreliability or if the subgroup represented less than 5 percent of test takers at a level. See methodology section.
‡ Calculation could not be performed due to a change in the state test.
[1] Unless otherwise indicated in the NOTES section below, state values exclude the district's results; see methodology section.
NOTES: **In the first four columns,** negative numbers indicate an achievement gap, where the disadvantaged group performed lower than the advantaged group. (Positive numbers indicate the disadvantaged group performed higher than the advantaged group.) **In the "change" columns,** negative numbers indicate the achievement gap widened; positive numbers indicate the achievement gap narrowed. **Average change values** appear in color when the gap is closing; details on the definition of a gap closure are found in the methodology section. Details on the calculation of **average change** are also found in the methodology section. **2008 decile ranks** appear in color when the 2008 gap is among the 20 percent of districts with the smallest gaps in the state. **Italicized values** are not comparable to other years. Test data for the **non-low-income subgroup** were not available prior to 2007. **Test standards changed in 2006** at all levels; as a result, 2005 proficiency results were not comparable to subsequent years and were not included in change calculations.

© 2009 THE ELI AND EDYTHE BROAD FOUNDATION

St. Louis Public Schools

MISSOURI

Reading Outperformance by Proficiency Category: District vs. State[1]

Percentage of students at various levels of proficiency in reading in 2008, average change from 2005 to 2008, and count of instances when the district outperformed the state[1]

	2008 performance				Average change			
	Below Proficient	Proficient	Advanced	Proficient or above	Below Proficient	Proficient	Advanced	Proficient or above
Elementary								
District								
All	76	18	6	24	0	1	-1	0
African American	79	17	4	21	**0**	1	0	**0**
Asian	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
Hispanic	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
White	64	23	13	36	1	1	-2	-1
Low income	78	17	5	22	-1	1	0	1
Non-low income	71	21	8	29	3	2	-5	-3
State[1]								
All	54	31	15	46	0	1	-1	0
African American	74	20	6	26	0	0	-1	0
Asian	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
Hispanic	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
White	50	33	17	50	0	1	-1	0
Low income	68	24	8	32	0	1	0	0
Non-low income	43	36	21	57	0	3	-3	0
Middle								
District								
All	81	16	4	19	-2	2	0	2
African American	84	14	2	16	-2	1	0	2
Asian	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
Hispanic	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
White	63	26	11	37	-2	2	0	2
Low income	84	14	2	16	-1	1	0	1
Non-low income	73	20	7	27	-4	**4**	0	4
State[1]								
All	51	35	14	49	-3	2	0	3
African American	74	22	5	26	-3	2	1	3
Asian	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
Hispanic	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
White	46	38	16	54	-2	2	0	2
Low income	66	27	7	34	-3	2	1	3
Non-low income	40	40	20	60	-5	4	1	5
High								
District								
All	81	14	4	19	**0**	**0**	0	**0**
African American	86	12	2	14	**0**	**0**	0	**0**
Asian	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
Hispanic	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
White	58	24	**17**	42	**-2**	**1**	**2**	**2**
Low income	84	13	3	16	**0**	**0**	0	**0**
Non-low income	78	16	6	22	**-3**	**2**	1	**3**
State[1]								
All	60	28	12	40	2	-2	0	-2
African American	83	14	3	17	1	-1	0	-1
Asian	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
Hispanic	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
White	56	30	14	44	2	-2	1	-2
Low income	75	19	5	25	1	-1	0	-1
Non-low income	54	31	15	46	2	-6	3	-2
Count of district outperformances/available comparisons								
All	0/3	0/3	0/3	0/3	1/3	1/3	0/3	1/3
African American	0/3	0/3	0/3	0/3	2/3	1/3	0/3	2/3
Asian	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
Hispanic	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
White	0/3	0/3	1/3	0/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3
Low income	0/3	0/3	0/3	0/3	1/3	1/3	0/3	1/3
Non-low income	0/3	0/3	0/3	0/3	1/3	2/3	0/3	1/3

SOURCE: Analysis of state test data.

— Not available. † Data were suppressed due to unreliability or if the subgroup represented less than 5 percent of test takers at a level. See methodology section.

‡ Calculation could not be performed due to a change in the state test.

[1] Unless otherwise indicated in the NOTES section below, state values exclude the district's results; see methodology section.

NOTES: **Advanced** is the state's highest proficiency level above proficient. **Outperformance comparisons** were performed on unrounded proficiencies. Instances of the **district outperforming the state** by a value of 0.5 percent or more appear in color. Details on the calculation of **average change** are found in the methodology section. For this state, at the elementary and middle school levels, **below proficient** combines the Basic and Below Basic categories. Test data for the **non-low-income subgroup** were not available prior to 2007. **Test standards changed in 2006** at all levels; as a result, 2005 proficiency results were not comparable to subsequent years and were not included in change calculations.

 © 2009 THE ELI AND EDYTHE BROAD FOUNDATION

St. Louis Public Schools
MISSOURI

Mathematics Outperformance by Proficiency Category: District vs. State[1]

Percentage of students at various levels of proficiency in mathematics in 2008, average change from 2005 to 2008, and count of instances when the district outperformed the state[1]

	2008 performance				Average change			
	Below Proficient	Proficient	Advanced	Proficient or above	Below Proficient	Proficient	Advanced	Proficient or above
Elementary								
District								
All	82	15	3	18	2	-1	-1	-2
African American	85	13	2	15	2	-1	0	-2
Asian	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
Hispanic	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
White	69	25	7	31	5	-3	-2	-5
Low income	83	14	2	17	2	-1	0	-2
Non-low income	77	18	5	23	4	-2	-2	-4
State[1]								
All	54	36	10	46	-1	1	0	1
African American	77	20	3	23	0	0	0	0
Asian	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
Hispanic	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
White	49	39	11	51	-1	1	0	1
Low income	68	27	5	32	0	1	0	0
Non-low income	43	43	14	57	0	1	-2	0
Middle								
District								
All	84	13	3	16	-2	1	0	2
African American	88	10	2	12	-1	1	0	1
Asian	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
Hispanic	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
White	62	27	11	38	**-3**	**3**	1	**3**
Low income	86	12	2	14	-2	1	0	2
Non-low income	77	17	6	23	-3	2	1	3
State[1]								
All	51	36	14	49	-3	1	1	3
African American	77	19	4	23	-3	2	1	3
Asian	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
Hispanic	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
White	45	39	16	55	-2	1	1	2
Low income	66	28	6	34	-3	2	1	3
Non-low income	40	41	19	60	-4	3	1	4
High								
District								
All	85	11	5	15	-1	0	**1**	1
African American	88	8	**3**	12	-1	0	**1**	1
Asian	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
Hispanic	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
White	63	23	13	37	-1	-2	**2**	1
Low income	85	10	5	15	-2	0	**2**	2
Non-low income	84	12	5	16	3	-2	-1	-3
State[1]								
All	53	35	12	47	-2	1	1	2
African American	82	16	2	18	-2	1	0	2
Asian	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
Hispanic	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
White	47	39	14	53	-2	1	1	2
Low income	70	25	5	30	-2	1	0	2
Non-low income	44	40	15	56	-6	2	5	6
Count of district outperformances/available comparisons								
All	0/3	0/3	0/3	0/3	0/3	0/3	1/3	0/3
African American	0/3	0/3	1/3	0/3	0/3	0/3	1/3	0/3
Asian	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
Hispanic	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
White	0/3	0/3	0/3	0/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3
Low income	0/3	0/3	0/3	0/3	0/3	0/3	1/3	0/3
Non-low income	0/3	0/3	0/3	0/3	0/3	0/3	0/3	0/3

SOURCE: Analysis of state test data.

— Not available. † Data were suppressed due to unreliability or if the subgroup represented less than 5 percent of test takers at a level. See methodology section.

‡ Calculation could not be performed due to a change in the state test.

[1] Unless otherwise indicated in the NOTES section below, state values exclude the district's results; see methodology section.

NOTES: **Advanced** is the state's highest proficiency level above proficient. **Outperformance comparisons** were performed on unrounded proficiencies. Instances of the **district outperforming the state** by a value of 0.5 percent or more appear in color. Details on the calculation of **average change** are found in the methodology section. For this state, at the elementary and middle school levels, **below proficient** combines the Basic and Below Basic categories. Test data for the **non-low-income subgroup** were not available prior to 2007. **Test standards changed in 2006** at all levels; as a result, 2005 proficiency results were not comparable to subsequent years and were not included in change calculations.

© 2009 THE ELI AND EDYTHE BROAD FOUNDATION

St. Louis Public Schools

MISSOURI

Standardized Residuals for Reading

Standardized residuals[1] for regressions of the percentage of students in the district scoring at or above proficient in reading, controlling for district poverty level: 2005–2008



SOURCE: Analysis of state test data.
[1] Positive residuals indicate higher-than-expected performance, and negative residuals indicate lower-than-expected performance, given the district's poverty level. Residuals are expressed in standard units. Regressions were weighted by district size.
NOTES: **See below** for details.

Standardized residuals[1] for regressions of the percentage of students in the district scoring at or above proficient in reading, controlling for district poverty level: 2005–2008

	2005	2006	2007	2008	Average change	Decile rank[2,3]
Elementary	1.16	-1.01	-1.36	-1.23	-0.75	9.00
Middle	-0.63	-1.32	-1.37	-2.03	-0.42	10.00
High	0.01	-0.48	-0.87	-1.32	-0.44	8.50
Count of positive residuals in reading/ total available	2/3	0/3	0/3	0/3	0/3	9.17
Count of positive residuals in reading and mathematics/total available	5/6	0/6	0/6	0/6	0/6	9.33

SOURCE: Analysis of state test data.
— Not available. † Data were suppressed due to unreliability. See methodology section.
[1] Positive residuals indicate higher-than-expected performance, and negative residuals indicate lower-than-expected performance, given the district's poverty level. Residuals are expressed in standard units. Regressions were weighted by district size.
[2] Average decile rank of 2007 and 2008 residuals. See methodology section.
[3] For the count of "positive residuals" rows, the decile rank is the average rank for the three education levels.
NOTES: **Positive average change values and decile ranks** in the upper half (1–5) appear in color.

 © 2009 THE ELI AND EDYTHE BROAD FOUNDATION

St. Louis Public Schools
MISSOURI

Standardized Residuals for Mathematics

Standardized residuals[1] for regressions of the percentage of students in the district scoring at or above proficient in mathematics, controlling for district poverty level: 2005–2008



SOURCE: Analysis of state test data.
[1] Positive residuals indicate higher-than-expected performance, and negative residuals indicate lower-than-expected performance, given the district's poverty level. Residuals are expressed in standard units. Regressions were weighted by district size.
NOTES: **See below** for details.

Standardized residuals[1] for regressions of the percentage of students in the district scoring at or above proficient in mathematics, controlling for district poverty level: 2005–2008

	2005	2006	2007	2008	Average change	Decile rank[2,3]
Elementary	0.63	-0.83	-1.52	-1.49	-0.71	9.50
Middle	0.52	-1.16	-1.17	-1.90	-0.73	9.50
High	0.09	-0.72	-0.92	-1.78	-0.58	9.50
Count of positive residuals in mathematics/ total available	3/3	0/3	0/3	0/3	0/3	9.50
Count of positive residuals in reading and mathematics/total available	5/6	0/6	0/6	0/6	0/6	9.33

SOURCE: Analysis of state test data.
— Not available. † Data were suppressed due to unreliability. See methodology section.
[1] Positive residuals indicate higher-than-expected performance, and negative residuals indicate lower-than-expected performance, given the district's poverty level. Residuals are expressed in standard units. Regressions were weighted by district size.
[2] Average decile rank of 2007 and 2008 residuals. See methodology section.
[3] For the count of "positive residuals" rows, the decile rank is the average rank for the three education levels.
NOTES: **Positive average change values and decile ranks** in the upper half (1–5) appear in color.

© 2009 THE ELI AND EDYTHE BROAD FOUNDATION

St. Louis Public Schools

MISSOURI

High School Graduation Rates

Three estimated high school graduation rates: 2003–2006



Estimated high school graduation rates for the classes of 2003–2006

	2003	2004	2005	2006	Change 2003–2006	Change 2004–2006	Change 2005–2006	Average change
Averaged Freshman Graduation Rate								
All	51	56	50	52	**1**	-4	**2**	0
African American	51	57	52	53	**2**	-4	**1**	0
Asian	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
Hispanic	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
White	47	52	43	44	-4	-8	**1**	-2
Urban Institute method[1]								
All	39	48	49	37	-3	-11	-12	-1
African American	39	45	53	38	-1	-7	-15	**1**
Asian	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
Hispanic	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
White	40	53	36	26	-14	-27	-10	-6
Manhattan Institute method[1]								
All	50	54	50	52	**3**	-1	**3**	0
African American	49	52	49	51	**2**	-1	**2**	0
Asian	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
Hispanic	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
White	58	61	52	†	†	†	†	-3

SOURCE: Analysis of data from the U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data (CCD).
— Not available. † Data were suppressed due to unreliability or if a subgroup represented less than 5 percent of the population. See methodology section.
[1] The Urban Institute method is also known as Swanson's cumulative promotion index (SCPI) and the Manhattan Institute method is also known as Greene's graduation indicator (GGI).
NOTES: **Gaps in lines** represent missing or suppressed data. **Positive change values** appear in color. Details on the calculation of **average change** are found in the methodology section.

 © 2009 THE ELI AND EDYTHE BROAD FOUNDATION

St. Louis Public Schools
MISSOURI

College Readiness Data

Test scores and participation rates for college readiness examinations: 2005–2008

	2005	2006	2007	2008	Change 2005–2008	Change 2006–2008	Change 2007–2008	Average change
SAT Reasoning Test[1]								
Mean total score (reading and mathematics)								
All	1,113	994	1,146	1,093	-20	**99**	-53	**9**
African American	927	935	1,022	†	†	†	†	**48**
Asian	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
Hispanic	†	—	†	†	†	—	†	†
White	1,274	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
Participation rate								
All	3	3	2	1	-2	-1	-1	-1
African American	2	2	1	1	-1	-1	-1	0
Asian	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
Hispanic	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
White	7	3	2	3	-5	-1	0	-2
ACT[1]								
Mean composite score (English, reading, mathematics, and science)								
All	17	16	16	16	-1	0	0	0
African American	16	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
Asian	20	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
Hispanic	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
White	22	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
Participation rate								
All	39	64	83	90	**51**	**26**	**7**	**17**
African American	38	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
Asian	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
Hispanic	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
White	25	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
Advanced Placement (AP) (all subjects)[2]								
Percent of tests taken with scores of 3 or above								
All	68	10	15	9	-59	-1	-5	-17
African American	†	4	5	3	†	-1	-2	-1
Asian	†	14	†	13	†	-1	†	-1
Hispanic	†	†	†	15	†	†	†	†
White	81	24	39	29	-53	**5**	-10	-14
Participation rate								
All	1	5	3	14	**13**	**8**	**10**	**4**
African American	0	4	2	11	**10**	**7**	**9**	**3**
Asian	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
Hispanic	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
White	3	5	6	19	**16**	**13**	**12**	**5**

SOURCE: Analysis of data from the Common Core of Data (CCD), ACT, and the College Board (copyright © 2005–2008 The College Board. www.collegeboard.com).
— Not available.
† Test scores were suppressed if fewer than 15 students took the test. Participation rates were suppressed due to unreliability or if the subgroup represented less than 5 percent of district enrollment in the relevant grades. See methodology section.
[1] Describes the most recent test results for graduating seniors.
[2] Describes test results for juniors and seniors taking any AP test in the given year.
NOTES: **Subgroup participation rates** may not reflect the "all students" rate due to some test takers not reporting their race/ethnicity. **Positive change values** appear in color. Details on the calculation of **average change** are found in the methodology section. **CCD data for 2008** were not available at the time of this analysis; participation rates for 2008 were estimated using 2007 enrollment data.

© 2009 THE ELI AND EDYTHE BROAD FOUNDATION

St. Louis Public Schools
MISSOURI

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

Overall AYP performance: 2005–2008

Subject/level	2005	2006	2007	2008
Percent of schools meeting AYP targets				
District	44	11	9	13
State	65	71	54	43
District overall AYP status	N	N	N	N

SOURCE: Data collected from state websites and education agencies.
— Not available.
NOTES: **"Y"** indicates the district met overall AYP targets. **"N"** indicates the district did not meet overall AYP targets.

District AYP status by subject and subgroup[1]

	2008: Met proficiency targets	2008: Met participation targets
English language arts		
All students	N	Y
African American	N	Y
American Indian/Alaska Native	N	Y
Asian/Pacific Islander	N	—
Hispanic	N	Y
White	N	Y
Low income	N	Y
English language learners	N	Y
Students with disabilities	N	Y
Mathematics		
All students	N	Y
African American	N	Y
American Indian/Alaska Native	N	Y
Asian/Pacific Islander	Y-CI	Y
Hispanic	N	Y
White	Y-G	Y
Low income	N	Y
English language learners	N	Y
Students with disabilities	N	Y

SOURCE: Data collected from state websites and education agencies.
— Not available.
[1] Data for the latest year available.
NOTES: **"Y"** indicates yes. **"N"** indicates no. **"Y-CI"** indicates that the subgroup made AYP through the application of confidence intervals. **"Y-G"** indicates the subgroup made AYP through growth measures.

 © 2009 THE ELI AND EDYTHE BROAD FOUNDATION

Technical Notes and Methodology

Understanding the Data Report

This data report contains all of the data collected and analyzed for selection of The 2009 Broad Prize finalists. It does not contain summaries that compare the district with other districts, nor any additional quantitative or qualitative data collected or analyzed for selection of the winner from among the finalists. However, summary tables containing results for all 100 eligible districts and the 3 previous years' winners are available at www.broadprize.org.

The Broad Prize finalists are determined by a panel of education experts from around the country, based on a review of the data and analyses for the 100 Broad Prize-eligible districts. There is neither a strict formula nor set of weighting factors applied to the data. Each Broad Prize Review Board member considers all of the data and analyses available each year and, based on his or her knowledge and expertise, selects five finalists. Both performance as of the most recent year and improvement over the four most recent years on the various measures included in this report are considered by the Review Board.

The rest of this section discusses the data collection and analysis procedures used to produce the data report. First, it describes the criteria and data sources for identifying the eligible districts. Second, it reviews each of the quantitative achievement measures used by the Review Board in March 2009 to identify the five finalists and the data on which the measures were based.

Eligible Districts

To be eligible for The Broad Prize, school districts must meet certain criteria set by The Broad Foundation related to size, poverty and urbanicity. Winners from the previous three years are ineligible. The criteria for eligibility are:

- All K–12 districts serving more than 100,000 students (25 districts).
- All K–12 districts serving between 35,000 and 99,999 students in which at least 40 percent of students are eligible for free or reduced-price school lunch (FRSL), in which at least 40 percent of student enrollment comes from minority groups, and which have an urban designation (Locale Code 11, 12, or 21 in the CCD data[1]) (63 districts).
- The largest urban districts in states with no districts meeting the above criteria, as long as the district has at least 20,000 students (11 districts).
- The next largest districts in the nation meeting the criteria of 40 percent FRSL, 40 percent minority and an urban designation. The purpose of this criterion was to bring the total number of districts to 100 (1 district).

1 As of 2007, CCD locale codes have changed: code 11 represents a large city; code 12 represents a mid-size city; and code 21 represents a large suburb. Sable, J. (2008). *Documentation to the NCES Common Core of Data Local Education Agency Universe Survey: School Year 2006–07 Version 1a* (NCES 2009-301). National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC.

Technical Notes and Methodology

For The 2009 Broad Prize, the 2006, 2007 and 2008 winners, Boston, New York City, and Brownsville, respectively, were removed from eligibility and the 2005 winner (Norfolk) became eligible again. Data for the non-eligible previous winners were also collected and reported to The Broad Prize Review Board.

The 100 eligible school districts are located in 38 states and the District of Columbia. Twelve states—Delaware, Hawaii, Idaho, Maine, Massachusetts, Montana, New Hampshire, North Dakota, South Dakota, Vermont, West Virginia and Wyoming—have no eligible districts this year. Hawaii is ineligible because it has a statewide school system.

Data Used for Measures of Student Achievement

Detailed data on various measures of student achievement were obtained for each district, using federal, state and other sources. Wherever possible, data were collected by grade level, race/ethnicity (African American, Asian, Hispanic and White), and income status (low income and non-low income). The achievement data examined included performance on state achievement tests, graduation rates based on federal counts of high school enrollments and completions, college readiness data obtained from the College Board and ACT, and information on Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP).

Reading and Mathematics Proficiency as Determined by State Tests

Key indicators of student performance are scores on state-mandated achievement tests and trends in scores over time. Test score data in reading and mathematics were collected from each state for 2005 through 2008.[2] These data were used to calculate the percentage of students in each district scoring at or above proficiency on their state tests in reading and mathematics in each grade. Weighted by the number of test takers at each grade level, these data on student achievement were aggregated across elementary grades (third through fifth), middle grades (sixth through eighth), and high school grades (ninth through 12th), where available. These state assessment data were analyzed (using methods described later) to calculate actual versus expected performance, to directly compare district with state performance, and to measure gaps and changes in gaps between low- and non-low-income students as well as between White and African-American students and White and Hispanic students.

Important Note Regarding State Test Data

Because states establish their own assessment and proficiency standards, districts' performance on state tests cannot be directly compared across states. To provide context for these data, summary tables containing information on state performance on the National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP), the 2007 NAEP Trial Urban District Assessment (TUDA), and a 2006 Northwestern Evaluation Association (NWEA) proficiency-standards mapping study are available online at www.broadprize.org but are not included in this data report.

2 The data were provided directly by state agencies or downloaded from their websites.

 © 2008 THE ELI AND EDYTHE BROAD FOUNDATION

Technical Notes and Methodology

High School Graduation Rates

Another key measure of student performance is the graduation rate. While using longitudinal student data generates the most accurate graduation rate, such data are not currently available in most states. In the absence of longitudinal data, cross-sectional data can be used to generate estimates of rates of high school graduation. There are several methods generally considered reliable estimators of graduation rates, three of which are used in this report and are described in the next section on methods of analysis.

In order to generate estimates that are comparable across the 100 Broad Prize-eligible districts, MPR obtains diploma counts and enrollment data for the districts from the federal Common Core of Data (CCD). The data used to create graduation rate estimates include total and subgroup enrollments and completion counts for each district for the high school classes of 2003 through 2006 (the most recent years that were available at time of analysis). The different methods also employ grade-level enrollment data, but the methods vary in terms of the specific years of enrollment data used in the calculations.

College Readiness Data

District-level measures of the college readiness of their students include SAT and ACT mean scores and participation rates. These two tests are designed to assess readiness for college-level work. Scale scores for each subject (reading and math) assessed by the SAT range from 200 to 800. (Writing scores were not included because data were not available for all four years covered by this analysis.) Scale scores for the composite ACT test (covering English, mathematics, reading and science) range from 1 to 36. With district permission, the College Board and ACT provided mean test scores for each district for 2005 through 2008, along with the number of seniors who had ever taken the test (regardless of when they took the test during high school). The most recent test scores were provided.

Another measure of college readiness is the extent to which students take and pass Advanced Placement (AP) examinations. These examinations provide a standardized measure of student performance in college-level courses taken while in high school. AP grades are reported on a five-point scale:

5 = Extremely well qualified
4 = Well qualified
3 = Qualified (equivalent to passing)
2 = Possibly qualified
1 = No recommendation

Again with permission from each district, the College Board provided data for the district for 2005 through 2008 on the number of AP examinations at each score level and on the number of juniors and seniors who took the test. MPR staff used these numbers to calculate percentages of AP examinations with scores of three or above (equivalent to pass rates) for each district.

Technical Notes and Methodology

The College Board and ACT do not calculate test participation rates. MPR staff calculated participation rates using enrollment data obtained from the federal Common Core of Data (CCD) for 11th- and 12th-graders, as appropriate, in combination with the number of students taking the different tests.

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Data

The data presented indicate the percentage of schools in each district and state that met federal AYP requirements in 2005 through 2008 under the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) legislation. Also presented is an indicator of whether the district met its overall AYP target in the given year and additional AYP detail for student subgroups, where available. These data were obtained from state and local education agency websites.

Data Analysis Methods

The 2009 Broad Prize data report presents data collected on district characteristics, background on state tests and AYP. In addition, MPR staff analyzed the above-described data on student achievement to develop measures of the following: achievement gaps, district proficiency rates compared with the state, standardized residuals, graduation rates and college readiness. Trend data are presented where available, as are "performance" and "improvement" measures. Each data report section is explained here and the relevant report page numbers are indicated in parentheses. Additional explanatory notes are included as footnotes in the data report itself.

MPR staff analyzed the data on student achievement described above to develop measures of the following:

- District and state proficiency rates on state reading and mathematics tests by education level (elementary, middle and high school) for all students, racial/ethnic subgroups—African American, Asian, Hispanic and White—and low-income and non-low-income subgroups.
- Achievement gaps between Whites and other racial/ethnic groups—African Americans and Hispanics—and between low-income and non-low-income students, and the progress that is being made in closing these gaps.
- Comparing the performance of all students, African-American, Hispanic, and low-income students in a district with their state peers, at the proficient or above level, and at the below proficient, proficient, and advanced levels on state tests.
- Expected versus actual performance on state tests, taking into consideration differences in state tests and the proportion of low-income students in each district.
- High school graduation rates.
- College readiness.

These are explained below.

 © 2008 THE ELI AND EDYTHE BROAD FOUNDATION

Technical Notes and Methodology

Background Information (page 2)

Description of District: 2004–2007

Background information on the finalists is presented in this section. These data were generally obtained from the U.S. Department of Education's Common Core of Data (CCD). Demographic percentages were calculated using enrollment counts. The minority percentages were calculated as the sum of non-White enrollments divided by the total district enrollment. Percent minority may not equal 100 percent minus percent White due to the small amounts of missing race/ethnicity data in some districts.

The information in the table is organized as follows:

First column: Lists the district characteristics, student characteristics and types of expenditures shown in the table

Remaining columns: Lists data for each year for which data were available (2004, 2005, 2006 and 2007)

State Test Information: 2005–2008

Key indicators of student performance include scores on state-mandated achievement tests and trends in scores over time. The state test information shows the tests and grades that were included in The 2009 Broad Prize analysis. The table notes indicate whether any tests were not comparable with other years, and may provide additional information. Non-comparable tests were not included in calculations of "change" or "average change" on pages 8 through 13. Because of the "relative" nature of standardized residuals, however, data for all tests were included in calculations of "overall performance" and "average change" on pages 14 and 15.

The information in the table is organized as follows:

First column: Lists the subject (reading and math) and level (elementary, middle and high school)

Second column: Specifies the test

Remaining columns: Specifies the grades included in the analysis for 2005, 2006, 2007, and 2008

Trends in Proficiency Rates (pages 3–7)

Test score data in reading and mathematics were collected from each state for 2005 through 2008. These data were used to calculate the percentage of students scoring at or above proficiency on their state tests in reading and mathematics in each grade. Weighted by the number of test takers at each grade level, these data on student achievement were aggregated across elementary grades (third through fifth), middle grades (sixth through eighth), and high school grades (ninth through 12th), where available.

District and state trends in proficiency are shown for all students in reading and math (page 3). Trends are also disaggregated by race/ethnicity (pages 4–5) and income status (pages 6–7) for both the district and state.

Technical Notes and Methodology

The "state" proficiency rates in these analyses generally excluded the district's results. That is, unless otherwise indicated, district proficiency rates were removed from state averages to produce "rest of state" proficiency rates for comparison purposes. This approach was particularly important in cases where very large eligible districts enrolled a significant proportion of the population in a state and would otherwise have been compared largely with itself. In states with multiple eligible districts, the "state" proficiency rates will vary, because each district was compared separately with all other districts in the state except itself.

Non-comparable test data are not included in trend lines. Data were suppressed if a subgroup represented less than 5 percent of the test takers in a subject at a level (elementary, middle, high school) or if the data were unreliable.

Trends in Overall Reading and Mathematics Proficiency (page 3)

Six different trend charts, with data for 2005, 2006, 2007, and 2008, are shown as follows:

Left side: District reading and mathematics proficiency trend lines for all students at the elementary, middle and high school levels

Right side: State reading and mathematics proficiency trend lines for all students at the elementary, middle and high school levels

Race/Ethnicity Trends in Reading and Mathematics Proficiency (pages 4–5)

For each subject, six different trend charts, with data for 2005, 2006, 2007, and 2008, are shown as follows:

Left side: District proficiency trend lines for White, African-American, Asian, and Hispanic students at the elementary, middle and high school levels

Right side: State proficiency trend lines for White, African-American, Asian, and Hispanic students at the elementary, middle and high school levels

Income Status Trends in Reading and Mathematics Proficiency (pages 6–7)

For each subject, six different trend charts, with data for 2005, 2006, 2007, and 2008, are shown as follows:

Left side: District proficiency trend lines for all students, low-income, and non-low-income students at the elementary, middle and high school levels

Right side: State proficiency trend lines for all students, low-income, and non-low-income students at the elementary, middle and high school levels

Proficiency Data Summaries (pages 8 and 10)

Percentages of students scoring at or above proficiency on the state tests between 2005 and 2008 are shown for reading on page 8 and for math on page 10 for both the district and the state. As indicated above, the "state" proficiency rates in these analyses generally excluded the district's results. That is, unless otherwise indicated, district proficiency rates were removed from state averages to produce "rest of state" proficiency rates for comparison purposes.

 © 2008 THE ELI AND EDYTHE BROAD FOUNDATION

Technical Notes and Methodology

The tables also show calculations of improvement over time. Simple change is calculated as the difference between 2005 and 2008, between 2006 and 2008, and between 2007 and 2008. Where data for one or two years in the pair were not available, not comparable, or suppressed, these change calculations could not be performed.

In addition, improvement or "average change" was calculated as the slope of the best fit line among the available data points for 2005 through 2008 The slope was generally determined by regressing the available proficiency rates on year. If only one data point was available, or if data were missing for both 2007 and 2008, average change was not calculated.

Data could be missing either because they were not available (indicated by "—") or because they were suppressed (indicated by "†"). Data were suppressed if a subgroup represented less than five percent of the test takers in a subject at a level (elementary, middle, high school) or if the data were unreliable. Data that were not comparable with other years, due, for example, to changes in the state test as described above, appear in italics and were treated in calculations as missing data (and the missing result is indicated by "‡").

Calculations were performed on unrounded numbers. Positive change values appear in color.

Reading and Mathematics Proficiency Data Summary (pages 8 and 10)

The information in the tables is organized as follows:

First column:	Subgroups are specified for the district and rest of state for each of the three levels (elementary, middle and high school)
Second column:	Proficiencies are specified for the 2005 academic year
Third column:	Proficiencies are specified for the 2006 academic year
Fourth column:	Proficiencies are specified for the 2007 academic year
Fifth column:	Proficiencies are specified for the 2008 academic year
Sixth column:	Change in proficiency is shown for the 2008 academic year minus the 2005 academic year
Seventh column:	Change in proficiency is shown for the 2008 academic year minus the 2006 academic year
Eighth column:	Change in proficiency is shown for the 2008 academic year minus the 2007 academic year
Ninth column:	The "average change" calculation is shown. "Average change" was calculated as the slope of the best fit line among the available data points for 2005 through 2008.

Proficiency Gaps (pages 9 and 11)

Measures of gap closures are shown for reading on page 9 and for math on page 11. Two types of comparisons were made when calculating achievement gaps:

Racial/Ethnic Gaps:	These compared the performance of African-American and Hispanic students with that of White students.
Income Gaps:	These compared the performance of low-income students with that of non-low-income students.

Three types of gaps were measured:

Technical Notes and Methodology

Internal District Gap

This measure calculates the gap in performance between a district's disadvantaged group and the district's advantaged group. Some caution must be exercised in comparing internal gaps across districts because these comparisons may be distorted by the following factors:

- The relative absence of an advantaged group in some districts (e.g., few White or few non-low-income students). To address this issue, internal gaps were not calculated in districts where either of the groups being compared represented less than 5 percent of the district's test-takers in a given subject and at a given level.
- Differences between districts in the composition of the "advantaged" or "disadvantaged" groups (e.g., high-income Whites in one district and moderate-income Whites in another).
- Higher than average performance or improvement by the advantaged group in some districts and lower than average performance or improvement by the advantaged group in others (which could cause districts with lower performing advantaged students to appear to be doing a better job of "closing the gap").
- Ceiling or floor effects, which can distort the comparison of gaps across states.

Gaps are represented by negative numbers and the closing of such gaps is represented by positive numbers. For example, if a district's African-American students perform 30 percentage points below the district's White students, this gap is represented by –30. If the gap closes to –10 in subsequent years, then the gap closure measure is the later year's gap minus the earlier year's gap (–10 minus –30 equals +20), meaning that the gap between African-American and White students has closed by 20 percentage points.

Internal District versus Internal State Gap

This measure corresponds to the district's internal gap minus the state's internal gap. The district's internal gap is defined as the performance of the district's disadvantaged group minus the performance of the district's advantaged group. The state's internal gap is defined as the performance of the state's disadvantaged group minus the performance of the state's advantaged group. As described above, the "state" internal gaps against which district internal gaps were compared generally excluded the district's results. That is, unless otherwise indicated, district proficiency rates were removed from state averages to produce "rest of state" values for comparison purposes.

Positive numbers indicate that the district outperformed the state on the measure. For example, if the district's Hispanic students are performing 10 percentage points below the district's White students, but the state's Hispanic students are performing 15 percentage points below the state's White students, then the internal district gap is 5 percentage points smaller than the internal state gap.

By similar reasoning, a positive change in this measure over time for Hispanic students would indicate that the district's Hispanics are improving faster relative to the district's Whites than the state's Hispanics are improving relative to the state's Whites.

 © 2008 THE ELI AND EDYTHE BROAD FOUNDATION

Technical Notes and Methodology

External Gap: District Disadvantaged versus State Advantaged

This measure was used to compare the performance of the district's disadvantaged group with that of the state's advantaged group. Thus, if 30 percent of District A's Hispanic students, 40 percent of District B's Hispanic students, and 50 percent of the state's White students are proficient on the state test, District A's external gap for Hispanics is 30 percent minus 50 percent (or –20 percentage points), and District B's external gap for Hispanics is 40 percent minus 50 percent (or –10 percentage points). As described above, the "state" internal gaps against which district internal gaps were compared generally excluded the district's results. That is, unless otherwise indicated, district proficiency rates were removed from state averages to produce "rest of state" values for comparison purposes. Note that comparing two districts' external gaps in the same state is virtually the same as comparing the performance of their disadvantaged groups except that the "state's" advantaged proficiency against which the district's disadvantaged group was compared was not exactly the same for each district.

External gap statistics are generally negative numbers, but improvement in external gaps (improvement in the performance of the district's disadvantaged students relative to the state's advantaged students) are shown as positive numbers.

An illustration of the three achievement gap measures follows:

	2005 Proficiency Rate		2008 Proficiency Rate	
	District	State	District	State
Low-income students	20	25	35	30
Non-low-income students	50	60	55	65

In this example, the gap measures would be:

Internal District Gap

- 2005 internal gap: –30 (equals 20 minus 50)
- 2008 internal gap: –20 (equals 35 minus 55)
- 2005–2008 change in internal gap: +10. This means that the district has closed its income gap by 10 percentage points since 2005.

Internal District versus Internal State Gap

- 2005 internal state gap: –35 (equals 25 minus 60)
- 2008 internal state gap: –35 (equals 30 minus 65)
- 2005–2008 change in internal state gap: 0. This means that the state's income gap has not changed since 2005.
- 2005 internal district vs. internal state gap: +5 (equals –30 minus –35)
- 2008 internal district vs. internal state gap: +15 (equals –20 minus –35)
- 2005–2008 change in internal district vs. internal state gap: +10. This means that the district's low-income gap has improved 10 percentage points more than its state gap since 2005.

Technical Notes and Methodology

External Gap: District Disadvantaged versus State Advantaged

- 2005 external gap: –40 (equals 20 minus 60)
- 2008 external gap: –30 (equals 35 minus 65)
- 2005–2008 change in external gap: +10. This means that the district's low-income performance has improved relative to the performance of the state's non-low-income group by 10 percentage points since 2005.

The tables also show calculations of improvement over time. Simple change is calculated as the difference between 2005 and 2008, between 2006 and 2008, and between 2007 and 2008. Where data for one or two years in the pair were not available, not comparable, or suppressed, these change calculations could not be performed.

In addition, improvement or "average change" was calculated as the slope of the best fit line among the available data points for 2005 through 2008. If only one data point was available, or if data were missing for both 2007 and 2008, average change was not calculated. Data could be missing either because they were not available (indicated by "—") or because they were suppressed (indicated by "†"). Data were suppressed if a subgroup represented less than 5 percent of the test takers in a subject at a level (elementary, middle, high school) or if the data were unreliable. Data that were not comparable with other years, due, for example, to changes in the state test as described above, appear in italics and were treated in calculations as missing data (and the missing result is indicated by "‡"). Calculations were performed on unrounded numbers.

An internal district gap was considered to be closing if the district's disadvantaged group proficiency was increasing and the district's advantaged group proficiency was either steady or increasing. The gap was closing because the district's disadvantaged group proficiency was increasing at a faster rate than the district's advantaged group proficiency.

An internal district vs. internal state gap was considered to be closing if the district's disadvantaged group proficiency was increasing, the district's advantaged group proficiency was either steady or increasing, and the internal district gap was closing at a faster rate than the state internal gap.

An external gap was considered to be closing if the district's disadvantaged group proficiency was increasing at a faster rate than the state's advantaged group proficiency.

When a gap is considered to be closing, the average change value appears in color.

To identify districts with the smallest gaps, decile ranks based on gaps for all districts in a state were computed. Decile ranks could only be calculated for internal district gaps and ranged from 1 for the smallest gaps to 10 for the largest gaps in a state. Gaps that had a decile rank of 1 or 2 were considered to be "small." Decile ranks of 1 or 2 appear in color.

 © 2008 THE ELI AND EDYTHE BROAD FOUNDATION

Technical Notes and Methodology

Important Note Regarding Achievement Gap Data

Caution must be used when looking at the gap measures for districts across states because the three gap measures are not standardized and are even more vulnerable than are standardized measures to ceiling and floor effects.

Reading and Math Proficiency Gaps (pages 9 and 11)

The information in the tables is organized as follows:

First column:	The internal district gap, internal district vs. internal state gap, and external gap are specified with regard to comparing the disadvantaged vs. advantaged groups (African-American vs. White, Hispanic vs. White, and low-income vs. non-low-income students) at each of the three levels (elementary, middle and high school)
Second column:	Gaps are specified for the 2005 academic year
Third column:	Gaps are specified for the 2006 academic year
Fourth column:	Gaps are specified for the 2007 academic year
Fifth column:	Gaps are specified for the 2008 academic year
Sixth column:	Change in the gap is shown for the 2008 academic year minus the 2005 academic year
Seventh column:	Change in the gap is shown for the 2008 academic year minus the 2006 academic year
Eighth column:	Change in the gap is shown for the 2008 academic year minus the 2007 academic year
Ninth column:	The "average change" calculation is shown. "Average change" was calculated as the slope of the best fit line among the available data points for 2005 through 2008.
Tenth column:	The within-state decile rank of the 2008 internal district gap is shown. Decile ranks range from 1 for the smallest gaps in the state to 10 for the largest.

Comparisons of District and State Performance (pages 12 and 13)

Tables on these pages compare the performance of seven subgroups (all students, African-American, Asian, Hispanic, White, low-income, and non-low-income students) in a district with their state peers in reading (on page 12) and mathematics (on page 13). Unlike the regression analyses, which appear on pages 14 and 15, these analyses directly compare district and state performance and do not take into account district poverty levels. These comparisons focus on the district's performance on the state test at the below proficient, proficient and advanced levels, as well as at the combined proficient or above level.[3]

The table shows district and state performance in 2008 across the four proficiency categories as well as average change in these categories for the years 2005, 2006, 2007 and 2008. "Average change" was calculated as the slope of the best fit line among the available data points for 2005 through 2008. The slope was generally determined by regressing the available proficiency rates on year. If only one data point was available, or if data were missing for both 2007 and 2008, average change was not calculated.

3 Below proficient" may combine any proficiency categories the state defines as not meeting proficiency standards. The "advanced" level was defined as the highest performance level above "proficient" on a state's test.

Technical Notes and Methodology

The "state" proficiency rates against which the district proficiency rates were compared in this section generally excluded the district's results. That is, unless otherwise indicated, district proficiency rates were removed from state averages to produce "rest of state" proficiency rates for comparison purposes. This approach was particularly important in cases where very large eligible districts enrolled a significant proportion of the population in a state and would otherwise have been compared largely with itself. In states with multiple eligible districts, the "state" proficiency rates will vary, because each district was compared separately with all other districts in the state except itself.

The 2008 performance and the improvement, or "average change," measures for all subgroups within each district were compared with the performance and improvement of their peers in the rest of the state. At the proficient, advanced, and proficient or above levels, the district outperformed the state when the percentage of students performing at that level in 2008 was *greater* than the state's. Similarly, at these same levels, the district out-improved the state when the average change rate was *greater* than the state's. At the below proficient level, the district outperformed the state when the percentage of students performing at that level in 2008 was *lower* than the state's, and the district out-improved the state when the average change rate was *lower* than the state's. Outperformance comparisons were performed on unrounded numbers, and instances of the district outperforming or out-improving the state by .5 percent age points or more appear in color.

The lower, shaded portion of the table shows the counts of district outperformances out of the number of available comparisons for each student group.

Test data were suppressed if they were deemed unreliable or if the subgroup being reported at a given level represented less than 5 percent of the test-takers at that level. Data that were not comparable with other years, due, for example, to changes in the state test as described above, appear in italics and were treated in calculations as missing data (and the missing result is indicated by "‡"). Average change calculations were performed on unrounded numbers.

Comparisons of District and State Performance in Reading and Mathematics (pages 12 and 13)

The information in the tables is organized as follows:

First column:	Subgroups are specified for the district and rest of state for each of the three levels (elementary, middle and high school)
Second column:	Percentages of students performing in the below proficient category are specified for the 2008 academic year
Third column:	Percentages of students performing in the proficient category are specified for the 2008 academic year
Fourth column:	Percentages of students performing in the advanced proficiency category are specified for the 2008 academic year

 © 2008 THE ELI AND EDYTHE BROAD FOUNDATION

Fifth column: Percentages of students performing in the proficient or above category are specified for the 2008 academic year

Sixth column: The "average change" in students performing in the below proficient category is shown. "Average change" was calculated as the slope of the best fit line among the available data points for 2005 through 2008.

Seventh column: The "average change" in students performing in the proficient category is shown. "Average change" was calculated as the slope of the best fit line among the available data points for 2005 through 2008.

Eighth column: The "average change" in students performing in the advanced proficiency category is shown. "Average change" was calculated as the slope of the best fit line among the available data points for 2005 through 2008.

Ninth column: The "average change" in students performing in the proficient or above category is shown. "Average change" was calculated as the slope of the best fit line among the available data points for 2005 through 2008.

Standardized Residuals for Reading and Mathematics (pages 14 and 15)

The trends for standardized residuals in reading and math at the elementary, middle and high school levels are shown on pages 14 and 15.

An ordinary least squares regression (OLS) analysis was conducted to determine the extent to which each Broad Prize-eligible district performed better or worse than other districts in its state given the district's percentage of low-income students. Specifically, the dependent variable in the regression analysis was the percentage of test takers in a district who were proficient or above on the state test. The independent variable was the percentage of test takers at the relevant level in the district who were low income. The regressions were weighted by district size, as measured by enrollment. This approach gives greater weight in the regressions to larger districts, and avoids possible undue influence of very small districts on the regression results. A separate regression was run for each year of data and each subject (reading and mathematics) for each level (elementary, middle, and high school) within each state.

Running the regressions required obtaining achievement data for all districts in the state, as well as data on the income status of test takers. In a few cases where data were available for the state and the eligible district, but were not available for all districts in the state, or where data on the proportion of test takers who were low income were not available, the regressions could not be run.

For each district, the expected or predicted proficiency level based on the regression was calculated. The difference between the district's actual percentage of students who scored at or above proficiency and the predicted or expected value is the residual. A positive residual indicates that the district is performing better than expected on the state test given their percentage of low-income students taking the test, while a negative residual indi-

Technical Notes and Methodology

cates lower-than-expected performance. It should be emphasized that residuals are relative performance measures. A district's performance was assessed relative to that of other districts in the state, not in absolute terms.

Some states changed tests over the period under review, and tests differed from state to state. Consequently, the interpretation of residuals varies. To allow for year-to-year comparisons, separate regressions for each year of data were run. In addition, in order to have a measure with greater comparability, The Broad Prize methodology uses "standardized residuals." A district's standardized residual is calculated by dividing its residual by the standard deviation of all residuals from the state regression.

As an example, a district in Arkansas may have a residual in elementary reading of 5.7 (meaning that they had 5.7 percent more students reach proficiency than their "expected level" given their district's poverty). At the same time, a district in Wisconsin may also have a residual of 5.7 in elementary reading. The assessment of how well each district is performing, however, may not be the same even though both have the same residual. If the majority of districts in Arkansas are within 6 percentage points of the expected performance level, while the majority of districts in Wisconsin are within 2 percentage points of the expected level, then the Wisconsin district is performing much better compared with its peers than the Arkansas district is compared with its peers. Standardizing the residuals helps account for differences in variability across states.

Caution must be exercised in comparing standardized residuals. For example, a district that performs above average in a state that ranks below the national average on NAEP may be performing no better than a district that performs below average in a state that ranks above the NAEP national average.

Separate residuals were calculated for each subject (reading and mathematics), level (elementary, middle and high school) and year (2005, 2006, 2007, and 2008). The table on the lower half of the page shows the standardized residuals values in reading or mathematics at the elementary, middle and high school levels, as well as "average change" and "decile rank." Improvement or "average change" in residuals was calculated as the slope of the best fit line among the available data points for 2005 through 2008. The slope was generally determined by regressing the available standardized residuals on year. If only one data point was available, or if residuals were missing for both 2007 and 2008, average change was not calculated. Decile ranks based on standardized residuals for all districts in a state regression were computed and the average decile ranks for 2007 and 2008 are presented. These average decile ranks were calculated separately by level (elementary, middle, and high school) and subject, and then averaged to produce a single performance measure for each eligible district. Decile ranks of 1–5, which represent the top half of residuals in the state, appear in color.

The table on the lower half of each page also shows the count of positive residuals for reading or mathematics and the count of available measures for that subject. Both tables show the count of positive residuals as well as the count of available residual measures for both subjects (reading and math) combined. Under the "decile rank"

 © 2008 THE ELI AND EDYTHE BROAD FOUNDATION

column, these rows show the average rank for the three education levels. Positive "average change" values and decile ranks in the upper half are shown in color.

Important Note Regarding the Comparison of Residuals for Different Districts

The analysis provides information on both performance and improvement. In theory, districts with high initial performance levels might be expected to have lower levels of improvement. A district that performed consistently above expectations during all four years, but did not improve, could still be thought of as consistently high performing.

In addition, because states use different tests and different standards of proficiency, individual states may be subject to "floor" or "ceiling" effects. If proficiency levels are generally very high in a state (near 90 percent, for example), then high-performing districts may not be able to show their relative achievement because their proficiency level cannot increase above 100 percent. Similarly, if state proficiency levels are very low, then the relative achievement of the higher performers may be understated because the lower performing districts cannot fall below zero percent.

Standardized Residuals Data for Reading and Mathematics (pages 14 and 15)

The upper half of each page shows three different trend bar charts, with standardized residuals for reading or mathematics for all students in 2005, 2006, 2007, and 2008 at the elementary, middle and high school levels. (Information for reading appears on page 14 and information for mathematics appears on page 15.)

The table on the lower half of each page is organized as follows:

First column:	Standardized residuals for each subject are specified for the district at each of the three levels (elementary, middle and high school) for all students. The table also shows the count of positive residuals and the count of available residual measures for all students in reading or mathematics and the combined counts of positive residuals and the count of available residual measures for both reading and mathematics.
Second column:	Standardized residuals are specified for the 2005 academic year
Third column:	Standardized residuals are specified for the 2006 academic year
Fourth column:	Standardized residuals are specified for the 2007 academic year
Fifth column:	Standardized residuals are specified for the 2008 academic year
Sixth column:	The "average change" calculation is shown. "Average change" was calculated as the slope of the best fit line among the available data points for 2005 through 2008.
Seventh column:	The average decile rank of the residual values for 2007 and 2008 is shown. For the "count of positive residuals" rows, the decile rank is the average rank for the three education levels.

Technical Notes and Methodology

High School Graduation Rates (page 16)

Three different methods were used to calculate high school graduation rates, all of which are considered reliable estimates of graduation rates in the absence of longitudinal student-level data.[4] While using longitudinal data generates the most accurate estimates of graduation rates, such information is not currently available in most states. Federal CCD data on enrollments and completions (as described above) were used to generate the graduation rate estimates. While each method uses CCD diploma counts for the graduating class in a given year, the methods rely on different years of enrollment data and, therefore, generate somewhat different results. Further descriptions of the individual methods are provided below.

Trend lines as well as specific graduation rates are shown for 2003 through 2006. The table also shows calculations for improvement over time. Simple change is calculated as the difference between 2003 and 2006, between 2004 and 2006, and between 2005 and 2006. Where data for one or two years in the pair were not available, not comparable or suppressed, these change calculations could not be performed. In addition, improvement or "average change" was calculated as the slope of the best fit line among the available data points for 2003 through 2006. If only one data point was available, or if data were missing for both 2005 and 2006, average change was not calculated.

Data could be missing either because they were not available (indicated by "—") or because they were suppressed (indicated by "†"). Graduation rates were suppressed if they were deemed unreliable or if a subgroup represented less than 5 percent of the district enrollment. Calculations were performed on unrounded numbers. Positive change values appear in color.

The three different high school graduation rate methods are:

1. The Averaged Freshman Graduation Rate (AFGR)
2. Urban Institute method (a.k.a. Cumulative Promotion Index or CPI)
3. Manhattan Institute method (a.k.a. Greene's Graduation Indicator or GGI)

The methodology for each of these is explained briefly below.

4 State education agencies may use different methods to calculate the graduation rates they report for federal accountability purposes; the graduation rates presented here may not match state-published rates. The three methods used for The Broad Prize provide comparable measures across the100 eligible districts that are located in 38 states and the District of Columbia.

 © 2008 THE ELI AND EDYTHE BROAD FOUNDATION

Technical Notes and Methodology

Averaged Freshman Graduation Rate (AFGR)

This method divides the number of students graduating in year t by an average of the eighth-grade enrollment in year t – 4, ninth-grade enrollment in year t – 3, and 10th-grade enrollment in year t – 2:

$$\text{Graduation Rate} = \frac{G_y}{\left(S_{8,y-4} + S_{9,y-3} + S_{10,y-2}\right)/3}$$

Where: G = Number of graduates receiving a regular diploma

y = School year

Denominator = Smoothed estimator for first-time 9th-grade enrollment

Urban Institute Method

This method assumes that graduation is a process composed of three grade-to-grade promotion transitions (9 to 10, 10 to 11, and 11 to 12), in addition to the graduation event (grade 12 to receipt of a diploma). Each of the transitions is calculated as a probability, based on current-year statistics, by dividing the enrollment of the current year by the enrollment of the previous year for the grade in question. These separate probabilities are then multiplied to produce the probability that a student in that school system will graduate.

$$\text{Graduation Rate} = \frac{S_{10,y+1}}{S_{9,y}} * \frac{S_{11,y+1}}{S_{10,y}} * \frac{S_{12,y+1}}{S_{11,y}} * \frac{G_y}{S_{12,y}}$$

Where: S_{grade} = Number of students in a specified grade

y = School year

G = Number of graduates receiving a regular diploma

Manhattan Institute Method

This calculation estimates an on-time graduation rate. The number of students who receive a diploma at time t is divided by an estimate of the number of students in the ninth-grade cohort three years earlier. The estimate of the ninth-grade cohort size is a smoothed estimator that takes into account population changes as students migrate between the public and private sectors between eighth and ninth grades, high ninth-grade enrollments due to higher than average retention in the ninth-grade year, and declining enrollment in 10th grade as students begin dropping out. This denominator is also adjusted for enrollment variability due to student mobility among districts and states rather than dropping out.

$$\text{Graduation Rate} = \frac{G_y}{\left(1 + \frac{\left(S_{9,y} + S_{10,y} + S_{11,y} + S_{12,y}\right) - \left(S_{9,y-3} + S_{10,y-3} + S_{11,y-3} + S_{12,y-3}\right)}{S_{9,y-3} + S_{10,y-3} + S_{11,y-3} + S_{12,y-3}}\right) * \left(\frac{S_{8,y-4} + S_{9,y-3} + S_{10,y-2}}{3}\right)}$$

Where: G = Number of graduates receiving a regular diploma

y = School year

S_{grade} = Number of students in a specified grade

Technical Notes and Methodology

A recent National Center for Education Statistics study reported that when calculating a statewide graduation rate, the Averaged Freshman Graduation Rate came closest to approximating a longitudinal graduation rate. The smaller the district, state or student group being analyzed, the less precisely the three graduation rates estimate the true longitudinal graduation rate. The different methodologies sometimes lead to very different results because each uses different types of data from different years. All three have strengths and weaknesses but are considered acceptable.

Estimated high school graduation rates table: 2003–2006 (page 16)

In the upper half of the page, three different trend charts, with data for 2003, 2004, 2005, and 2006, are shown for each of the three different graduation rates for all students and for African-American, Asian, Hispanic and White student subgroups.

In the lower half of the page, the information in the table is organized as follows:

First column:	The three different graduation rate methods, Averaged Freshmen Graduation Rate, Urban Institute Method and Manhattan Institute Method, are specified for all students and for the African-American, Asian, Hispanic and White student subgroups.
Second column:	Graduation rates are specified for the 2003 academic year
Third column:	Graduation rates are specified for the 2004 academic year
Fourth column:	Graduation rates are specified for the 2005 academic year
Fifth column:	Graduation rates are specified for the 2006 academic year
Sixth column:	Change in the graduation rates is shown for the 2006 academic year minus the 2003 academic year
Seventh column:	Change in the graduation rates is shown for the 2006 academic year minus the 2004 academic year
Eighth column:	Change in the graduation rates is shown for the 2006 academic year minus the 2005 academic year
Ninth column:	The "average change" calculation is shown. "Average change" was calculated as the slope of the best fit line among the available data points for 2003 through 2006.

College Readiness Data (page 17)

District-level measures of the college readiness of students include SAT, ACT and Advanced Placement. The table provides measures of performance on these tests and participation rates.

With district permission, College Board and ACT provided SAT (reading and math) test scores and mean ACT (composite) test scores, respectively, for each district for 2005 through 2008. The SAT reading and math scores were combined to produce mean total SAT scores. Mean ACT composite scores were reported as provided. The College Board also provided the number of AP examinations at each score level (1 to 5) for each district for 2005

 © 2008 THE ELI AND EDYTHE BROAD FOUNDATION

through 2008. The percentage of AP tests taken that earned passing scores (3 or above) was calculated. The percent of all AP tests taken with scores of three or above are detailed in this report.

The College Board and ACT do not calculate test participation rates. However, they provided the number of seniors who had taken the SAT and ACT tests (regardless of when they took the test during high school), as well as the number of juniors and seniors who took any AP test in the given year. Participation rates were calculated using these numbers as the numerator and enrollment data for 11th- and 12th-graders from the federal CCD as the denominator.[5]

The tables also show calculations of improvement over time. Simple change is calculated as the difference between 2005 and 2008, between 2006 and 2008, and between 2007 and 2008. Where data for one or two years in the pair were not available or suppressed, these change calculations could not be performed.

The "average change" calculation is shown. "Average change" was calculated as the slope of the best fit line among the available data points for 2005 through 2008. If only one data point was available, or if data were missing for both 2007 and 2008, average change was not calculated. Calculations were performed on unrounded numbers. Positive change values appear in color.

Data were suppressed if they were deemed unreliable. Test scores were suppressed if they were based on the performance of fewer than 15 students, as required by the College Board. Participation rates were suppressed if a subgroup represented less than 5 percent of enrollment in the relevant grades. In addition, subgroup results were suppressed if data on the number of test takers whose race/ethnicity was identified represented less than 90 percent of the total number of test takers for a given test and year.

Test scores and participation rates on college readiness examinations: 2005–2008 (page 17)

The information in the table is organized as follows:

First column:	The table is divided into the three different college readiness sections: SAT, ACT, and Advanced Placement. Each college readiness section first shows performance measures and then participation rates for all students as well as for the African-American, Asian, Hispanic and White student subgroups.
Second column:	Relevant values are listed for the 2005 academic year
Third column:	Relevant values are listed for the 2006 academic year
Fourth column:	Relevant values are listed for the 2007 academic year
Fifth column:	Relevant values are listed for the 2008 academic year
Sixth column:	Change in values is shown for the 2008 academic year minus the 2005 academic year

5 Participation rates in 2008 were calculated using 2007 CCD enrollments as the denominator, because 2008 enrollment data were not yet available.

Technical Notes and Methodology

Seventh column: Change in values is shown for the 2008 academic year minus the 2006 academic year

Eighth column: Change in values is shown for the 2008 academic year minus the 2007 academic year

Ninth column: The "average change" calculation is shown. "Average change" was calculated as the slope of the best fit line among the available data points for 2005 through 2008.

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) (page 18)

The upper table shows overall AYP results for 2005, 2006, 2007, and 2008. For each year, the upper rows show the percentage of schools in the district meeting AYP targets and the percentage of schools in the state meeting AYP targets. The lower rows show whether overall AYP targets were met ("Y" for yes, "N" for no) by the levels/categories by which AYP is determined within that state for the given year.

The information in the lower table is organized as follows:

First column: The breakdown of AYP results in English language arts and in mathematics are specified for the specific student subgroups for which districts and schools are held accountable in the state.

Second column: AYP proficiency results are listed for 2008 or the most recent year for which results by accountability subgroup were available.

Third column: AYP participation results are listed for 2008 or the most recent year for which results by accountability subgroup were available

 © 2008 THE ELI AND EDYTHE BROAD FOUNDATION