



Results from the
2009-10 School Year

BEATING THE ODDS

Analysis of **Student Performance**
on State Assessments and NAEP



BEATING THE ODDS

Analysis of **Student Performance**
On State Assessments and NAEP

Results from the 2009-10 School Year

Renata Uzzell, Research Manager
Candace Simon, Research Manager
Amanda Horwitz, Research Manager
Makeda Amelga, Research Intern

Sharon Lewis, Research Director
Michael Casserly, Executive Director



March 2011

Acknowledgments

The Council of the Great City Schools thanks our superintendents, school board members, research directors, and staff for their courage in producing this report and for their commitment to our urban schoolchildren.

Sources

Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2009 Reading Assessment.

Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2009 Mathematics

Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, "Public Elementary/Secondary School Universe Survey," and "Local Education Agency Universe Survey." (All data are labeled preliminary by NCES.)

State Department of Education websites.

Council of the Great City Schools

The Council of the Great City Schools is a coalition of 65 of the nation's largest urban school systems. Its Board of Directors is composed of the Superintendent of Schools and one School Board member from each member city. An Executive Committee of 24 individuals, equally divided in number between Superintendents and School Board members, provides oversight of the 501 (c)(3) organization in between Board meetings. The mission of the Council is to advocate for and to assist in the improvement of public education in the nation's major cities. To meet that mission, the Council provides services to its members in the areas of legislation, research, communications, curriculum and instruction, and management. The group convenes two major conferences each year on promising practices in urban education; conducts studies on urban school conditions and trends; and operates ongoing networks of senior personnel, communications, curriculum, research, technology, and others. The Council was founded in 1956 and incorporated in 1961, and has its headquarters in Washington, DC.

Chair

Dilafruz Williams, Board Member
Portland Public Schools

Chair-Elect

Beverly Hall, Superintendent
Atlanta Public Schools

Secretary/Treasurer

Candy Olson, Board Member
Hillsborough County School District

Immediate Past Chair

Carol Johnson, Superintendent
Boston Public Schools

Executive Director

Michael Casserly

Task Forces on Achievement and Professional Development

Eileen Cooper Reed, Board Member
Cincinnati Public Schools

Carlos Garcia, Superintendent
San Francisco Unified School District

Carol Comeau, Superintendent
Anchorage Alaska

Lydia Lee, Board Member
Minneapolis Public Schools

Deborah Shanley, Dean
Brooklyn College, City University of New York

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Figures and Tables	VI
Executive Summary.....	1
Introduction	9
District Achievement on State Assessments.....	15
I. Improving Mathematics Achievement: A Natural Priority	15
II. Improving Reading Achievement: A Fundamental Challenge	19
District Achievement on NAEP.....	23
I. NAEP Mathematics	24
II. NAEP Reading.....	27
Student Demographics and Staffing.....	31
Discussion.....	35
Appendix A: Number of Districts Reporting and Improving in Figures 1-4.....	37
Appendix B: Number of Districts Reporting and Improving in Figures 5-7.....	38
Appendix C: Number of Districts Reporting and Improving in Figures 8-11.....	39
Appendix D: Number of Districts Reporting and Improving in Figures 12-14	40
Appendix E: TUDA Participation in Reading and Mathematics	41
Appendix F: Trends in NAEP Proficiency Levels for TUDA Cities in Math.....	42
Appendix G: Trends in NAEP Proficiency Levels for TUDA Cities in Reading	43
Appendix H: Calculations.....	44

FIGURES

Figure 1.	Percentage of Districts with Percentage Point Gains on State Math Assessments, 2007-2010	15
Figure 2.	Percentage of Districts with Gains in Math Between 2007 and 2010 by Grade.....	16
Figure 3.	Percentage of Districts Performing At or Above States' Proficiency Rates in Math, 2007- 2010	16
Figure 4.	Percentage of Districts with Faster Growth than State in Math, 2010.....	16
Figure 5.	Percentage of Districts with 4th and 8th Grade Math Percentage Point Change Between 2007 and 2010 by Student Ethnicity	17
Figure 6.	Percentage of Districts with 4th and 8th Grade Math Percentage Point Change Between 2007 and 2010 by Student Group.....	17
Figure 7.	Percentage of Districts Reducing Achievement Gaps in Math, 2010.....	17
Figure 8.	Percentage of Districts with Percentage Point Gains on State Reading Assessments, 2007-2010.....	19
Figure 9.	Percentage of Districts with Gains in Reading Between 2007 and 2010 by Grade	19
Figure 10.	Percentage of Districts Performing At or Above States' Proficiency Rates in Reading, 2007-2010.....	20
Figure 11.	Percentage of Districts with Faster Growth than State in Reading, 2010	20
Figure 12.	Percentage of Districts with 4th and 8th Grade Reading Percentage Point Change Between 2007 and 2010 by Student ethnicity	21
Figure 13.	Percentage of Districts with 4th and 8th Grade Reading Percentage Point Change Between 2007 and 2010 by Student Group.....	21
Figure 14.	Percentage of Districts Reducing Achievement Gaps in Reading, 2010.....	21
Figure 15.	Percentage of Students Performing At or Above Proficient on NAEP Math Between 2005 and 2009 Large Cities vs. National Public	24

FIGURES CONT'D.

Figure 16. Percentage of Students in TUDA Districts Performing At or Above Proficient on NAEP Math in 2009	24
Figure 17. Percentage of Students Eligible for FRPL Performing At or Above Proficient in Math in 2009 Large Cities vs. National Public.....	25
Figure 18. Percentage of Students Performing At or Above Proficient by Student Ethnicity in Math 2009 Large Cities vs. National Public.....	25
Figure 19. Percentage of Students Performing At or Above Proficient on NAEP Reading Between 2005-2009 Large Cities vs. National Public.....	27
Figure 20. Percentage of Students in TUDA Districts Performing At or Above Proficient on NAEP Reading in 2009.....	27
Figure 21. Percentage of Students Eligible for FRPL Performing At or Above Proficient in Reading 2009 Large Cities vs. National Public	28
Figure 22. Percentage of students Performing At or Above Proficient by Student Ethnicity in Reading 2009 Large Cities vs. National Public.....	28
Figure 23. CGCS Demographic Profile	33



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Council of the Great City Schools has prepared this tenth edition of *Beating the Odds* to give the nation an in-depth look at how big city schools are performing on the academic goals and standards set by the states. This analysis examines student achievement in mathematics and reading from spring 2007 through spring 2010. It also measures achievement gaps between cities and states, Blacks and Whites, Hispanics and Whites, and between other student groups. Finally, the report examines district progress. It asks two critical questions: “Are urban schools improving academically?” and “Are urban schools closing achievement gaps?”

In general, *Beating the Odds X* shows that the Great City Schools continue to make important gains in mathematics and reading scores on state assessments. The study also presents evidence that gaps may be narrowing.

As with other reports in this series, the findings in *Beating the Odds X* are to be interpreted with caution. The nation does not have an assessment system that allows us to measure progress relative to the same standard across all school districts in the country. The Council of the Great City Schools is addressing this weakness through the Trial Urban District Assessment (TUDA) of the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) and by advocating for common standards in reading, mathematics, and science. TUDA data are prominently displayed in this report.

Data from this report indicate that urban school districts are making progress. Some outcomes look better than others. Trend lines differ from one city to another. Performance at the elementary level is generally better than at the middle grades. Nevertheless, the data indicate overall movement and progress. Furthermore, the results from the TUDA assessments in reading and mathematics indicate that Large Cities (LC) and most individual districts are making some progress. While NAEP performance trends are emerging, it is important to note that the nation is moving towards a uniform set of academic standards.

This report is the nation’s tenth look at how its major city school systems are performing on the state assessments devised to boost standards, measure progress, provide opportunity, and

ensure accountability for results. Data are presented on 65 city school systems from 36 states and the District of Columbia. The statistics are presented year-by-year and grade-by-grade on each state test in mathematics and reading between 2006-2007 and 2009-2010. City-by-city statistics are available on the Council’s website, www.cgcs.org. We also present data by race, language, disability, and income in cases where the states report these publicly.

Every effort was made to report achievement data in a way that was consistent with the No Child Left Behind Act— that is, according to the percentages of students above “proficiency.” Additionally, the progress of students at the lowest levels of academic attainment is reported so that we can evaluate how urban school districts are serving our most vulnerable students.

BTO X also examines how urban districts participating in NAEP are progressing. Their scores are compared to students in the National Public (NP) sample. Additionally, urban district scores are compared to scores of students in Large Cities (LC), as defined by NAEP. It is important to note that students attending the Great City Schools represent at least 70% of students enrolled in Large Cities; therefore, this statistic is important as we measure and monitor progress across the Great City Schools.

The report also presents important demographic data. Included are enrollment data by race, poverty, English-language proficiency, and disability status. Statistics are also presented on student/teacher ratios and average school size. Finally, changes in these variables between 2005-2006 and 2008-2009 (the most recent year on which federally collected data are available) are shown. Data are presented for each city and state.

Where We Are Today: Key Findings

To assess student achievement in the Great City Schools, the Council analyzed state assessment data in a variety of ways.

First, we examined the percentage of Great City School students who scored at or above proficiency on their respective state assessment. These data on fourth and eighth graders are reported from 2006-2007 through 2009-2010.

Second, the Council looked at gaps in student scores on state assessments based on race as well as economic, language, and disability status. We wanted to determine the extent to which the Great City Schools have reduced achievement gaps and to discern which grades were making the most progress in narrowing the gaps. Rather than defining the achievement gaps as the difference between the various student groups within each district, we define the gap as the difference between the proficiency rates of a given student group in the district and their comparison group statewide. For example, we compared the proficiency rate of Black students in a given district to White students in the same grade across the state. We also compared other student groups like English language learners in the district to non English language learners across the state. This innovation eliminates the artificial “zero-sum” game that pits students in the same district against one another, and takes into account the fact that some cities have very few White or economically advantaged students to whom a comparison can be made.

Third, the Council looked at whether the performance of each Great City School district was above or below the average for its state. We did not examine school-by-school data or “group performance within school” data because of the sheer volume of such an analysis.

Finally, this report examines the progress of districts participating in NAEP, comparing their 2009 TUDA scores with those of Large Cities (LC) and National Public (NP) variables.

Eleven major findings about student achievement in urban schools emerged from this study, *Beating the Odds X*.¹

Finding 1: Mathematics achievement on state assessments is improving in urban schools

The Council’s analysis of district and student mathematics scores in the fourth and eighth grades on state assessments shows an increase in the percentage of students scoring at or above proficient since 2007 --

- Eighty-three percent of districts increased the percentage of fourth-grade students who scored at or above proficient between 2007 and 2010. A quarter of districts increased the percentage of fourth graders that scored at or above proficient by greater than 10 percentage points.
- Eighty-four percent of districts increased the percentage of eighth-grade students who scored at or above proficient between 2007 and 2010. Over a quarter of the districts increased the percentage of eighth-grade students that scored at or above proficient by greater than 10 percentage points.
- Fifty-six percent of districts showed increased performance for all grades tested on their respective state assessments; 86% showed increased performance for half or more of the grades tested.

Finding 2: Urban school achievement is below state averages in mathematics on state assessments

Despite significant gains in performance and faster rates of improvement than their states, the majority of urban school districts continue to score below state

¹ This and subsequent calculations include only those states in which the Great City School districts are located.

averages on fourth and eighth-grade mathematics assessments since 2007 --

- Some 51% of districts' annual change in students scoring at or above proficient was greater than their respective states in the fourth grade, and 60% had greater annual growth in proficiency than their respective state in the eighth grade.
- Some 21% of Great City School districts had fourth-grade proficiency rates at or above their respective state, while fifteen percent of districts had eighth-grade proficiency rates at or above their respective states.

The districts with fourth-grade mathematics scores equal to or greater than their respective states included Albuquerque, Anchorage, Austin, Broward County (FL), Charleston, Clark County (NV), District of Columbia (DC), Guilford, Long Beach, Palm Beach (FL), Portland, San Diego, San Francisco, and Seattle. Districts with eighth-grade mathematics scores equal to or greater than their respective states included Albuquerque, Anchorage, Broward County (FL), Charleston, Palm Beach (FL), and Portland.

Finding 3: Gaps in mathematics achievement on state assessments in urban schools appear to be narrowing

The Council's analysis of fourth and eighth-grade mathematics scores shows some progress in reducing racially and economically identifiable achievement gaps. The data show that on state assessments since 2007 --

- The majority of the Great City School districts² – 66% – narrowed the gap between their fourth-grade Black students and fourth-grade White students statewide in mathematics proficiency. At the eighth-grade level, 70% of the Great City School districts narrowed the achievement gap between their Black students and White students statewide in mathematics.

- Sixty-six percent of the Great City School districts narrowed the gap between their fourth-grade Hispanic students and White fourth graders statewide. Sixty-seven percent of Great City School districts narrowed the Hispanic-White gap in mathematics achievement among eighth graders.
- Sixty-two percent of the Great City School districts narrowed the mathematics achievement gap between economically disadvantaged fourth graders and non-economically disadvantaged fourth graders statewide. At the eighth grade level, 56% of districts narrowed this gap.

Finding 4: Reading achievement on state assessments is improving in urban schools

The Council's analysis of district and student reading scores in the fourth and eighth grades on state assessments shows an increase in the percentage of students scoring at or above proficient since 2007 --

- Sixty-six percent of districts increased the percentage of fourth-grade students who scored at or above proficient between 2007 and 2010. Thirteen percent of districts increased the percentage of fourth graders that scored at or above proficient by greater than 10 percentage points.
- Eighty-four percent of districts increased the percentage of eighth-grade students who scored at or above proficient between 2007 and 2010. A third of the districts increased the percentage of eighth graders that scored at or above proficient by greater than 10 percentage points.
- Twenty-two percent of districts showed increased performance for all grades tested on their respective state assessments. Some 76% of districts showed increased performance for half or more of all grades tested.

²Data were not available for every district. The percentages of districts achieving specified outcomes vary from finding to finding. Appendix A shows the number of districts included in each analysis

Finding 5: Urban student achievement on state assessments is below state averages in reading

Despite significant gains in performance urban school districts continue to score below state averages on fourth and eighth-grade reading assessments.

- Some 56% of districts' annual change in fourth-grade students scoring at or above proficient was greater than their respective states in reading; approximately half of the districts had greater annual growth in proficiency than their respective state in the eighth grade.³
- Some 23% of districts had fourth-grade proficiency rates that were equal to or greater than their respective states; 19% of districts had eighth-grade proficiency rates that were equal to or greater than their states.

The districts with fourth-grade reading scores equal to or greater than their respective states included Albuquerque, Anchorage, Austin, Broward County (FL), Charleston, District of Columbia (DC), Jackson, Long Beach, Orange County, Portland, Palm Beach County (FL), San Diego, San Francisco, and Seattle. Districts with eighth-grade reading scores equal to or greater than their respective states included Albuquerque, Anchorage, Broward County (FL), Charleston, Hillsborough, New York City, Orange County, Palm Beach County, Portland, San Diego, San Francisco and Seattle.

Finding 6: Gaps in reading achievement on state assessments in urban schools appear to be narrowing

Evidence from the Council's analysis of fourth and eighth-grade reading scores shows some progress in reducing racially and economically identifiable achievement gaps. The data show that on state assessments since 2007 --

³That is, compared to the states served by the Council of the Great City Schools districts.

- Some 62% of districts narrowed the achievement gap between their Black fourth graders and White fourth graders statewide; 54% of Great City School districts narrowed the achievement gap in reading between their Black eighth graders and White eighth graders statewide.
- Seventy-eight percent of districts narrowed the achievement gap in reading between their Hispanic fourth graders and White fourth graders statewide; 63% of districts narrowed the achievement gap in reading between their Hispanic eighth graders and White eighth graders statewide.
- Sixty-three percent of districts narrowed the achievement gap in reading between their economically disadvantaged fourth graders and non-economically disadvantaged fourth graders statewide; 66% of districts narrowed this economic achievement gap in the eighth grade.

Finding 7: Students in large cities (LC) and those in public schools across the nation (NP) made significant gains from 2005 to 2009 on NAEP mathematics in both grades four and eight. Large city (LC) students made significant gains in reading grade four only while national public (NP) students made significant gains in both grades 4 and 8

- The percentage of fourth graders in Large Cities (LC) who scored at or above proficient in mathematics increased significantly from 24 in 2005 to 29 in 2009. The change in the percentage of fourth graders in NP who scored at or above proficient increased significantly from 2005 (35) to 2009 (38).
- The percentage of eighth graders in LC who scored at or above proficient in mathematics increased significantly from 19 in 2005 to 24 in 2009. The percentage of eighth graders in NP who scored at or above proficient increased significantly from 28 in 2005 to 33 in 2009.

- The percentage of fourth graders in LC who scored at or above proficient in reading increased significantly from 20 in 2005 to 23 in 2009. The percentage of fourth graders in NP who scored at or above proficient increased significantly from 30 to 32.
- The percentage of eighth graders in LC who scored at or above proficient in reading was not significantly different from 2005 (20) to 2009 (21). The percentage of eighth graders in NP increased significantly from 29 in 2005 to 30 in 2009.

Finding 8: A few districts outperform public schools nationwide on NAEP in mathematics

- The percentage of fourth graders who scored at or above proficient in Charlotte (45) was significantly higher than fourth graders in NP (38).
- The percentage of eighth graders who scored at or above proficient in Austin (39) was significantly higher than eighth graders in NP (33).

Finding 9: A few districts perform no different than public schools nationwide on NAEP in reading

- The percentage of fourth graders who scored at or above proficient in Austin (32), Charlotte (36), Jefferson County (KY) (30), Miami-Dade (31), New York City (29) and San Diego (29) was not significantly different from fourth graders in NP (32).
- The percentage of eighth graders who scored at or above proficient in Austin (30), Charlotte (28), and Miami-Dade (28) was not significantly different than eighth graders in NP (29).

Finding 10: Some student groups in TUDA districts outperform their counterparts in public schools across the nation on NAEP in mathematics

- The percentage of White fourth graders who scored at or above proficient in mathematics in Atlanta (79), Austin (74), Charlotte (72), District of Columbia (81), and Houston (71) was significantly higher than White fourth graders in NP (50). The percentage of White eighth graders in Austin (70), Boston (67), Charlotte (58), and Houston (67) who scored at or above proficient in mathematics was significantly higher than White eighth graders in NP (43).
- The percentage of Black fourth graders who scored at or above proficient in mathematics in Boston (23), Charlotte (24), and New York City (21) was significantly higher than Black fourth graders in NP (15). The percentage of Black eighth graders who scored at or above proficient in mathematics in Austin (21), Boston (18), and Charlotte (17) was significantly higher than Black eighth graders in NP (12).
- The percentage of Hispanic fourth graders who scored at or above proficient in mathematics in Houston (28) and Miami-Dade (35) was significantly higher than Hispanic fourth graders in NP (21). The percentage of Hispanic eighth graders who scored at or above proficient in mathematics in Austin (22) and Miami-Dade (23) was significantly higher than Hispanic eighth graders in NP (17).
- The percentage of lower-income fourth graders who scored at or above proficient in mathematics in Boston (25) and New York City (32) was significantly higher than lower-income fourth graders in NP (22). The percentage of lower-income eighth graders who scored at or above proficient in Boston (23) and New York (23) was significantly higher than lower-income students in NP (17).

Finding 11: Some student groups in TUDA districts outperform their counterparts in public schools across the nation on NAEP in reading.

- The percentage of White fourth graders who scored at or above proficient in reading in Atlanta (76), Austin (64), Charlotte (59), DCPS (75) and Houston (59) was significantly higher than White fourth graders in NP (41). The percentage of White eighth graders who scored at or above proficient in Atlanta (70), Austin (55), Boston (55) and Charlotte (48) was significantly higher than White eighth graders in NP (39).
- The percentage of Hispanic fourth graders who scored at or above proficient in reading in Miami-Dade (34) was significantly higher than Hispanic fourth graders in NP (16). The percentage of Hispanic eighth graders who scored at or above proficient in Miami-Dade (29) was significantly higher than Hispanic eighth graders in NP (16).
- The percentage of lower-income fourth graders who scored at or above proficient in reading in Miami-Dade (23) and New York City (26) was significantly higher than lower-income fourth graders in NP (17). The percentage of lower-income eighth graders who scored at or above proficient in Miami-Dade (21) was significantly higher than lower-income eighth graders in NP (16).

Who We Are Today: Key Factors That Shape the Urban Context

Big-city school systems are different from districts in other settings. They serve a demographically different student body and they operate in political and financial environments that are more complex, contentious, and competitive than smaller systems.

These contextual differences are significant and should be considered in any study of urban school achievement. The Council's analysis identified two broad factors that warrant attention as the nation strives to meet the goals established by No Child Left Behind.

Factor 1: The nation cannot meet the broad goals of No Child Left Behind and raise achievement across the board without paying attention to students enrolled in urban schools.

- The Great City Schools enrolled 16% of the nation's public school students in school year 2008-2009.
- In 2008-2009, the Great City Schools enrolled about one third of the nation's Black, limited English proficient and Hispanic students and about a quarter of the nation's economically disadvantaged students.

Factor 2: Students in urban schools are more likely to be Black, Hispanic, or Asian American; to come from low-income families; and to be raised in non-English speaking homes than other students.

The Council's analysis showed that—

- Eighty percent of students in the Great City Schools in 2008-2009 were Black, Hispanic, Asian American, or other students of color, compared with about 44% nationwide.
- Sixty-five percent of students in the Great City Schools in 2008-2009 were eligible for a federal free lunch subsidy, compared with about 44% nationwide.
- Sixteen percent of students in the Great City Schools in 2008-2009 were English language learners, compared with approximately nine percent nationwide.



INTRODUCTION

The movement to reform education in the U.S. is grounded in concerns for improving America's urban public schools. Conversations about standards, testing, vouchers, charter schools, funding, equity, desegregation, governance, privatization, mayoral control, social promotions, and accountability are discussions—at their core—about public education in the cities. It is a discussion worth having, for nowhere does the national resolve to strengthen our educational system face a tougher test than in our large urban centers. There, every problem is more pronounced, every solution harder to implement.

For many years progress in urban education appeared to be at a standstill. Critics noted that performance was stagnant and urban systems seemed paralyzed by structural problems in governance, labor relations, bureaucracy, resources, management, operations, and politics.

Urban school leadership appeared to have tried everything and come up short: thousands of education programs, hundreds of curricular changes, countless social interventions, and numerous parental involvement strategies—all at a cost of millions of dollars. Among many observers, there was the nagging fear that the struggle was lost and the effort wasted.

What changed the outlook, of course, was the standards movement in the early 90s. The public reminded educators—particularly those in cities—why we were in business in the first place and what we were being held responsible for delivering. Not only did the priorities of big city schools change, but the prospects for meeting our challenges brightened as well. Urban leaders redoubled their efforts. They improved their support to schools, designed more purposeful professional development, better aligned their curricula to state standards, differentiated instruction, and created meaningful accountability systems; thus bringing forth the first fragile signs that a turn-around in urban education was indeed possible.

Urban schools know that it is not enough to assure people that we are working harder to meet high standards or to say that public education is worth the investment, although both are surely true. We must back up those assurances with results—concrete, verifiable documentation that our efforts to improve education in the cities are paying off and that the public's money is being well spent.

This report provides a tenth look at the performance of the Great City Schools on assessments used by the states to measure student achievement and to hold districts and schools accountable under the federal No Child Left Behind Act. *Beating the Odds X* also examines the progress that urban districts have made on the Trial Urban District Assessment (TUDA) of the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). The report seeks to answer the questions, “Are urban schools improving?” and “Are achievement gaps narrowing?” This report provides a straightforward picture of urban school progress to the public, the press, policymakers, educators, and everyone with a stake in education reform.

The report is divided into two sections:

- The first section explains the purpose of the report, the methods used to analyze the data, and the limitations of that data. It lays out the main findings emerging from the Council's analysis of state assessment data, TUDA, and other information. It also presents graphs and bullets showing critical trends in urban student achievement and changes in urban school demographic patterns.
- The second section presents individual district profiles reporting demographics and achievement data for each Council district. Earlier print editions of this report included individual district profiles.

This year, because of the sheer volume of the profiles, the individual profiles are available on our website at <http://www.cgcs.org>. There, readers have the option of downloading the districts of most interest to them.

The purpose of measuring student performance and reporting it to the public is, of course, to channel help to those students, schools, and communities that need it most—and to honestly confront shortcomings and pursue needed improvements. This report will show the shortcomings and the progress. It also lays out the challenges, for Beating the Odds X is not only a report card on urban education—it is also a report card on the nation and its commitment to leave no child behind.

Methodology

This report presents district-by-district reading and mathematics achievement for 65 of the nation's major city school systems. It provides performance data from spring 2007 through spring 2010. It also presents state-test data by year, grade, race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and language and disability status.

These state assessment results were collected by Council staff from a number of sources. Each state's website was searched for information that described its assessments, the grades and subjects in which the tests were administered, the years in which the tests were given, the format or metric in which results were reported, and changes in test forms, procedures, or scales. The decision was ultimately made to include data only on reading (or language arts) and mathematics, because all states reported results in these critical subject areas. Science results will be added in subsequent reports.

Assessment data were then examined to determine the number of years the state had administered the tests to ensure that the report included only results that were comparable from year to year. Data were eliminated if states changed tests or significantly modified their guidelines about which students to test.

Data were also collected by race where reported by the state. Not all states report their disaggregated data, even if they gather it. Results for Black, Alaskan Native/American Indian, Asian American/Pacific Islander, Hispanic and White students are included in this report.

When available, data were also collected on economically disadvantaged students (usually defined as free & reduced price lunch or Title I eligibility), English language learners (usually defined as limited English proficiency or bilingual), and students with disabilities (usually defined as Special Education or students with Individualized Education Plans).

The reader should note that data are generally presented in the same way that the federal No Child Left Behind legislation requires. Every effort was made to report district-wide data in "performance levels" to show the percentage of students who score at or above "proficient" or "below basic" levels as specified in the law. We did not report "at or below basic" categories, as this represents only the inverse of proficiency scores rather than a meaningful category of the lowest level of achievement.

We then calculated the annual change for each district and juxtaposed it against the state's progress over the same period so the reader could compare each district's rate of progress with that of its state.

In addition to the data presented for individual districts, aggregate test results are reported for districts. Aggregate district results are generated by counting the number of districts that achieved a particular outcome (e.g., the number of districts that increased or decreased achievement gaps since the earliest year of data reported for their district in this edition of BTO).

Data Limitations

The assessment data presented in *Beating the Odds X* have a number of important limitations that readers should keep in mind. We have not been able to correct many of these problems since our first report was published because states have not always changed how they report their results. The reader should be aware of the following limitations in the data—

1. As a result of the nation's 50-state assessment system, it is not possible to compare assessment data across states. Each state has developed its own test, test administration guidelines, timelines, grades tested, and other technical features. It is not technically sound to compare districts across state lines. Therefore, the report does not rank cities on their performance, nor are test results in one state or city directly compared with any other. Comparisons within a given state can be made but should be done with caution.
2. Trend lines vary in duration from state to state. Because of differences in testing patterns, data availability, and changes in tests from state to state, some districts have trend lines spanning more years than other districts do. Some may have data for as many as four years (from 2006-2007 through 2009-2010), while others may have data for just one year.
3. No tests of statistical significance were conducted on test-score changes on state assessments, nor are standard errors of measurement included in this report. Most states do not yet publish the statistics necessary to make these calculations possible. As such, the comparisons in this report are made using point estimates rather than confidence intervals.
4. Tests also vary in their degree of difficulty. This report did not attempt to analyze the difficulty or rigor of state assessments. A state with a challenging test may produce lower district scores, while a state with an easy test may have higher district scores. High scores do not necessarily mean an easier test, however.
5. States use similar terminology for the various performance levels (i.e., advanced, proficient, basic, and below basic), but these terms do not mean the same things from state to state. A level of student performance that is considered "proficient" in one state may be "basic" or below in another. In addition, the scale from the highest possible score to the lowest will differ from test to test and will affect how close city averages look compared to their states. Moreover, the distance between any two points on a scale may not be the same.
6. The data in this report are limited by what each state publicly reports. There may be circumstances where the data in this report are incomplete because the state has not posted all of its findings on its website or has not broadly circulated reports containing the findings by our publication date.
7. One part of the analysis compares specific districts to their respective states in the most recent year of testing: 2009-2010. Districts with 2009-2010 data were only included in the analysis if 2009-2010 data was also available for their state. These calculations are represented in the summary statistics regarding district performance relative to their states.
8. State and aggregate results in the report include data from the respective cities. We have not attempted to remove city data from state or national averages before making comparisons.
9. Some states administer reading tests to their students; other states administer an English language arts test. This report presents both kinds of data under the general "reading" heading. In general, language arts tests include both reading and writing, but states may have such tests with differing mixes of the two areas. In addition, the types of writing included on the state tests may differ from state-to-state and from year-to-year. For instance, one year a state may have a writing component that calls for students to write a narrative, but the next year, the state may have students summarizing information or responding to a literature prompt. Scores can fluctuate accordingly. This report relies mainly on reading tests to summarize our findings, but if language arts tests are available instead of reading tests those results are used here.

10. Finally, the reader should recognize that the state assessment data are not the same as data provided on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). The state tests may not measure the same things as NAEP; they are given to all children, not just a sample; they use different scale scores, if they use scale scores at all; they use different definitions—in the vast majority of cases—of what proficiency means; they are often much less rigorous; and were designed for different purposes.

Demographic and Staffing Data

To place the academic gains in context, the Council collected additional data on district demographics and staffing. This information came from various surveys of the National Center for Education Statistics that we collected through the Common Core of Data. Trends for each variable are shown for school years 2005-2006 and 2008-2009 (the most recent year for which federal data were available). Thus, the time period for these contextual data is slightly different from the period for which test scores were reported.

Once the data were collected, the Council prepared preliminary profiles on each member city. Profiles were e-mailed to the superintendent and the research director of each member district. Districts were asked to review the data, submit corrections, and add clarifying comments and end notes.

Corrections to the profiles were then made. Few districts adjusted any of the statewide achievement reports, but some provided clarifying information about changes in state testing practices and reporting. Districts were asked to provide documentation in the form of published reports or internet links to support their requested changes. A number of corrections, however, were made to NCES demographic and staffing data. The Council made those corrections but included a note on the profile, so readers would know that data came from NCES but were adjusted by the individual school systems.



DISTRICT ACHIEVEMENT ON STATE ASSESSMENTS

I. IMPROVING MATHEMATICS ACHIEVEMENT: A NATIONAL PRIORITY

In April 2009, President Obama reconfirmed the nation's commitment to strengthening student achievement in mathematics and science. Addressing the National Academy of Sciences, the president announced the beginning of a national campaign to move American students "from the middle to the top of the pack in science and mathematics over the next decade".


While science scores are not yet reported as widely, *Beating the Odds X* examines state assessment results in mathematics to determine whether urban public school systems are making progress toward this goal of increased student achievement. The Council examined mathematics achievement data on state assessments in multiple ways. Looking at state assessment results for all of the Great City School districts along with state results, this report tracks--

- ◆ Trends in mathematics achievement;
- ◆ District achievement compared to the state;
- ◆ Achievement of student groups; and
- ◆ Changes in achievement gaps in mathematics among various student groups.

Trends in Mathematics Achievement at the School District Level

The Council first examined state assessment results for all the Great City School districts. These district level data were further analyzed to determine: a) the percentage point gains in mathematics scores in grades four and eight; b) the percentage of districts that improved in all grades tested; c) the percentage of districts that improved in half or more of the grade levels tested; and d) the percentage of districts that improved their mathematics scores in grades three through eleven.


- Eighty-three percent of districts increased the percentage of fourth-grade students who scored at or above proficient between 2007 and 2010. A quarter of districts increased the percentage of fourth graders that scored at or above proficient by greater than 10 percentage points. (Figure 1)
- Eighty-four percent of districts increased the percentage of eighth-grade students who scored at or above proficient between 2007 and 2010. Over a quarter of the districts increased the percentage of eighth graders that scored at or above proficient by greater than 10 percentage points.⁴ (Figure 1)
- Fifty-six percent of districts showed increased performance for all grades tested on their respective state assessments.
- Some eighty-six percent of districts showed increased performance for half or more of all grades tested.⁵
- A minimum of 72% of districts showed increased performance in at least one grade tested for grades three through eleven. Percent of districts with increased performance ranged from 72% at grade eleven to 93% at grade seven. (Figure 2)



⁴This analysis included 55 districts for which there were longitudinal math data on fourth graders for each year from 2007 through 2010; and 50 districts for which there were longitudinal math data on eighth graders over the same period. Percentage point change was calculated by subtracting the percentage of students at or above proficient in 2009 from the percentage of students at or above proficient in 2007.

⁵This analysis included 59 districts for which there were longitudinal math data on fourth graders and eighth graders for each year from 2007 through 2010. Increased performance was determined by analyzing annual change for each grade where possible. (see calculations section)

FIGURE 2. PERCENTAGE OF DISTRICTS WITH GAINS IN MATH BETWEEN 2007 AND 2010 BY GRADE



District Achievement in Mathematics Compared to the State

Second, the Council examined how Great City School districts performed in relation to their states on mathematics assessments. These district and state level achievement data were further analyzed to determine: the percent of districts with mathematics scores equal to or greater than their respective states and the percent of districts that increased their mathematics scores at faster rates than their respective states.

- Some twenty-one percent of districts had fourth-grade proficiency rates that were equal to or greater than their respective states. (Figure 3)
- Fifteen percent of districts had eighth-grade proficiency rates that were equal to or greater than their respective states.⁶ (Figure 3)
- Some fifty-one percent of districts' annual change in students scoring at or above proficient was greater than their respective states in fourth-grade mathematics. (Figure 4)
- Approximately sixty percent of districts' annual change in students scoring at or above proficient was greater than their respective states in eighth-grade mathematics.⁷ (Figure 4)

⁶ This analysis included 62 districts and their respective states for which there were math data for fourth graders in 2010; and 55 districts and their respective states for which there were math data for eighth graders in 2010. This analysis compared the percentage of students at or above proficient in 2010 for each district to the percentage of students proficient in the same grade for their respective state.

⁷ This analysis included 59 district for which there were longitudinal math data on fourth graders for each year from 2007 through 2010; and 55 districts for which there were longitudinal math data on eighth graders over the same period.

FIGURE 3. PERCENTAGE OF DISTRICTS PERFORMING AT OR ABOVE STATES' PROFICIENCY RATES IN MATH, 2007 - 2010





FIGURE 4. PERCENTAGE OF DISTRICTS WITH FASTER GROWTH THAN STATE IN MATH, 2010



Third, the Council examined state assessment data from various student groups including: Black, White, American Indian, Asian/Pacific Islander, and Hispanic students. In addition, achievement for students with disabilities (SD), English language learners (ELL), and lower-income (FRPL) students was reviewed. These district data were further analyzed to determine the percentage point increases for each group from 2007 to 2010.⁸

- Eighty-three percent of districts increased the percentage of Black fourth graders that scored at or above proficient; seventy-eight percent increased their percent of Hispanic fourth graders that scored at or above proficient. (Figure 5)

⁸ For each subgroup, trends were based on the number of years for which data were available within each particular district. The data varies for each group and subject.




- Some eighty-four percent of districts increased the percentage of Black eighth graders that scored at or above proficient; 80% increased the percentage of Hispanic eighth graders that scored at or above proficient. (Figure 5)
- Sixty-eight percent of districts increased the percentage of students with disabilities in fourth grade that scored at or above proficient; 67% increased the percentage of English language learners that scored at or above proficient; and 86% of districts increased the percentage of lower-income students that scored at or above proficient. (Figure 6)
- Some seventy percent of districts increased the percentage of students with disabilities in eighth grade that scored at or above proficient; 61% increased the percentage of English language learners that scored at or above proficient; and 85% increased the percentage of lower-income students that scored at or above proficient. (Figure 6)

Changes in Mathematics Achievement Gaps Within Student Groups

Finally, state assessment data were examined to determine whether achievement gaps in mathematics were narrowing in the Great City Schools.⁹ We define the gap as the difference between the proficiency rates of a given student group in the district and their comparison groups statewide. Trends in grades four and eight are presented.

- Some sixty-six percent of districts narrowed the achievement gap between their Black fourth graders and White fourth graders statewide; 70% of Great City School districts narrowed the achievement gap in mathematics between their Black eighth graders and White eighth graders statewide. (Figure 7)

⁹For each subgroup, achievement gaps were based on the number of years for which data were available within each particular district. The data varies for each group and subject.



- Sixty-six percent of districts narrowed the achievement gap in mathematics between their Hispanic fourth graders and White fourth graders statewide; 67% of districts narrowed the achievement gap in mathematics between their Hispanic eighth graders and White eighth graders statewide. (Figure 7)
- Sixty-two percent of districts narrowed the achievement gap in mathematics between their economically disadvantaged fourth graders and non-economically disadvantaged fourth graders statewide; 56% of districts narrowed the achievement gap in mathematics between their economically disadvantaged eighth graders and non-economically disadvantaged eighth graders statewide. (Figure 7)
- Sixty-two percent of districts narrowed the achievement gap in mathematics between their English language learners in the fourth grade and non-English language learners in the fourth grade statewide; 45% of districts narrowed the achievement gap in mathematics between their English language learners in the eighth grade and non-English language learners in the eighth grade statewide. (Figure 7)
- Fifty-one percent of districts narrowed the achievement gap in mathematics between their students with disabilities in the fourth grade and students without disabilities in the fourth grade statewide; 49% of districts narrowed the achievement gap in mathematics between their students with disabilities in the eighth grade and students without disabilities in the eighth grade statewide. (Figure 7)

II. IMPROVING READING ACHIEVEMENT: A FUNDAMENTAL CHALLENGE

In the nation’s urban school systems, the polarizing debate over whole language versus phonics has largely given way to a growing understanding of the need to both build foundational literacy skills in early childhood and explicitly support academic literacy development throughout adolescence. However, advancing literacy-- particularly at the secondary level-- remains a fundamental challenge for local and national education leaders, and the need to raise student achievement in reading has never been more pressing.

“Encouraging students to improve their reading is a key to their success in school and in life,”
 - Secretary of Education Arne Duncan



To examine reading achievement in the nation’s Great City School districts, the Council examined reading achievement data on state assessments in multiple ways. Looking at state assessment results for all of the Great City School districts along with state results, this report examines—

- ◆ Trends in reading achievement;
- ◆ District achievement compared to the state;
- ◆ Achievement of student groups; and
- ◆ Changes in achievement gaps in reading among various student groups.

Trends in Reading Achievement at the School District Level

The Council first examined state assessment results for all the Great City School districts. These district level data were further analyzed to determine: a) the percentage point gains in reading scores in grades four and eight; b) the percentage of districts that improved in all grades tested; c) the percentage of districts that improved in half or more of the grade levels tested; and d) the percentage of districts that improved their reading scores in grades three through eleven.

- Sixty-six percent of districts increased the percentage of fourth-grade students who scored at or above proficient between 2007 and 2010. Thirteen percent of districts increased the percentage of fourth graders that scored at or above proficient by greater than 10 percentage points. (Figure 8)
- Eighty-four percent of districts increased the percentage of eighth-grade students who scored at or above proficient between 2007 and 2010. A third of the districts increased the percentage of eighth graders that scored at or above proficient by greater than 10 percentage points.¹⁰ (Figure 8)
- Twenty-two percent of districts showed increased performance for all grades tested on their respective state assessments.
- Some 76% of districts showed increased performance for half or more of all grades tested.¹¹



¹⁰ This analysis included 55 districts for which there were longitudinal reading data on fourth graders for each year from 2007 through 2010; and 51 districts for which there were longitudinal reading data on eighth graders over the same period. Percentage point change was calculated by subtracting the percentage of students at or above proficient in 2010 from the percentage of students at or above proficient in 2007.


¹¹ This analysis included 59 districts for which there were longitudinal reading data on fourth graders and eighth graders for each year from 2007 through 2010. Increased performance was determined analyzing annual change for each grade where possible. (See calculations section)

- A minimum of 56% of districts showed increased performance in at least one grade tested for grades three through eleven. The percent of districts with increased performance ranged from 56% at grades five and eleven to 95% at grade nine. (Figure 9)

District Achievement in Reading Compared to the State

Second, the Council examined how Great City School districts performed in relation to their states on reading assessments. These district and state level achievement data were further analyzed to determine: the percent of districts with reading scores equal to or greater than their respective states and the percent of districts that increased their reading scores at faster rates than their respective states.


- Some twenty-three percent of districts had fourth-grade proficiency rates that were equal to or greater than their respective states. (Figure 10)
- Nineteen percent of districts had eighth-grade proficiency rates that were equal to or greater than their respective states.¹² (Figure 10)
- Some fifty six percent of districts' annual change in students scoring at or above proficient was greater than their respective states in grade four reading. (Figure 11)
- At least fifty-three percent of districts' annual change in students scoring at or above proficient was greater than their respective states in grade eight reading.¹³ (Figure 11)



¹²This analysis included 62 districts and their respective states for which there were reading data for fourth graders in 2010; and 62 districts and their respective states for which there were reading data for eighth graders in 2010. This analysis compared the percentage of students at or above proficient in 2010 for each district to the percentage of students proficient in the same grade for their respective state.

¹³This analysis included 59 districts for which there were longitudinal reading data on fourth graders for each year from 2007 through 2010; and 55 districts for which there were longitudinal reading data on eighth graders over the same period.

FIGURE 11. PERCENTAGE OF DISTRICTS WITH FASTER GROWTH THAN STATE IN READING, 2010



Reading Achievement of Student Groups

Third, the Council examined state assessment data from various student groups including: Black, White, American Indian, Asian/Pacific Island, and Hispanic students. In addition, achievement for students with disabilities (SD), English language learners (ELL), and lower-income (FRPL) students was reviewed. These district data were further analyzed to determine the percentage point increases for each group from 2007 to 2010.¹⁴

- Approximately sixty-three percent of districts increased the percentage of Black fourth graders that scored at or above proficient; seventy percent increased their percent of Hispanic fourth graders that scored at or above proficient. (Figure 12)
- Some seventy-nine percent of districts increased the percentage of Black eighth graders that scored at or above proficient; 85% increased the percentage of Hispanic eighth graders that scored at or above proficient. (Figure 12)
- Fifty-five percent of districts increased the percentage of students with disabilities in grade four that scored at or above proficient; 64% increased the percentage of English language learners that scored at or above proficient; and 69% of districts increased the percentage of low-income students that scored at or above proficient. (Figure 13)

¹⁴For each subgroup, trends were based on the number of years for which data were available within each particular district. The data varies for each group and subject.

FIGURE 12. PERCENTAGE OF DISTRICTS WITH 4TH AND 8TH GRADE READING PERCENTAGE POINT CHANGE BETWEEN 2007 AND 2010 BY STUDENT ETHNICITY





FIGURE 13. PERCENTAGE OF DISTRICTS WITH 4TH AND 8TH GRADE READING PERCENTAGE POINT CHANGES BETWEEN 2007 AND 2010 BY STUDENT GROUP



- Some sixty-eight percent of districts increased the percentage of students with disabilities in grade eight that scored at or above proficient; 62% increased the percentage of English language learners that scored at or above proficient; and 72% increased the percentage of low-income students that scored at or above proficient. (Figure 13)

Changes in Reading Achievement Gaps within Student Groups


Finally, state assessment data were examined to determine whether achievement gaps in reading were narrowing in the Great City Schools.¹⁵

- Some sixty-two percent of districts narrowed the achievement gap between their Black fourth graders and White fourth graders statewide; 54% of Great City School districts narrowed the achievement gap in reading between their Black eighth graders and White eighth graders statewide. (Figure 14)

¹⁵ For each subgroup, achievement gaps were based on the number of years for which data were available within each particular district. The data varies for each group and subject.

- Seventy-eight percent of districts narrowed the achievement gap in reading between their Hispanic fourth graders and White fourth graders statewide; 63% of districts narrowed the achievement gap in reading between their Hispanic eighth graders and White eighth graders statewide. (Figure 14)
- Sixty-three percent of districts narrowed the achievement gap in reading between their economically disadvantaged fourth graders and non-economically disadvantaged fourth graders statewide; 66% of districts narrowed the achievement gap in reading between their economically disadvantaged eighth graders and non-economically disadvantaged eighth graders statewide. (Figure 14)
- Fifty-nine percent of districts narrowed the achievement gap in reading between their English language learners in the fourth grade and non-English language learners in the fourth grade statewide; 31% of districts narrowed the achievement gap in reading between their English language learners in the eighth grade and non-English language learners in the eighth grade statewide. (Figure 14)
- Thirty-six districts narrowed the achievement gap in reading between their students with disabilities in the fourth grade and students without disabilities in the fourth grade statewide; 51% of districts narrowed the achievement gap in reading between their students with disabilities in the eighth grade and students without disabilities in the eighth grade statewide. (Figure 14)

FIGURE 14. PERCENTAGE OF DISTRICTS REDUCING STUDENT GROUP GAPS IN READING, 2010*



*We define the gap as the difference between the proficiency rates of a given student group in the district and their comparison group



OUR BEST WRITING

20-19-18-17-16-15-14-13-12-11-10-9-8-7-6-5-4-3-2-1

enda

DISTRICT ACHIEVEMENT ON NAEP

The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) is a sample-based survey assessment that provides periodic reports on student performance in reading, mathematics, and other subjects. The Trial Urban District Assessment (TUDA), initiated by the Council of the Great City Schools and the National Assessment Governing Board (NAGB) in 2000, is a special project of NAEP that allows a limited number of cities to obtain city-specific results.

The number of TUDA districts has steadily increased over time. In 2002, 6 districts participated in TUDA; 2003, 10 districts; 2005, 11 districts; 2007, 11 districts; and 2009, 18 districts. It is expected that 21 districts will participate in 2011. TUDA assessments in reading and mathematics were administered in 2002, 2003, and every odd year thereafter. TUDA 2009 mathematics results were released in December 2009; reading results were released in May 2010.

“Just as the national public (NP) sample is used as a benchmark for comparing results for states, results for urban districts are compared to results from large cities nationwide. Referred to as “large cities” in TUDA reports, results for large cities are for public schools located in the urbanized areas of cities with populations of 250,000 or more. Large City (LC) is not synonymous with ‘inner city.’ Schools in participating TUDA districts are also included in the results for large cities, even though some districts (Atlanta, Austin, Charlotte, Cleveland, Fresno, Houston, Jefferson County, Los Angeles, and Miami-Dade) include some schools not classified as large city schools.”¹⁶

Council member districts, with few exceptions, meet the criteria for LC. It is estimated that students enrolled in Council districts comprise at least 70% of the LC variable. These analyses have been derived from various NAEP reports; therefore, tests of significance have been completed and included in this report.

¹⁶ Source: IES: National Center for Educational Statistics, US Department of Education, The Nation's Report Card 2009 Mathematics and Reading.

I. NAEP MATHEMATICS


NAEP Mathematics Achievement for Large Cities and TUDA Districts in 2009

The Council examined mathematics assessment results for the 18 TUDA districts that participated in 2009. These results were analyzed to identify:

- ◆ The achievement trends of Large Cities (LC) compared to National Public (NP);
- ◆ The achievement of TUDA districts compared to LC and NP;
- ◆ Students eligible for the National School Lunch Program in TUDA districts compared to LC and NP;
- ◆ The achievement of students groups in TUDA districts compared to LC and NP.


NAEP Mathematics Achievement Trends in Large Cities Compared with National Public

- The percentage of fourth graders in Large Cities (LC) who scored at or above proficient in mathematics increased significantly from 24 in 2005 to 29 in 2009. The change in the percentage of fourth graders in NP who scored at or above proficient from 2005 (35) to 2009 (38) was statistically significant. (Figure 15)
- The percentage of eighth graders in LC who scored at or above proficient increased significantly from 19 in 2005 to 24 in 2009. The percentage of eighth graders in NP who scored at or above proficient increased significantly from 28 in 2005 to 33 in 2009. (Figure 15)



Large Cities and Individual TUDA Districts Compared with National Public in 2009

- The percentage of fourth graders who scored at or above proficient in LC (29) was significantly lower than fourth graders in NP (38). (Figure 16)
- The percentage of fourth graders who scored at or above proficient in Charlotte (45) was significantly higher than fourth graders in NP (38). The percentage of fourth graders who scored at or above proficient in Austin (38), New York City (35), and San Diego (36) was not significantly different from NP (33). (Figure 16)
- The percentage of eighth graders who scored at or above proficient in LC (24) was significantly lower than eighth graders in NP (33). (Figure 16)



- The percentage of eighth graders who scored at or above proficient in Austin (39) was significantly higher than eighth graders in NP (33). The percentage of eighth graders who scored at or above proficient in Boston (31), Charlotte (33), San Diego (32) was not significantly different from NP.

Mathematics Achievement of Student Groups in TUDA Districts and Large Cities Compared with National Public in 2009

Lower-income students in TUDA districts and Large Cities compared with Lower-income students in National Public


- The percentage of lower-income fourth graders who scored at or above proficient in LC (20) was significantly lower than lower-income fourth graders in NP (22). (Figure 17)
- The percentage of lower-income fourth graders who scored at or above proficient in Boston (25) and New York City (32) was significantly higher than lower-income fourth graders in NP (22). The percentage of lower-income fourth graders who scored at or above proficient in Austin (22), Charlotte (24), Houston (24), Miami-Dade (23), and San Diego (19) was not significantly different from NP.
- The percentage of lower-income eighth graders who scored at or above proficient in LC (15) was significantly lower than lower-income eighth graders in NP (17). (Figure 17)

- The percentage of lower-income eighth graders who scored at or above proficient in Boston (23) and New York (23) was significantly higher than lower-income eighth graders in NP (17). The percentage of lower-income eighth graders who scored at or above proficient in Austin (19), Charlotte (17), Houston (18), Miami-Dade (16), Philadelphia (13), and San Diego (19) was not significantly different from NP.

White students in TUDA districts and Large Cities compared with White students in National Public

- The percentage of White fourth graders who scored at or above proficient in LC (55) was not significantly different from White fourth graders in NP (50). (Figure 18)
- The percentage of White fourth graders who scored at or above proficient in Atlanta (79), Austin (74), Charlotte (72), District of Columbia (81), Houston (71), Miami-Dade (61), and San Diego (62) was significantly higher than White fourth graders in NP (50). The percentage of White fourth graders who scored at or above proficient in Boston (52), Chicago (44), Jefferson County (KY) (44), Los Angeles (45), Milwaukee (42), and New York City (58) was not significantly different from NP.
- The percentage of White eighth graders who scored at or above proficient in LC (46) was significantly higher than White eighth graders in NP (43). (Figure 18)

FIGURE 17. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS ELIGIBLE FOR FRPL PERFORMING AT OR ABOVE PROFICIENT IN MATH IN 2009
LARGE CITIES VS. NATIONAL PUBLIC




- The percentage of White eighth graders who scored at or above proficient in Austin (70), Boston (67), Charlotte (58), Houston (67), and San Diego (55) was significantly higher than White eighth graders in NP (43). The percentage of White eighth graders who scored at or above proficient in Chicago (39), Fresno (38), Los Angeles (41), Miami-Dade (40), New York City (47), and Philadelphia (35) was not significantly different from NP (43).

Black students in TUDA districts and Large Cities compared with Black students in National Public

- The percentage of Black fourth graders who scored at or above proficient in LC (14) was not significantly different from Black fourth graders in NP (15). (Figure 18)
- The percentage of Black fourth graders who scored at or above proficient in Boston (23), Charlotte (24), and New York City (21) was significantly higher than Black fourth graders in NP (15). The percentage of Black fourth graders who scored at or above proficient in LC (14), Austin (13), Fresno (12), Houston (17), Jefferson County (KY) (11), Los Angeles (10), Miami-Dade (12), and San Diego (15) was not significantly different from NP (15).
- The percentage of Black eighth graders who scored at or above proficient in LC (10) was significantly lower than Black eighth graders in NP (12). (Figure 18)
- The percentage of Black eighth graders who scored at or above proficient in Austin (21), Boston (18), and Charlotte (17) was significantly higher than Black eighth graders in NP (12). The percentage of Black eighth graders who scored at or above proficient in Fresno (7), Houston (13), Los Angeles (5), Miami-Dade (12), New York City (12), and San Diego (16) was not significantly different from NP (12).

Hispanic students in TUDA districts and Large Cities compared with Hispanic students in National Public

- The percentage of Hispanic fourth graders who scored at or above proficient in LC (21) was not significantly different from Hispanic fourth graders in NP (21). (Figure 18)
- The percentage of Hispanic fourth graders who scored at or above proficient in Houston (28) and Miami-Dade (35) was significantly higher than Hispanic fourth graders in NP (21). The percentage of Hispanic fourth graders who scored at or above proficient in Atlanta (16), Austin (25), Boston (24), Charlotte (27), Chicago (18), District of Columbia (25), Jefferson County (KY) (23), Milwaukee (16), New York City (24), Philadelphia (15), and San Diego (19) was not significantly different from NP.
- The percentage of Hispanic eighth graders who scored at or above proficient in LC (16) was not significantly different from Hispanic eighth graders in NP (17). (Figure 18)
- The percentage of Hispanic eighth graders who scored at or above proficient in Austin (22) and Miami-Dade (23) was significantly higher than Hispanic eighth graders in NP (17). The percentage of Hispanic eighth graders who scored at or above proficient in Boston (20), Charlotte (21), Chicago (18), Detroit (8), District of Columbia (17), Houston (21), New York City (14), Philadelphia (12), and San Diego (14) was not significantly different from NP (17).



II. NAEP READING


NAEP Reading Achievement for Large Cities and TUDA Districts in 2009

The Council examined reading assessment results for the 18 TUDA districts that participated in 2009. These results were analyzed to identify:

- ◆ The achievement trends of Large Cities compared to National Public;
- ◆ The achievement of TUDA districts compare to Large Cities and National Public;
- ◆ Students eligible for the National School Lunch Program in TUDA districts compared to Large Cities and National Public; and
- ◆ The achievement of students groups in TUDA districts compared to Large Cities and National Public.


NAEP Reading Achievement Trends in Large Cities Compared with National Public

- The percentage of fourth graders in LC who scored at or above proficient increased significantly from 20 in 2005 to 23 in 2009. The percentage of fourth graders in NP who scored at or above proficient increased significantly from 30 to 32. (Figure 19)
- The percentage of eighth graders in LC who scored at or above proficient was 20 in 2005 and 21 in 2009; the percentage of eighth graders in NP who were at or above proficient increased significantly from 29 in 2005 to 30 in 2009. (Figure 19)



Large Cities and Individual TUDA Districts Compared with National Public in 2009

- The percentage of fourth graders who scored at or above proficient in LC (23) was significantly lower than fourth graders in NP (32). (Figure 20)
- The percentage of fourth graders who scored at or above proficient in Austin (32), Charlotte (36), Jefferson County (KY) (30), Miami-Dade (31), New York City (29) and San Diego (29) was not significantly different from fourth graders in NP (32).
- The percentage of eighth graders who scored at or above proficient in LC (21) was significantly lower than eighth graders in NP (30). (Figure 20)
- The percentage of eighth graders who scored at or above proficient in Austin (30), Charlotte (28), and Miami-Dade (28) was not significantly different from eighth graders in NP (29).



NAEP Reading Achievement of Student Groups in TUDA Districts and Large Cities Compared with National Public in 2009


Lower-income students in TUDA districts and Large Cities compared with Lower-income students in National Public

- The percentage of lower-income fourth graders who scored at or above proficient in LC (15) was significantly lower than lower-income fourth graders in NP (17). (Figure 21)
- The percentage of lower-income fourth graders who scored at or above proficient in Miami-Dade (23) and New York City (26) was significantly higher than lower-income fourth graders in NP (17). The percentage of lower-income fourth graders who scored at or above proficient in Austin (14), Boston (19), Charlotte (19) and Jefferson County (KY) (17) was not significantly different from NP (17).
- The percentage of lower-income eighth graders who scored at or above proficient in LC (13) was significantly lower than lower-income eighth graders in NP (16). (Figure 21)
- The percentage of lower-income eighth graders who scored at or above proficient in Miami-Dade (21) was significantly higher than lower-income eighth graders in NP (16). The percentage of lower-income eighth graders who scored at or above proficient in Austin (15), Boston (16), Charlotte (15), Chicago (13), Jefferson County (KY) (15), New York City (18) and San Diego (13) was not significantly different from NP (16).

White students in TUDA districts and Large Cities compared with White students in National Public

- The percentage of White fourth graders who scored at or above proficient in LC (47) was not significantly different from White fourth graders in NP (41). (Figure 22)
- The percentage of White fourth graders who scored at or above proficient in Atlanta (76), Austin (64), Charlotte (59), DCPS (75) and Houston (59) was significantly higher than White fourth graders in NP (41). The percentage of White fourth graders who scored at or above proficient in Baltimore (32), Boston (46), Chicago(41), Fresno(29), Jefferson County (42), Los Angeles (35), Miami-Dade (51), Milwaukee (34), New York City (49), Philadelphia (28) and San Diego (51) was not significantly different from NP (41).
- The percentage of White eighth graders who scored at or above proficient in LC (42) was not significantly different from White eighth graders in NP (39). (Figure 22)
- The percentage of White eighth graders who scored at or above proficient in Atlanta (70), Austin (55), Boston (55) and Charlotte (48) was significantly higher than White eighth graders in NP (39). The percentage of White eighth graders who scored at or above proficient in Chicago (40), Fresno (32), Houston (52), Jefferson County (KY) (34), Los Angeles (38), Miami-Dade (43), Milwaukee (33), New York City (41), Philadelphia (33) and San Diego (43) was not significantly different from NP (39).

FIGURE 21. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS ELIGIBLE FOR FRPL PERFORMING AT OR ABOVE PROFICIENT IN READING 2009
LARGE CITIES VS. NATIONAL PUBLIC




Black students in TUDA districts and Large Cities compared with Black students in National Public

- The percentage of Black fourth graders who scored at or above proficient in LC (13) was not significantly different from Black fourth graders in NP (15). (Figure 22)
- The percentage of Black fourth graders who scored at or above proficient in Atlanta (13), Austin (18), Boston (18), Charlotte (19), Fresno (8), Houston (16), Jefferson County (12), Los Angeles (12), Miami-Dade (13), New York City (17) and San Diego (18) was not significantly different from NP (15).
- The percentage of Black eighth graders who scored at or above proficient in LC (11) was significantly lower than Black eighth graders in NP (13). (Figure 22)
- The percentage of Black eighth graders who scored at or above proficient in Atlanta (12), Austin (14), Boston (14), Charlotte (15), Chicago (11), Fresno (8), Houston (11), Jefferson County (13), Los Angeles (11), Miami-Dade (17), New York City (12), Philadelphia (9) and San Diego (8) was not significantly different from Black eighth graders in NP (13).

Hispanic students in TUDA districts and Large Cities compared with Hispanic students in National Public

- The percentage of Hispanic fourth graders who scored at or above proficient in LC (14) was significantly lower than Hispanic fourth graders in NP (16). (Figure 22)
- The percentage of Hispanic fourth graders who scored at or above proficient in Miami-Dade (34) was significantly higher than Hispanic fourth graders in NP (16). The percentage of Hispanic fourth graders who scored at or above proficient in Austin (17), Boston (17), Charlotte (23), Chicago (15), Cleveland (11), District of Columbia (17), Houston (14), Milwaukee (11) and New York City (20) was not significantly different from NP (16).
- The percentage of Hispanic eighth graders who scored at or above proficient in LC (14) was not significantly different from Hispanic eighth graders in NP (16). (Figure 22)
- The percentage of Hispanic eighth graders who scored at or above proficient in Miami-Dade (29) was significantly higher than Hispanic eighth graders in NP (16). The percentage of Hispanic eighth graders who scored at or above proficient in Austin (18), Boston (13), Charlotte (18), Chicago (17), Cleveland (11), Detroit (6), District of Columbia (22), Houston (15), Milwaukee (15), New York City (13), Philadelphia (9) and San Diego (14) was not significantly different from NP (16).





STUDENT DEMOGRAPHICS AND STAFFING

The challenge of the Great City Schools is to increase student achievement in a context far different from that of the average public school system. Urban education is unique, in part, because it serves students who are typically from lower-income families, who are learning English as a second language, and who often face discrimination. The role of urban schools is to overcome these barriers and teach all children to the same high standards.

This chapter examines the context of urban education—a context that should be considered in discussing the achievement data presented in previous chapters. The chapter reviews basic demographic characteristics of the Great City Schools, including student poverty and limited English proficiency, and how they have changed during the period in which state assessments were being implemented.

The reader can find individual city data online. The demographic and staffing data for this portion of the study were gathered from the Common Core of Data at the National Center for Education Statistics. Due to the preliminary and sometimes erroneous nature of some of these 2008-2009 data, the information was supplemented with data from district or state websites and district research staff.

The demography of urban education continues to be a subject of enormous public interest. Our student composition is important because research shows that income, disability, and English-language proficiency are strongly correlated with academic achievement.

Student Enrollment in the Great City Schools

The Great City Schools continue to enroll a significant share of the nation's students.

- The Great City Schools enrolled 7,926,363 students in 2008-2009 (the most recent year on which federal data are available), a decrease of about two percent over the 8,080,103 students enrolled in 2005-2006. (Figure 23)
- During the same period, total public school enrollment nationally grew by about one percent. Enrollments increased from 49,113,298 students in 2005-2006 to 49,265,572 students in 2008-2009. (Figure 23)
- The share of the nation's public school students enrolled in the Great City Schools remained the same at 16% for 2005-2006 to 2008-2009 school years. (Figure 23)

Income and Poverty in the Great City Schools

Students in the Great City Schools are far more likely to come from low-income homes than the average student nationally. A summary of key indicators for the 2008-2009 school year include the following—

- About sixty-five percent of students in the Great City Schools were eligible for a free lunch subsidy, compared with 44% nationally. (Figure 23)
- About twenty-four percent of the nation's free-lunch eligible students are enrolled in the Great City Schools. (Figure 23)

English Language Learners and Students with Disabilities

The Great City Schools also serve a higher proportion of English language learners than the average school system. However, these urban school systems enroll about the same percentage of students with disabilities as the average school district nationally. Key indicators in the 2008-2009 school year include the following—

- About sixteen percent of students enrolled in the Great City Schools are English language learners, compared with nine percent of students nationally. (Figure 23)
- About fourteen percent of students enrolled in Great City Schools are classified as students with disabilities; compared with 13% of students nationally. (Figure 23)
- Urban schools tend to enroll more students with low-incidence, high-cost disabilities than the average district, which may be due to deficiencies in the quality and availability of health, child, and prenatal care in many inner cities.

Enrollments by Race And Ethnicity in The Great City Schools

The racial characteristics of urban schools are also significantly different from the average school system nationwide. Approximately 80% of Great City School students are of color—primarily Black, Hispanic, or Asian American—compared with 44% nationally.

Key statistics include the following—

- About nine percent of Great City School students were Asian American/Pacific Islander, American Indian or Alaskan Native in 2008-2009, compared with six percent nationwide. (Figure 23)
- The percentage of students in the Great City Schools who were Black declined from 37% in 2005-2006 to 34% in 2008-2009. The percentage of students nationally who were Black remained at 17% over the same period. (Figure 23)
- The percentage of students in the Great City Schools who were Hispanic increased from 35% in 2005-2006 to 37% in 2008-2009. The percentage of students nationally who were Hispanic increased from 20% to 21% over the same period. (Figure 23)
- The percentage of students in the Great City Schools who were White decreased from 20% in 2005-2006 to 19% in 2008-2009. The percentage of students nationally who were White decreased from 57% to 54% over the same period. (Figure 23)
- Approximately 29% of all students of color in the nation were enrolled in the Great City Schools in 2008-2009.

Student-Teacher Ratios and Average Enrollments per School

Research suggests that the number of students in a class affects student achievement. In particular, access to smaller classes has been shown to improve achievement for some students, while larger classes have a negative effect on student performance. Moreover, the benefits of smaller classes appear to be greater for disadvantaged and minority students. In order to explore this issue, the Council analyzed two contextual variables: student-teacher ratios and average enrollments per school. Student-teacher ratios are not synonymous with class size, because they include special education teachers and other instructional staff that are often assigned to small and dedicated classes, but the ratios might serve as a convenient proxy.


- The average student-teacher ratio in the Great City Schools was 16 in 2008-2009 compared to the national average of 15 students per teacher. (Figure 23)

At the same time, the Council’s analysis showed the following trends in school size in urban districts—

- The average number of students per school in the Great City Schools declined from 648 students in 2005-2006 to 602 in 2008-2009—a drop of about seven percent. (Figure 23)
- The average number of students per school nationally decreased from 498 in 2005-2006 to 483 in 2008-2009—a decline of 3%. (Figure 23)
- The average school in the Great Cities enrolled about 119 more children (602 students) than the average school nationally (483 students) in 2008-2009. (Figure 23)

FIGURE 23: COUNCIL OF THE GREAT CITY SCHOOLS

	CGCS		NATION	
	2006-2006	2008-2009	2005-2006	2008-2009
CGCS School Data				
Number of Students	8,080,103	7,926,363	49,113,298	49,265,572
Number of FTE Teachers	488,114	511,145	3,057,723	3,246,705
Student-Teacher Ratio	17	16	16	15
Number of Schools	12,477	13,163	98,564	101,979
Student Groups				
Free and Reduced Price Lunch	66%	65%	41%	44%
Students with Disabilities	13%	14%	14%	13%
English Language Learners	15%	16%	9%	9%
Student Racial/Ethnic Enrollment				
Amer. Indian/Al. Native	1%	1%	1%	1%
Asian	7%	8%	5%	5%
Black	37%	34%	17%	17%
Hispanic	35%	37%	20%	21%
White	20%	19%	57%	54%



Demographic Notes:
 Sources: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, "Public Elementary/Secondary School Universe Survey" and "Local Education Agency Universe Survey." (All data are labeled preliminary by NCES.) Some districts chose to provide data after review and missing data were also sought from state and district websites.



DISCUSSION

This report represents the tenth time that the Council of the Great City Schools has examined the status and progress of America's urban schools on state reading and mathematics tests. The report is imperfect for all the reasons indicated in the methodology section. Data are not comparable from one state to another. Test results are reported in different metrics. Not all states publish their disaggregated results.

Test participation rates are not always available. Testing procedures are sometimes not the same from year to year. All of these limitations underscore the need for a national set of achievement standards as well as a national system for organizing, aggregating, and disseminating data regarding how the nation's school districts are progressing toward the goal of improving achievement and reducing racially and economically identifiable achievement gaps.

Nevertheless, the data in *Beating the Odds X* present the best available picture of how America's Great City Schools are performing on state tests and strongly suggest that they are making substantial progress in both reading and mathematics.

These results continue to be preliminary but encouraging. The Council is committed to improving its annual reporting of city results on state tests. And the Council will make every effort to continue reporting data in a way that is consistent with *No Child Left Behind* (NCLB) as long as the law is in place. We want to encourage the public to expect more transparency in urban school data.

City schools, moreover, want to improve their reporting to the nation on other indicators, including course-taking patterns and graduation rates. No single indicator gives the public the entire picture of urban education any more than one Stock Market index adequately describes the economy.

However limited and flawed the state data continue to be, the overall direction of the state numbers is corroborated by the most recent estimates from the National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP).

The state and the NAEP assessments are entirely different tests, designed with different purposes, and using entirely different metrics.

Both the state assessment data and the data from the NAEP, however, indicate that mathematics achievement in the cities has improved by significant margins at both the fourth and eighth grades, and that reading is improving in the cities at the fourth-grade level. NAEP data do not yet indicate the presence of significant progress in eighth-grade reading in large cities or throughout the nation as a whole as the state data in this report do.

Mathematics Results

The trends in mathematics performance are unambiguous for the nation and the Great City Schools. Achievement is improving. The only debate at this point is over whether the gains should be faster. *Beating the Odds X* indicates that the 83% of Great City School districts increased the percentage of fourth graders scoring at or above proficiency between 2007 and 2010. Additionally, a quarter of the districts increased the percentage of fourth graders that scored at or above proficient by greater than 10 points over that same period. At the same time, 84% of districts increased the percentage of eighth graders that scored at or above proficient; and over a quarter had percentage point increases of greater than 10 points.

Reducing racial disparities in academic achievement is also a fundamental goal of NCLB. This report, *Beating the Odds X*, indicates that the Great City Schools are reducing racial and ethnic gaps in student performance in mathematics. Approximately two thirds of Council districts are narrowing racial and ethnic gaps in mathematics achievement among fourth and eighth graders. Furthermore, over half of the districts are also reducing differences by economic group in achievement at both the elementary and middle school levels.

Reading Results

The data in this report also suggest that reading achievement in the Great City Schools is improving. *Beating the Odds X* found gains in the percentage of students who were scoring at or above proficiency levels on their respective state tests. Sixty-six percent of Great City School districts increased the percentage of fourth-grade students who scored at or above proficient between 2007 and 2010. Similarly 84% of districts increased the percentage of eighth-grade students who scored at or above proficient during that same time; a third of the districts had gains of over 10 percentage points.

Racial achievement gaps in elementary reading achievement also showed signs of narrowing. Over one-half of urban school districts narrowed the gaps between Black students and White students statewide. Similarly, over two-thirds of districts narrowed the fourth and eighth grade Hispanic-White achievement gaps. Two out of three districts narrowed the gaps between economically disadvantaged fourth and eighth graders and their more well-off counterparts statewide.

The Urban Context

Progress in mathematics and reading achievement is occurring in an urban context that is significantly different from other schools. *Beating the Odds X* looked at those differences and how they have changed over the last several years. Urban schools enroll about 24% of the nation's free-lunch eligible students, 29% of all students of color in the country, and disproportionately large numbers of English language learners and economically disadvantaged students. While we embrace and encourage diversity, we understand that large concentrations of these student groups often dictate additional support for these students and their teachers so that all students reach their highest potential. These percentages have remained relatively unchanged in recent years.

Nonetheless, it is clear that student achievement in the Great City Schools is improving. Some of these gains are coming from working harder and smarter and squeezing inefficiencies out of every scarce dollar. Some of the gains, however, come from cities doing what the nation has agreed is likely to work—higher standards, strong and stable leadership, better teaching, more instructional time, regular assessments, stronger accountability, and efficient management.

The data suggest that gains are possible on a large scale—not just school-by-school. It is now time to determine how the pace of improvement can be accelerated. The Council of the Great City Schools and its member districts are asking these questions and pursuing the answers aggressively.

The nation, for its part, needs to think long and hard about why urban schools have to beat any odds.

Appendix A: Number of Districts Reporting and Improving in Figures 1-4

FIGURE 1. PERCENTAGE OF DISTRICTS WITH PERCENTAGE POINTS GAIN ON STATE MATH ASSESSMENTS , 2007-2010	Districts Improving	Districts Reporting
Grade 4		
1 to 5 percentage points	18	55
6 to 10 percentage points	14	55
11 to 15 percentage points	11	55
≥ 16 percentage points	3	55
Grade 8		
1 to 5 percentage points	11	50
6 to 10 percentage points	17	50
11 to 15 percentage points	10	50
≥ 16 percentage points	4	50
FIGURE 2. PERCENTAGE OF DISTRICTS WITH GAINS IN MATH BETWEEN 2007 AND 2010 BY GRADE	Districts Improving	Districts Reporting
Grade 3	44	59
Grade 4	51	59
Grade 5	46	59
Grade 6	55	59
Grade 7	47	59
Grade 8	47	55
Grade 9	17	18
Grade 10	22	30
Grade 11	18	25
FIGURE 3. PERCENTAGE OF DISTRICTS PERFORMING AT OR ABOVE STATES' AVERAGE IN MATH	Greater than or Equal to State Scores	Districts Reporting
SY 2009-10		
Grade 4	13	62
Grade 8	8	55
SY 2008-09		
Grade 4	12	59
Grade 8	9	52
SY 2007-08		
Grade 4	11	57
Grade 8	7	50
SY 2006-07		
Grade 4	13	56
Grade 8	9	49
FIGURE 4. PERCENTAGE OF DISTRICTS WITH FASTER GROWTH THAN STATE IN MATH, 2010		
Grade 4	30	59
Grade 8	33	55

Appendix B: Number of Districts Reporting and Improving in Figures 5-7

FIGURE 5. PERCENTAGE OF DISTRICTS WITH 4TH AND 8TH GRADE MATH PERCENTAGE POINT CHANGE BETWEEN 2007 AND 2010 BY STUDENT ETHNICITY										
	Black		American Indian		Asian/Pacific Islander		Hispanic		White	
	Districts Improving	Districts Reporting	Districts Improving	Districts Reporting	Districts Improving	Districts Reporting	Districts Improving	Districts Reporting	Districts Improving	Districts Reporting
Grade 4										
1 to 5 percentage points	12	55	7	37	12	49	11	55	15	54
6 to 10 percentage points	18	55	4	37	11	49	13	55	14	54
11 to 15 percentage points	8	55	3	37	3	49	10	55	6	54
≥ 16 percentage points	7	55	8	37	5	49	9	55	2	54
Grade 8										
1 to 5 percentage points	10	50	1	32	12	45	8	50	21	49
6 to 10 percentage points	18	50	1	32	9	45	12	50	7	49
11 to 15 percentage points	11	50	9	32	5	45	11	50	5	49
≥ 16 percentage points	3	50	8	32	4	45	9	50	4	49

FIGURE 6. PERCENTAGE OF DISTRICTS WITH 4TH AND 8TH GRADE MATH PERCENTAGE POINT CHANGE BETWEEN 2007 AND 2010 BY STUDENT GROUP						
	ELL		FRPL		SD	
	Districts Improving	Districts Reporting	Districts Improving	Districts Reporting	Districts Improving	Districts Reporting
Grade 4						
1 to 5 percentage points	7	55	11	55	12	54
6 to 10 percentage points	9	55	19	55	7	54
11 to 15 percentage points	11	55	10	55	7	54
≥ 16 percentage points	10	55	7	55	11	54
Grade 8						
1 to 5 percentage points	7	49	8	46	5	48
6 to 10 percentage points	8	49	16	46	20	48
11 to 15 percentage points	1	49	11	46	4	48
≥ 16 percentage points	14	49	4	46	5	48

FIGURE 7. PERCENTAGE OF DISTRICTS REDUCING ACHIEVEMENT GAPS IN MATH		
	Districts Closing the Gap	Districts Reporting
Grade 4		
Black - White	33	50
Hispanic - White	33	50
FRPL - Non FRPL	26	42
ELL - Non ELL	23	37
SD - Non SD	21	41
Grade 8		
Black - White	30	43
Hispanic - White	29	43
FRPL - Non FRPL	18	32
ELL - Non ELL	13	29
SD - Non SD	17	35

Appendix C: Number of Districts Reporting and Improving in Figures 8-11

FIGURE 8. PERCENTAGE OF DISTRICTS WITH PERCENTAGE POINT GAINS ON STATE READING ASSESSMENTS , 2007-2010	Districts Improving	Districts Reporting
Grade 4		
1 to 5 percentage points	18	55
6 to 10 percentage points	11	55
11 to 15 percentage points	5	55
≥ 16 percentage points	2	55
Grade 8		
1 to 5 percentage points	14	51
6 to 10 percentage points	12	51
11 to 15 percentage points	15	51
≥ 16 percentage points	2	51
FIGURE 9. PERCENTAGE OF DISTRICTS WITH GAINS IN READING BETWEEN 2007 AND 2010 BY GRADE	Districts Improving	Districts Reporting
Grade 3	40	59
Grade 4	39	59
Grade 5	33	59
Grade 6	44	55
Grade 7	44	59
Grade 8	44	55
Grade 9	21	22
Grade 10	28	36
Grade 11	15	27
FIGURE 10. PERCENTAGE OF DISTRICTS PERFORMING AT OR ABOVE STATES' PROFICIENCY RATES IN READING	Greater than or Equal to State Scores	Districts Reporting
SY 2009-10		
Grade 4	14	62
Grade 8	12	62
SY 2008-09		
Grade 4	14	59
Grade 8	9	55
SY 2007-08		
Grade 4	9	57
Grade 8	9	53
SY 2006-07		
Grade 4	9	56
Grade 8	8	52
FIGURE 11. PERCENTAGE OF DISTRICTS WITH FASTER GROWTH THAN STATE IN READING, 2010		
Grade 4	33	59
Grade 8	29	55

Appendix D: Number of Districts Reporting and Improving in Figures 12-14

FIGURE 12. PERCENTAGE OF DISTRICTS WITH 4TH AND 8TH GRADE READING PERCENTAGE POINT CHANGE BETWEEN 2007 AND 2010 BY STUDENT ETHNICITY	Black		American Indian		Asian/Pacific Islander		Hispanic		White	
	Districts Improving	Districts Reporting	Districts Improving	Districts Reporting	Districts Improving	Districts Reporting	Districts Improving	Districts Reporting	Districts Improving	Districts Reporting
Grade 4										
1 to 5 percentage points	16	55	4	38	13	49	14	55	26	55
6 to 10 percentage points	11	55	4	38	11	49	9	55	5	55
11 to 15 percentage points	5	55	3	38	6	49	12	55	3	55
≥ 16 percentage points	3	55	6	38	2	49	4	55	0	55
Grade 8										
1 to 5 percentage points	10	51	2	32	5	45	9	51	19	51
6 to 10 percentage points	15	51	7	32	16	45	10	51	11	51
11 to 15 percentage points	11	51	2	32	6	45	14	51	8	51
≥ 16 percentage points	4	51	7	32	4	45	10	51	1	51

FIGURE 13. PERCENTAGE OF DISTRICTS WITH 4TH AND 8TH GRADE READING PERCENTAGE POINT CHANGE BETWEEN 2007 AND 2010 BY STUDENT GROUP	ELL		FRPL		SD	
	Districts Improving	Districts Reporting	Districts Improving	Districts Reporting	Districts Improving	Districts Reporting
Grade 4						
1 to 5 percentage points	10	55	16	55	14	54
6 to 10 percentage points	12	55	13	55	6	54
11 to 15 percentage points	8	55	5	55	4	54
≥ 16 percentage points	5	55	4	55	6	54
Grade 8						
1 to 5 percentage points	9	50	9	51	7	50
6 to 10 percentage points	6	50	9	51	16	50
11 to 15 percentage points	10	50	16	51	8	50
≥ 16 percentage points	6	50	6	51	3	50

FIGURE 14. PERCENTAGE OF DISTRICTS REDUCING ACHIEVEMENT GAPS IN READING	Districts Closing the Gap	Districts Reporting
	Grade 4	
Black - White	31	50
Hispanic - White	39	50
FRPL - Non FRPL	27	43
ELL - Non ELL	22	37
SD - Non SD	15	42
Grade 8		
Black - White	25	46
Hispanic - White	29	46
FRPL - Non FRPL	19	29
ELL - Non ELL	10	32
SD - Non SD	19	37

Appendix E: TUDA Participation in Reading and Mathematics

	2003 Reading	2005 Reading	2007 Reading	2009 Reading	2003 Math	2005 Math	2007 Math	2009 Math
Atlanta Public Schools	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Austin Independent School District		✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓
Baltimore City Public Schools				✓				✓
Boston School District	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Chicago Public Schools	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Cleveland Metropolitan School District	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Detroit Public Schools				✓				✓
District of Columbia Public Schools	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Fresno Unified School District				✓				✓
Houston Independent School District	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Jefferson County Public Schools (KY)				✓				✓
Los Angeles Unified School District	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Miami-Dade County Public Schools				✓				✓
Milwaukee Public Schools				✓				✓
New York City Public Schools	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
School District of Philadelphia				✓				✓
San Diego Unified School District	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Appendix F: Trends in NAEP Proficiency Levels for TUDA Cities in Math

4th Grade	2003		2005		2007		2009	
	% Below Basic	% At or Above Proficient	% Below Basic	% At or Above Proficient	% Below Basic	% At or Above Proficient	% Below Basic	% At or Above Proficient
National Public	24***	31***	21	35***	19	39	19*	38*
Large Cities	37***	20***	32	24***	30	28	28**	29**
Atlanta	50***	13***	43***	17***	39	20	37*,**	21*,**
Austin	—	—	15	40	17	40	17*	38*
Baltimore City	—	—	—	—	—	—	36*,**	13*,**
Boston	41***	12***	28***	22***	23	27	19*	31**
Charlotte	16	41	14	44	15	44	14*,**	45*,**
Chicago	50***	10***	48***	13	42	16	38*,**	18*,**
Cleveland	49	10	40***	13***	47	10	49*,**	8*,**
Detroit	—	—	—	—	—	—	69*,**	3*,**
District of Columbia (DCPS)	64***	7***	55***	10***	51***	14***	43*,**	19*,**
Fresno	—	—	—	—	—	—	42*,**	14*,**
Houston	30***	18***	23	26	20	28	18*	30**
Jefferson County (KY)	—	—	—	—	—	—	28**	31**
Los Angeles	48***	13***	42	18	40	19	39*,**	19*,**
Miami-Dade	—	—	—	—	—	—	19*	33**
Milwaukee	—	—	—	—	—	—	41*,**	15*,**
New York City	33***	21***	27***	26***	21	34	21*	35*
Philadelphia	—	—	—	—	—	—	39*,**	16*,**
San Diego	34***	20***	26	29***	26	35	23*	36*
8th Grade	2003		2005		2007		2009	
	% Below Basic	% At or Above Proficient	% Below Basic	% At or Above Proficient	% Below Basic	% At or Above Proficient	% Below Basic	% At or Above Proficient
National Public	33***	27***	32	28***	30	31***	29*	33*
Large Cities	50***	16***	47	19***	43	22***	40**	24**
Atlanta	70***	6***	69***	7***	59	11	54*,**	11*,**
Austin	—	—	32***	33***	28	34***	25*,**	39*,**
Baltimore City	—	—	—	—	—	—	57*,**	10*,**
Boston	52***	17***	42***	23***	35	27***	33*,**	31*
Charlotte	33***	32	31	33	30	34	28*	33*
Chicago	58***	9***	55***	11***	51	13	49*,**	15*,**
Cleveland	62	6	66***	6	55	7	58*,**	8*,**
Detroit	—	—	—	—	—	—	77*,**	4*,**
District of Columbia (DCPS)	71***	6***	69***	7***	66***	8***	62*,**	12*,**
Fresno	—	—	—	—	—	—	54*,**	15*,**
Houston	48***	12***	42***	16***	35	21	31*	24**
Jefferson County (KY)	—	—	—	—	—	—	40**	22**
Los Angeles	68***	7***	62***	11***	55	14	54*,**	13*,**
Miami-Dade	—	—	—	—	—	—	36*,**	22**
Milwaukee	—	—	—	—	—	—	63*,**	7*,**
New York City	46***	20***	46***	20	43	22	40**	26**
Philadelphia	—	—	—	—	—	—	48*,**	17*,**
San Diego	47***	18***	39***	22***	38***	24***	32*	32*

*Significantly different (p<.05) from large city in 2009.

** Significantly different (p<.05) from nation in 2009.

*** Significantly different (p<.05)

Appendix G: Trends in NAEP Proficiency Levels for TUDA Cities in Reading

4th Grade	2003		2005		2007		2009	
	% Below Basic	% At or Above Proficient	% Below Basic	% At or Above Proficient	% Below Basic	% At or Above Proficient	% Below Basic	% At or Above Proficient
National Public	38***	30***	38***	30***	34	32	34*	32*
Large Cities	53***	19***	51***	20***	47	22	46**	23**
Atlanta	63***	14***	59***	17***	52	18***	50***	22**
Austin	—	—	39	28	38	30	35*	32*
Baltimore City	—	—	—	—	—	—	58*,**	12*,**
Boston	52***	16***	49***	16***	46***	20	39*,**	24**
Charlotte	36***	31	35	33	34	35	29*,**	36*
Chicago	60***	14	60	14	56	16	55*,**	16*,**
Cleveland	65	9	63	10	61	9	66*,**	8*,**
Detroit							73*,**	5*,**
District of Columbia (DCPS)	69***	10***	67***	11***	61***	14***	54*,**	18*,**
Fresno	—	—	—	—	—	—	60*,**	12*,**
Houston	52***	18	48	21	51***	17	45**	19**
Jefferson county (KY)	—	—	—	—	—	—	36*	30*
Los Angeles	65***	11	63	14	61	13	60*,**	13*,**
Miami-Dade	—	—	—	—	—	—	32*	31*
Milwaukee	—	—	—	—	—	—	61*,**	12*,**
New York City	47***	22***	43	22***	43***	25	38*,**	29*
Philadelphia	—	—	—	—	—	—	61*,**	11*,**
San Diego	49***	22***	49***	22***	45	25	41*,**	29*
8th Grade	2003		2005		2007		2009	
	% Below Basic	% At or Above Proficient	% Below Basic	% At or Above Proficient	% Below Basic	% At or Above Proficient	% Below Basic	% At or Above Proficient
National Public	28***	30	29***	29***	27***	29***	26*	30*
Large Cities	42***	19***	40***	20	40***	20	37**	21**
Atlanta	53***	11***	54***	12***	47***	13	40**	17*,**
Austin	—	—	35***	27	34	28	29*	30*
Baltimore City	—	—	—	—	—	—	46*,**	10*,**
Boston	39***	22	39***	23	37	22	32**	23**
Charlotte	29	30	31	29	31	29	30*,**	28*
Chicago	41	15	40	17	39	17	40**	17*,**
Cleveland	52	10	51	10	44	11	48*,**	10*,**
Detroit	—	—	—	—	—	—	60*,**	7*,**
District of Columbia (DCPS)	53	10***	55	12	52	12	52*,**	14*,**
Fresno	—	—	—	—	—	—	52*,**	12*,**
Houston	45***	14***	41***	17	37	18	36**	18**
Jefferson County (KY)	—	—	—	—	—	—	32*,**	26*,**
Los Angeles	57***	11***	53***	13	50***	12	46*,**	15*,**
Miami-Dade	—	—	—	—	—	—	27*	28*
Milwaukee	—	—	—	—	—	—	49*,**	12*,**
New York City	38	22	39	20	41	20	38**	21**
Philadelphia	—	—	—	—	—	—	44*,**	15**
San Diego	40	20	37	23	40	23	35**	25

*Significantly different (p<.05) from large city in 2009.

** Significantly different (p<.05) from nation in 2009.

*** Significantly different (p<.05)

APPENDIX H: CALCULATIONS

Annual Change

$$\text{Annual Change} = \frac{(\text{Data from most recent school year} - \text{Baseline year})}{\text{Number of years} - 1}$$

$$\text{Percentage Point Change} = \text{Data from most recent year} - \text{Data from Baseline year}$$

Achievement Gaps

$$\text{Black-White} = \text{Black (district level data)} - \text{White (state level data)}$$

$$\text{Hispanic-White} = \text{Hispanic (district level data)} - \text{White (state level data)}$$

$$\text{FRPL - Non FRPL} = \text{FRPL (district level data)} - \text{Non FRPL (state level data)}$$

$$\text{ELL - Non ELL} = \text{ELL (district level data)} - \text{Non ELL (state level data)}$$

$$\text{SWD - Non SWD} = \text{SWD (district level data)} - \text{Non SWD (state level data)}$$

Change in Achievement Gaps

$$\text{Change in Gap} = \text{Achievement Gap from Baseline year} - \text{Most current year}$$

**Note: A negative change indicates that the gap is closing. The larger the negative number the more the gap has closed

NOTES

NOTES