

# A CALL FOR CHANGE:

THE SOCIAL AND EDUCATIONAL FACTORS CONTRIBUTING  
TO THE OUTCOMES OF BLACK MALES IN URBAN SCHOOLS



Research Conducted by  
The Council of the Great City Schools  
October 2010

**A CALL FOR CHANGE:**  
THE SOCIAL AND EDUCATIONAL FACTORS  
CONTRIBUTING TO THE OUTCOMES OF BLACK  
MALES IN URBAN SCHOOLS

Authors:  
Sharon Lewis  
Candace Simon  
Renata Uzzell  
Amanda Horwitz  
Michael Casserly

# ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Council of the Great City Schools thanks our superintendents and school board members for their continued support in producing this study.

## SOURCES

- U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Science, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2009 Reading
- U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2009 Mathematics
- 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.)
- U.S. Department of Commerce, Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2007
- Annie E. Casey Foundation. KidsCount
- Bureau of Justice Statistics, Prison inmates at Midyear, Current Population Survey 2009.

## 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 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 relating to personnel, communications, curriculum, research, technology, and other areas. The Council was founded in 1956 and incorporated in 1961 and has its headquarters in Washington, DC.

| EXECUTIVE OFFICERS   | ACHIEVEMENT AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT TASK FORCE CHAIRS             |
|--|--|
| <b>CHAIR</b><br>Dilafruz Williams, Board Member<br>Portland Public Schools                     | Carlos Garcia, Superintendent<br>San Francisco Unified School District |
| <b>CHAIR-ELECT</b><br>Beverly Hall, Superintendent<br>Atlanta Public Schools                   | Eileen Cooper Reed, Board Member<br>Cincinnati Public Schools          |
| <b>SECRETARY/TREASURER</b><br>Candy Olson, Board Member<br>Hillsborough County School District | Carol Comeau, Superintendent<br>Anchorage Alaska                       |
| <b>IMMEDIATE PAST CHAIR</b><br>Carol Johnson, Superintendent<br>Boston Public Schools          | Lydia Lee, Board Member<br>Minneapolis School Board                    |
| <b>EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR</b><br>Michael Casserly  | Deborah Shanley, Dean, Brooklyn College<br>City University of New York |

# PREFACE

The nation's young Black males are in a state of crisis. They do not have the same opportunities as their male or female counterparts across the country. Their infant mortality rates are higher, and their access to health care is more limited. They are more likely to live in single-parent homes and less likely to participate in early childcare programs. They are less likely to be raised in a household with a fully employed adult, and they are more likely to live in poverty. As adults, Black males are less likely than their peers to be employed. At almost every juncture, the odds are stacked against these young men in ways that result in too much unfulfilled potential and too many fractured lives.

Much of this story has been told before. Still, there has been little work focusing specifically on the academic attainment of Black males in our schools and how it is contributing to the destructive pattern we see. This report tackles the issues head on by conducting a first-time analysis of data from the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) on how Black males are performing academically. We look at ourselves—the large central cities—most critically, because it is in our urban schools that nearly 30 percent of all Black males in the nation are educated.

In order to get a complete picture of the depth of the issues, we look most closely at the reading and math achievement of the fourth- and eighth-grade Black males in our large city schools. We track their progress and compare their scores, as a whole, with the scores of White males in national public schools. In various combinations, we compare the scores of Black and White males who are and are not eligible for free or reduced-price lunch, Black and White males with and without disabilities, and Black males in urban areas vs. Black males in national public schools among other comparisons. Also, we look at the disaggregated reading and math achievement levels of Black males in 18 big city school districts.

Finally, we look at dropout figures and school experiences. We examine college entrance examination scores and college readiness, enrollment, and graduation data. The report concludes with statistics on the postsecondary experiences of Black males, professional degrees attained, wages, and living conditions. We conclude with profiles of Black males from our Great City Schools who have thrived despite the odds and who serve as inspirations for all.

This report will not make many people feel good, even though it contains evidence that Black males attending schools in urban areas have made more progress than those living elsewhere. In fact, this report is likely to make people angry, and it should. We hope that this is a louder and more jolting wake-up call to the nation than this country is used to hearing. The fact that previous calls have fallen on so many deaf ears is not encouraging, but we are convinced that we must ring the alarms one more time and play a larger role in setting this situation right.

The issues that emerge from the statistics we present are both moral and economic. With so many of our citizens lacking access to the fruits of the richest nation on earth, our aspirations as a truly just nation are called into question. And our ability to maintain our success and leadership is jeopardized by having so much talent go to waste. This report is a call to action for America to do better.

I wish to thank Sharon Lewis for her leadership in initiating this report and Candace Simon, who did most of the analysis. I also thank Renata Uzzell and Amanda Horwitz for their substantial contributions to this effort.

Michael Casserly  
Executive Director  
Council of the Great City Schools

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....   | 01  |
| CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION AND DEMOGRAPHICS .....                                | 09  |
| CHAPTER 2. SOCIAL AND EDUCATIONAL FACTORS .....                               | 15  |
| FACTOR 1. READINESS TO LEARN.....   | 16  |
| FACTOR 2. BLACK MALE ACHIEVEMENT ON NAEP                                      |     |
| FACTOR 2A. READING GRADE 4.....   | 22  |
| FACTOR 2B. READING GRADE 8.....   | 32  |
| FACTOR 2C. MATHEMATICS GRADE 4.....   | 42  |
| FACTOR 2D. MATHEMATICS GRADE 8.....   | 52  |
| FACTOR 3. BLACK MALE ACHIEVEMENT ON NAEP IN SELECTED BIG CITY DISTRICTS ..... | 62  |
| FACTOR 4. COLLEGE AND CAREER PREPAREDNESS.....                                | 76  |
| FACTOR 5. SCHOOL EXPERIENCE.....  | 82  |
| FACTOR 6. POSTSECONDARY EXPERIENCE.....                                       | 88  |
| CHAPTER 3. PROFILES OF EXCELLENCE .....                                       | 95  |
| CHAPTER 4. A PLAN OF ACTION AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....                          | 99  |
| APPENDIX: COUNCIL OF THE GREAT CITY SCHOOLS' DEMOGRAPHICS, 2008-2009.....     | 103 |

# FIGURES

## DEMOGRAPHICS

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Figure D1. CGCS Demographic Enrollment by Race and Gender, 2009 .....              | 13 |
| Figure D2. Percentage of FRPL and SD Students in CGCS School Districts, 2009 ..... | 13 |
| Figure D3. Percentage of CGCS Students by Range of Selected Groups, 2009.....      | 14 |
| Figure D4. CGCS Student Enrollment as Percentage of Nation by Group, 2009 .....    | 14 |

## FACTOR 1: READINESS TO LEARN

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Figure 1.1 Infant Mortality Rate by Ethnicity, 2003-2007 .....  | 17 |
| Figure 1.2 Percentage of Children 17 years of Age and Under<br>Not Covered by Private or Government Health Insurance, 2008.....                     | 17 |
| Figure 1.3 Percentage of Black Male Children 0-4 Years of Age Without Family<br>Health Insurance by Urbanicity and Income, 2006-2008 .....          | 18 |
| Figure 1.4 Percentage of Children Ages 18 and Under Living in Single-Parent Households by Race, 2008 .....  | 18 |
| Figure 1.5 Percentage of Black Children under Age 18 by Living Arrangements, 2007 .....   | 19 |
| Figure 1.6 Percentage Distribution of Primary Care Arrangements<br>of Four-Year-Old Black Children, 2005-2006 .....                                 | 19 |
| Figure 1.7 Percentage of Black Children Ages 6 to 18<br>by Parent's Highest Level of Educational Attainment, 2008.....                              | 20 |
| Figure 1.8 Percentage of Children Ages 18 and Under Living in Families<br>Where No Parent Has Full-Time, Year-Round Employment, by Race, 2008 ..... | 21 |
| Figure 1.9 Percentage of Children Under Age 18 Living in Poverty by Race/Ethnicity, 2007 .....  | 21 |

## FACTOR 2: BLACK ACHIEVEMENT ON NAEP

### FACTOR 2A: READING GRADE 4

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Figure 2.1 Grade 4 NAEP Reading Scale Scores by Ethnicity, 2003-2009 .....  | 24 |
| Figure 2.2. Grade 4 NAEP Reading Scale Scores of Black Males<br>and Females (LC) and Hispanic Males and Females (LC), 2003-2009 ..... | 25 |
| Figure 2.3 Grade 4 NAEP Reading Scale Scores of Black Males (LC) vs. Black Males (NP), 2003-2009 .....                                | 26 |

# FIGURES

Figure 2.4 Grade 4 NAEP Reading Scale Scores of Black Males (LC) vs. White Males (NP), 2003-2009 ..... 26

Figure 2.5 Percentage of Grade 4 Black Males (LC) vs. White Males (NP) Performing At or Above Proficient in NAEP Reading, 2003-2009 ..... 27

Figure 2.6 Grade 4 NAEP Reading Scale Scores of FRPL and Non-FRPL Black Males (LC) and FRPL and Non-FRPL White Males (NP), 2003-2009 ..... 28

Figure 2.7 Percentage of Grade 4 Non-FRPL Black Males (LC) vs. FRPL White Males (NP) Performing At or Above Proficient in NAEP Reading, 2003-2009..... 29

Figure 2.8 Grade 4 NAEP Reading Scale Scores of SD and Non-SD Black Males (LC) and SD and Non-SD White Males (NP), 2003-2009 ..... 30

Figure 2.9 Percentage of Grade 4 Non-SD Black Males (LC) vs. SD White Males (NP) Performing At or Above Proficient in NAEP Reading, 2003-2009 ..... 31

## FACTOR 2B: READING GRADE 8

Figure 2.10 Grade 8 NAEP Reading Scale Scores by Ethnicity, 2003-2009..... 34

Figure 2.11 Grade 8 NAEP Reading Scale Scores of Black Males and Females (LC) and Hispanic Males and Females (LC), 2003-2009 ..... 35

Figure 2.12 Grade 8 NAEP Reading Scale Scores of Black Males (LC) vs. Black Males (NP), 2003-2009 ..... 36

Figure 2.13 Grade 8 NAEP Reading Scale Scores of Black Males (LC) vs. White Males (NP), 2003-2009 ..... 36

Figure 2.14 Percentage of Grade 8 Black Males (LC) vs. White Males (NP) Performing At or Above Proficient in NAEP Reading, 2003-2009 ..... 37

Figure 2.15 Grade 8 NAEP Reading Scale Scores of FRPL and Non-FRPL Black Males (LC) and FRPL and Non-FRPL White Males (NP), 2003-2009..... 38

Figure 2.16 Percentage of Grade 8 Non-FRPL Black Males (LC) vs. FRPL White Males (NP) Performing At or Above Proficient in NAEP Reading, 2003-2009 ..... 39

Figure 2.17 Grade 8 NAEP Reading Scale Scores of SD and Non-SD Black Males (LC) and SD and Non-SD White Males (NP), 2003-2009 ..... 40

Figure 2.18 Percentage of Grade 8 Non-SD Black Males (LC) vs. SD White Males (NP) Performing At or Above Proficient in NAEP Reading, 2003-2009 ..... 41

## FACTOR 2C: MATHEMATICS GRADE 4

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Figure 2.19 Grade 4 NAEP Mathematics Scale Scores by Ethnicity, 2003-2009 .....  | 44 |
| Figure 2.20 Grade 4 NAEP Mathematics Scale Scores of Black Males and Females (LC) and Hispanic Males and Females (LC), 2003-2009 .....                       | 45 |
| Figure 2.21 Grade 4 NAEP Mathematics Scale Scores of Black Males (LC) vs. Black Males (NP), 2003-2009 .....  | 46 |
| Figure 2.22 Grade 4 NAEP Mathematics Scale Scores of Black Males (LC) vs. White Males (NP), 2003-2009 .....  | 46 |
| Figure 2.23 Percentage of Grade 4 Black Males (LC) vs. White Males (NP) Performing At or Above Proficient in NAEP Mathematics, 2003-2009 .....               | 47 |
| Figure 2.24 Grade 4 NAEP Mathematics Scale Scores of FRPL and Non-FRPL Black Males (LC) and FRPL and Non-FRPL White Males (NP), 2003-2009 .....              | 48 |
| Figure 2.25 Percentage of Grade 4 Non-FRPL Black Males (LC) vs. FRPL White Males (NP) Performing At or Above Proficient in NAEP Mathematics, 2003-2009 ..... | 49 |
| Figure 2.26 Grade 4 NAEP Mathematics Scale Scores of SD and Non-SD Black Males (LC) and SD and Non-SD White Males (NP), 2003-2009 .....                      | 50 |
| Figure 2.27 Percentage of Grade 4 Non-SD Black Males (LC) vs. SD White Males (NP) Performing At or Above Proficient in NAEP Mathematics, 2003-2009 .....     | 51 |

## FACTOR 2D: MATHEMATICS GRADE 8

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Figure 2.28 Grade 8 NAEP Mathematics Scale Scores by Ethnicity, 2003-2009 .....   | 54 |
| Figure 2.29 Grade 8 NAEP Mathematics Scale Scores of Black Males and Females (LC) and Hispanic Males and Females (LC), 2003-2009 .....          | 55 |
| Figure 2.30 Grade 8 NAEP Mathematics Scale Scores of Black Males (LC) vs. Black Males (NP), 2003-2009 .....                                     | 56 |
| Figure 2.31 Grade 8 NAEP Mathematics Scale Scores of Black Males (LC) vs. White Males (NP), 2003-2009 .....                                     | 56 |
| Figure 2.32 Percentage of Grade 8 Black Males (LC) vs. White Males (NP) Performing At or Above Proficient in NAEP Mathematics, 2003-2009 .....  | 57 |
| Figure 2.33 Grade 8 NAEP Mathematics Scale Scores of FRPL and Non-FRPL Black Males (LC) and FRPL and Non-FRPL White Males (NP), 2003-2009 ..... | 58 |



# FIGURES

Figure 2.34 Percentage of Grade 8 Non-FRPL Black Males (LC) vs. FRPL Black Males (NP) Performing At or Above Proficient in NAEP Mathematics, 2003- 2009.....59

Figure 2.35 Grade 8 NAEP Mathematics Scale Scores of SD and Non-SD Black Males (LC) vs. SD and Non-SD White Males (NP), 2003-2009 .....60

Figure 2.36 Percentage of Grade 8 Non-SD Black Males (LC) vs. SD White Males (NP) Performing At or Above Proficient in NAEP Mathematics, 2003- 2009.....61

## **FACTOR 3: BLACK MALE ACHIEVEMENT ON NAEP IN SELECTED BIG CITY DISTRICTS**

Figure 3.1 Grade 4 NAEP Reading Scale Scores of Black Males in TUDA Districts, LC and NP, 2003-2009 .....64

Figure 3.2 Grade 4 NAEP Reading Scale Scores of Black Males in TUDA Districts, LC and NP, 2009.....65

Figure 3.3 Grade 4 Black Males Performing Below Basic and At or Above Proficient in NAEP Reading in TUDA Districts, LC and NP, 2009 .....66

Figure 3.4 Grade 8 NAEP Reading Scale Scores of Black Males in TUDA Districts, LC and NP, 2003-2009.....67

Figure 3.5 Grade 8 NAEP Reading Scale Scores of Black Males in TUDA Districts, LC and NP, 2009.....68

Figure 3.6 Percentage of Grade 8 Black Males Performing Below Basic and At or Above Proficient in NAEP Reading in TUDA Districts, LC and NP, 2009.....69

Figure 3.7 Grade 4 NAEP Mathematics Scale Scores of Black Males in TUDA Districts, LC and NP, 2003-2009.....70

Figure 3.8 Grade 4 NAEP Mathematics Scale Scores of Black Males in TUDA Districts, LC and NP, 2009.....71

Figure 3.9 Grade 4 Black Males Performing Below Basic and At or Above Proficient in NAEP Mathematics in TUDA Districts, LC and NP, 2009 .....72

Figure 3.10 Grade 8 NAEP Mathematics Scale Scores of Black Males in TUDA Districts, LC and NP, 2003-2009.....73

Figure 3.11 Grade 8 NAEP Mathematics Scale Scores of Black Males in TUDA Districts, LC and NP, 2009.....74

Figure 3.12 Grade 8 Black Males Performing Below Basic and At or Above Proficient in NAEP Mathematics in TUDA Districts, LC and NP, 2009.....75

## **FACTOR 4: COLLEGE AND CAREER PREPAREDNESS**

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Figure 4.1 High School Dropout Rates for Males by Ethnicity, 2005-2008.....   | 77 |
| Figure 4.2 Average Freshman Graduation Rates for Public High School Students by Ethnicity, 2007 .....                               | 77 |
| Figure 4.3 Percentage of High School Students Taking Advanced Placement Exams by Ethnicity, 2008 .....                              | 78 |
| Figure 4.4 Average SAT Scores for Males by Race, 2009 .....   | 78 |
| Figure 4.5 Average ACT Scores for Students by Race, 2009.....   | 79 |
| Figure 4.6 Percentage of Students Meeting ACT College Readiness Benchmark Scores by Race, 2009 .....                                | 79 |
| Figure 4.7 Percentage of Black and White Males Enrolled in a Two-Year or Four-Year College After High School Graduation, 2009 ..... | 80 |

## **FACTOR 5: SCHOOL EXPERIENCE**

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Figure 5.1 Percentage of High School Seniors Participating in School-Sponsored Extracurricular Activities by Race/Ethnicity, 2004.....        | 83 |
| Figure 5.2 Percentage of High School Seniors Participating in School-Sponsored Extracurricular Activities by Socioeconomic Status, 2004 ..... | 83 |
| Figure 5.3 Percentage of Kindergarten through Grade 8 Students Retained in a Grade During Their School Career, 2007 .....                     | 84 |
| Figure 5.4 Percentage of Students Suspended from Public Elementary and Secondary Schools by Race/Ethnicity, 2006 .....                        | 84 |
| Figure 5.5 Rates of Violent Incidents in Public Schools by Urbanicity, 2008.....  | 85 |
| Figure 5.6 Rates of Violent Incidents in Public Schools by Minority Enrollment, 2008.....   | 85 |
| Figure 5.7 Rates of Violent Incidents in Public Schools by Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Enrollment, 2008.....                           | 86 |
| Figure 5.8 Percentage of Public Schools Reporting Gang Activities During School Year, 2008 .....  | 87 |

# FIGURES

## FACTOR 6: POSTSECONDARY EXPERIENCES

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Figure 6.1 College Graduation Rates for First-Time Postsecondary Students in Full-Time Degree Seeking 4- Year Institutions, 2001 ..... | 89 |
| Figure 6.2 Unemployment Rates for Black and White Males Ages 20 and Over, Second Quarter 2010 .....                                    | 89 |
| Figure 6.3 Bachelor's Degrees Conferred on Black Males by Field of Study, 2008.....  | 90 |
| Figure 6.4 Professional Degrees Conferred on Black Males by Field of Study, 2008 .....   | 91 |
| Figure 6.5 Educational Attainment of Male Population 18 Years and Over by Race, 2009 .....   | 91 |
| Figure 6.6 Income by Educational Attainment of Black and White Males Ages 18 and Over, 2006.....                                       | 92 |
| Figure 6.7 Percentage of Black Males Ages 16 and Over in the Labor Force by Occupation, 2008 .....                                     | 93 |
| Figure 6.8 Percentage Distribution of Black and White Males Ages 18 and Over in College and Prison Population, 2008 .....              | 93 |
| Figure 6.9 Imprisonment Rate per 100,000 Persons in the U.S. Resident Population of Black and White Males Ages 18 and Over, 2008.....  | 94 |
| Figure 6.10 Percentage of Black and White Male Prisoners Under State and Federal Jurisdiction by Age, 2008 .....                       | 94 |

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## “EDUCATION IS A PRECONDITION TO SURVIVAL IN AMERICA TODAY.”

~ MARIAN WRIGHT EDELMAN

The purpose of this study is to bring much-needed attention to the comprehensive challenges of Black males in the United States. Black males continue to perform lower than their peers throughout the country on almost every indicator. And while much work over the years has gone into addressing the challenge of the Black–White achievement gap, there has been no concerted national effort focused on the education and social outcomes of Black males specifically. There is no specified office within the U.S. Department of Education; no primary federal source to collect and maintain data on Black males; no legislative projects within local, state, or national budgets; no attention on the collection of information on this set of issues outside of a few dedicated organizations; no national policy that would drive resources or attention to the issue; and no federal education program on the educational status of Black males. While there are educators, researchers, policymakers, governmental leaders, faith-based leaders, civil rights leaders, and others intent on improving the quality of life for Black males, their efforts are often too disconnected and too uncoordinated to match the comprehensive nature of the problem. This is a national catastrophe, and it deserves coordinated national attention.

The Council of the Great City Schools pays special tribute and gives thanks to the organizations that have brought attention to these issues—the Schott Foundation, National Urban League, and Children’s Defense Fund. We thank them, too, for their continued efforts. Also, we recognize the work of Jawanza Kunjufu, John Ogbu, Ronald Ferguson, Pedro Noguera, Michael Nettles, and other researchers and scholars who have continued to keep this issue front and center in their work.

This study attempts to pull together much of the disparate work on Black male achievement. Still, the work is limited in that it examines only six areas in the lives of America’s Black males:

1. Readiness to learn
2. Black male achievement on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP)
3. Black male achievement on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) in selected big city school districts
4. College and career preparedness
5. School experience
6. Postsecondary experience

Moreover, in each area we only highlight a few indicators. We recognize that many more indicators could have been addressed, but we are convinced that we have more than made the case for action in this report.

The reader should keep a number of things in mind as he or she goes through the report. First, all data reported here are from secondary sources unless otherwise indicated.

Second, the years on which data are reported vary from indicator to indicator depending on the source, but all are the most recently available.

Third, data are disaggregated, when available by gender within race, so that comparisons can be made between Black males and White males. But data are not always available to do that. In far too many instances, data were only available for race and not for gender within race. We believe that critical data should be made available by gender within race if we are going to truly understand the extent and nature of the challenges confronted by Black males.

Fourth, the Council analyzed National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) data on the achievement of Black males at both the national public (NP) and large city (LC) levels and on 18 big city school districts using data from the Trial Urban District Assessments (TUDA). The large cities in the nation are those with populations of 250,000 or more. In this paper, large city means the combined public school student enrollments in the nation’s large city public schools. All of the NAEP analyses were conducted using the NAEP Data Explorer <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/naepdata/report.aspx>.

We believe that the analyses conducted, which disaggregated results by gender within race, represents the first time these data have been used in this way. Wherever possible, we also analyzed the differences in the NAEP data to determine whether or not they were statistically significant.

## FINDINGS

A summary of the key findings in each of the six areas follows:

### FACTOR 1: READINESS TO LEARN

Large numbers of Black children continue to live in deplorable conditions. Significant numbers live in poverty, their families are in peril, their parents lack postsecondary education, and they are not participating in structured early child-care programs at the same rate as their White peers.

- Between 2003 and 2007, Black mothers had infant mortality rates at least twice as high as White mothers.
- In 2008, Black children ages 17 and under were nearly 50 percent more likely to be without private or government health insurance than White children.
- In 2008, Black children ages 18 and under were three times more likely to live in single-parent households than White children. Nearly two-thirds of all Black children lived in a single-parent household.
- In 2008, Black children were twice as likely as White children to live in a household where no parent had full-time or year-round employment.
- In 2008, one-third of Black children had a parent with a high school diploma, 24 percent had a parent with at least some college experience, and less than 15 percent had a parent who held a bachelor's degree.
- In 2007, one out of every three Black children lived in poverty compared with one out of every ten White children.

### FACTOR 2: BLACK MALE ACHIEVEMENT ON THE NATIONAL ASSESSMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRESS (NAEP)

Achievement levels of Black males continue to be lower than those of White males. The achievement gaps between Black males attending large city (LC) schools (public schools in the set of U.S. cities with populations exceeding 250,000) and White males in national public schools (NP) were wide in 2003 and continued to be wide in 2009, the

most recent year of NAEP testing. In fact, large city (LC) Black males *not eligible for free or reduced-price lunch* had reading and mathematics scores similar to or lower than those of White males in national public schools (NP) who were *eligible for free or reduced-price lunch*. Furthermore, large city (LC) Black males *without disabilities* had reading and mathematics scores, on average, lower than those of White males in national public schools (NP) *with disabilities*.

### READING GRADES 4 AND 8

- In 2009, average reading scale scores of large city (LC) Black students in grade 4 and 8 were not significantly different from Hispanic students in large cities (LC). Both, however, were lower than White students in national public schools (NP).
- In 2009, the average scale score of Black males in large cities (LC) were significantly lower than Black females and Hispanic females in large cities (LC) at grades 4 and 8. However, the average scale score of Black males in large cities was not significantly different from Hispanic males in large cities at both grades.
- Between 2003 and 2009 the average reading scale scores of Black males in large cities (LC) and in national public schools increased significantly in grade 4. In grade 8, the average reading scale score of Black males in national public schools (NP) also increased significantly between 2003 and 2009.
- In 2009, the average reading scale score of large city (LC) Black males was not significantly different from that of Black males in national public schools (NP) at grade 4 but significantly different at grade 8.
- Between 2003 and 2009, the average reading scale score of large city (LC) Black males was lower than the average score of White males in national public schools (NP) by at least 28 points at grade 4 and 29 points at grade 8.

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- In 2009, the average reading scale score of large city (LC) Black males who were *not eligible for free or reduced-price lunch* (Non-FRPL) was one point lower at grade 4 and seven points lower at grade 8 than the score of White males in national public schools (NP) who were *eligible for free or reduced-price lunch* (FRPL).
- In 2009, the average reading scale score of large city (LC) Black males *without disabilities* (Non-SD) was only two points higher at grade 4 and five points higher at grade 8 than the score of White males nationwide (NP) *with disabilities* (SD).

## MATHEMATICS GRADES 4 AND 8

- In 2009, the average mathematics scale score of large city (LC) Black students in grade 4 and 8 was significantly lower than Hispanic students in large cities (LC). Both were lower than White students in national public schools (NP).
- In 2009, the average mathematics scale scores of Black males in large cities (LC) was not significantly different from Black females in large cities (LC) in grades 4 and 8. However, the average scale scores of Black males in large cities (LC) were significantly lower than Hispanic males and Hispanic females in large cities (LC) at grades 4 and 8.
- Between 2003 and 2009, the average mathematics scale scores of Black males in large cities (LC) and in national public schools (NP) increased significantly in both grades 4 and 8.
- In 2009, the average mathematics scale score of large city (LC) Black males was significantly lower than the average scores of Black males in national public schools (NP) in both grades 4 and 8.
- Between 2003 and 2009, the average mathematics scale score of large city (LC) Black males remained at least 30 points lower at grade 4 and 38 points lower at grade 8 than the score of White males in national public schools (NP).
- In 2009, the average mathematics scale score of large city (LC) Black males who were *not eligible for free or reduced-price lunch* (Non-FRPL) was eight points lower at grade 4 and 12 points lower at grade 8 than the score of White males nationwide (NP) who were *eligible for free or reduced-price lunch* (FRPL).

- In 2009, the average mathematics scale score of large city (LC) Black males *without disabilities* (Non-SD) was nine points lower in grade 4 and two points lower at grade 8 than the score of White males nationwide (NP) *with disabilities* (SD).

## FACTOR 3: BLACK MALE ACHIEVEMENT ON THE NATIONAL ASSESSMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRESS (NAEP) IN SELECTED BIG CITY DISTRICTS

With few exceptions, reading and mathematics scale scores on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) among Black males in TUDA districts were lower than Black males in national public schools (NP) at grades 4 and 8. In fact, at least 50 percent of fourth- and eighth-grade Black males in most Trial Urban District Assessment (TUDA) districts and nationwide scored below Basic levels.

## READING GRADES 4 AND 8

- Between 2003 and 2009, average reading scale scores of fourth- and eighth-grade Black males increased significantly in Atlanta and New York City. Fourth-graders in Boston, Charlotte, District of Columbia (DCPS) and New York City also increased during that same period.
- In 2009, the average reading scale scores for fourth-grade Black males in Boston and New York City were significantly higher than scale scores for Black males in national public schools (NP). In addition, fourth-grade Black males in Boston, Charlotte, Houston, and New York City scored significantly higher in reading than Black males in large cities generally (LC).
- In 2009, all TUDA districts had approximately 50 percent or more of their fourth-grade Black males performing below *Basic* levels in reading. The percentage of Black males at or above *Proficient* levels in fourth-grade reading ranged from a low of 3 percent in Cleveland and Detroit to a high of 16 percent in Charlotte. Twelve percent of Black males in national public schools (NP) were at or above *Proficient* levels.
- In 2009, average reading scale scores of eighth-grade Black males in Cleveland, Detroit, District of Columbia, Fresno, and Milwaukee were significantly lower than scale scores among Black males in national public schools (NP). None of the average reading scale scores for Black males in any TUDA

district were significantly higher than scores for Black males in national public schools (NP) or in the large cities (LC).

- In 2009, at least 50 percent of eighth-grade Black males in all but four TUDA districts performed below *Basic* levels in reading. The percentage of Black males at or above *Proficient* levels ranged from a low of 3 percent in Milwaukee to a high of 13 percent in Austin. Nine percent of Black males in national public schools (NP) were at or above *Proficient* levels.

### **MATHEMATICS GRADES 4 AND 8**

- Between 2003 and 2009, average mathematics scale scores of fourth and eighth grade Black males increased significantly in Atlanta and Boston. Scores of fourth-graders in District of Columbia, and New York City as well as eighth-graders in Charlotte and Chicago also increased during that same period.
- In 2009, the average mathematics scale scores of fourth-grade Black males in Boston, Charlotte, and New York City were significantly higher than the scale scores of Black males in national public schools (NP). Black males in Boston, Charlotte, Houston, and New York City scored significantly higher, on average, than Black males in large cities generally (LC).
- In 2009, at least 30 percent of fourth-grade Black males in most TUDA districts performed below *Basic* levels in mathematics; and in eight of the 18 districts, at least 50 percent of fourth-graders performed below *Basic* levels. The percentage of fourth-grade Black males at or above *Proficient* levels ranged from 2 percent in Detroit to 25 percent in Charlotte. Fifteen percent of Black males in national public schools were at or above *Proficient* levels.
- In 2009, the average mathematics scale scores of eighth-grade Black males in Austin, Boston, and Charlotte were significantly higher than Black males in national public schools (NP). Black males in Austin, Boston, Charlotte, and Houston scored, on average, higher than Black males in other large cities (LC).
- In 2009, at least 50 percent of eighth-grade Black males in TUDA districts performed below *Basic* levels in mathematics. The percentage of Black males at or above *Proficient* levels ranged from 2 percent in Milwaukee to 19 percent in Austin. Twelve percent of Black Males in national public schools (NP) were at or above *Proficient* levels.

### **FACTOR 4: COLLEGE AND CAREER PREPAREDNESS**

Black males were more likely, compared with White males, to drop out of high school and not graduate. Fewer Black males take Advanced Placement exams or enroll in two- or four-year colleges after graduation. Furthermore, the average SAT and ACT scores of Black males were lower than those of White males.

- In 2008, Black males were nearly twice as likely to drop out of high school as White males. Nine percent of Black males dropped out of high school compared with 5 percent of White males.
- In 2008, Advanced Placement test takers were more likely to be White students than Black students. Approximately 60 percent of AP test takers were White, 15 percent Hispanic, 10 percent Asian and 8 percent Black.
- In 2009, the average SAT scores of Black males were lower than those of White males in critical reading, mathematics, and writing. The gap between White and Black students taking the SAT was 104 points in critical reading, 120 points in mathematics, and 99 points in writing.
- The average ACT scores of Black students were lower than those for White students in English, mathematics, and reading. In 2009, the gap between White and Black students was six points in English, five points in mathematics, and six points in reading.
- In 2009, Black males were less likely than White males to enroll in a two-year or four-year college after high school graduation. Three out of 10 Black males enrolled in a four-year institution, compared with four out of 10 White males.



# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## FACTOR 5: SCHOOL EXPERIENCE

Black students were less likely than their White peers to participate in academic clubs, more likely to be suspended from school, and more likely to be retained in grade. Students attending public schools with more than 50 percent minority students were more likely to report incidents of violent crimes than their peers at other schools with smaller minority enrollments.

- Black high school seniors were less likely to participate in academic clubs than other classmates in 2004. Some 45 percent of Black students participated in sports activities, 17 percent in academic clubs, and 24 percent in extracurricular music activities.
- Black or poor students attending public school were more likely to be retained during their K-8 school career than their classmates. In 2007, at least 23 percent of students who were retained were poor, and 16 percent were Black, compared with 5 percent of non-poor and 8 percent of White students.
- In 2006, Black students were three times more likely than White students, two times more likely than Hispanic and American Indian students, and five times more likely than Asian American students to be suspended from school. Some 15 percent of Black students and 5 percent of White students were suspended from public elementary and secondary schools.
- Public schools with more than 50 percent minority student enrollments reported a higher rate of crime than schools with fewer minority students in 2008.
- In 2008, gang activities were more likely to be reported by public schools in cities; public schools with a high percentage of minority students; and public schools with a high percentage of FRPL students than other types of public schools.

## FACTOR 6: POSTSECONDARY EXPERIENCE

Black males had significantly different postsecondary experiences than White males. Their graduation rates were lower, unemployment rates higher, they were more likely to earn a lower income than White males with similar educational backgrounds, and they were more likely to be incarcerated.

- In 2001, graduation rates for White males were consistently higher than national averages. The graduation rates were at least 50 percent higher for Whites males than for Black males. Approximately 15 percent of Black males graduated in four years and about one-third graduated in five years compared with 33 percent of White males graduating in four years and one-half graduating in five years.
- In the second quarter of 2010, the unemployment rate for Black males ages 20 and over was twice as high as the unemployment rate for White males of the same age. Black males had a double-digit unemployment rate (17.3 percent), while the unemployment rate for White males was in the single digits (8.6 percent) and below the national average (9.6 percent).
- In 2008, Black males who graduated from college were more likely to earn bachelor's degrees in business than any other field. Approximately 30 percent earned a degree in business, 10 percent in social sciences and history, and fewer than 10 percent earned degrees in all other reported areas.
- In 2009, approximately 20 percent of Black males age 18 or over had either attained some college or had a college degree. Ten percent of Black males had earned bachelor's degrees, compared with 18 percent of White males. Four percent of Black males had earned master's degrees, compared with 6 percent of White males.
- Black males age 18 and over were more likely to have a lower income than White males with similar educational backgrounds. In 2006, the wage gap between Black and White males who did not graduate from high school was approximately \$5,000, compared with a gap of over \$20,000 for those with a master's degree.
- In 2008, Black males ages 18 and over represented only 5 percent of the total college student population but 36 percent of the total prison population.

- In 2008, Black males ages 18 and over were imprisoned at a rate six and a half times higher than White males.

## PROFILES OF EXCELLENCE

Despite the discouraging data on the social and educational influences on Black males, there is hope. There are a considerable number of Black males who “beat the odds” and succeed in their chosen fields. In this section of the report, we highlight young Black men from urban school districts who stood out among their peers. Their profiles show that, with appropriate support, a school that promotes excellence, and adults who nourish their growth, success is possible.

## FUTURE RESEARCH

Improving the quality of education for Black males in America is a national imperative. The current state of affairs, if left unaddressed, not only threatens to devastate more lives but to affect the ability of Black males to care for their current and future families.

To begin addressing these issues more effectively, the Council of the Great City Schools is launching a renewed research effort that the organization hopes will yield more effective strategies than have been used in the past. Typically, the Council would review existing data, identify districts making more progress than others, and study how these more successful districts were producing their gains. But the data we examined, particularly NAEP data, suggest that few major city school districts are realizing outsized results with their Black male students, so the Council is going to take a different approach than is normally the case.

The Council will continue to analyze new and secondary data on the quality of education for Black males attending schools in the nation’s largest urban districts, but the organization will also work to assemble the best thinking from around the country on what needs to be done (a) to improve the life circumstances of Black males, (b) to promote these strategies among the nation’s major city school districts, (c) and to marshal the energy and commitment of like-minded individuals and groups to ensure progress.

In particular, the Council will move to--

- Convene a panel of 10 to 15 esteemed school district, state, national, and university leaders, as well as civic and faith-based leaders and governmental officials, who are concerned about the education of Black males. This panel of leaders would serve as a governing board and would provide advice and guidance to the Council on the formulation of strategies for improvement. The panel would identify critical academic and nonacademic challenges and barriers to educating Black males. And it would provide guidance on the direction and development of a national strategy.
- Identify one or more scholars to write papers that would not only describe the challenges but also offer recommendations and solutions.
- Have urban school board members, superintendents, and other senior staff and teachers from Council member districts review each paper.
- Ask reviewers to comment on the promise and feasibility of the recommendations, and have scholars revise or extend their proposals accordingly.
- Convene a major conference to publicly discuss the recommendations and direction.
- Compile all recommendations, strategies, and proposals into a final report.
- Urge the Council’s board of directors (who consist of the superintendent and one school board member from each Council district) to move forward on the recommendations.
- Marshal organizations, individuals, and agencies in support of a “Call to Action” to improve the attainment of the nation’s Black males.

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Convene a White House conference on the status of Black males and develop an overall call to action and strategic direction for improvement.
2. Encourage Congress, as it reauthorizes the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), to establish an explicit program with financial aid that would help public schools close achievement gaps. The program should include both educational strategies and social supports for Black males.
3. Marshal the energies and commitment of national and local organizations with an interest and stake in seeing improvement to coordinate their efforts on behalf of Black male youth. Such groups might include the Boys and Girls Clubs, 100 Black Men, the National Urban League, the NBA, the music industry, and others.
4. Build a nationwide network of support, particularly in the nation's major cities, to mentor and support individual Black male young people and their families.
5. Establish an ongoing network of mentoring, internship, and career experiences for adolescent Black males with the private sector in the nation's major cities.
6. Expand the number of Black male counselors in the nation's urban schools in order to provide social, psychological, and college/career guidance and direction to Black male students.
7. Encourage local, state, and national educators/researchers to disaggregate academic and nonacademic data by gender and race/ethnicity so that valid comparisons can be made between Black males and their peers.
8. Ensure that Black male students are taking the requisite courses at the appropriate level of rigor beginning in late elementary school, at least, to ensure that they are on track academically for high school graduation.
9. Work with the higher education community to ensure appropriate academic and social supports for Black male students in higher education.
10. Encourage school district leaders, especially in the big cities, to better target their instructional programming, interventions, and afterschool initiatives to address the specific academic and social needs of Black male students. School boards and superintendents should be asking for regular updates on the status and progress of their initiatives for these students.
11. Create a cadre of individuals to work in Black communities to address issues of violence and disruption both on the streets and in school.

# CHAPTER 1



# INTRODUCTION

Many individuals and organizations—education, civic, business, faith-based, and others—have been working tirelessly to close the achievement gap between racial and ethnic groups for some time. But only modest progress has been made and the achievement gaps remain wide. The Council of the Great City Schools is stepping forward on this issue because so many of the nation's Black males are enrolled in our schools.

In 2009, approximately 29 percent of all Black male students in the nation were enrolled in the organization's 65 urban school districts out of approximately 15,000 school districts nationwide. In addition, 20 percent of the nation's students eligible for FRPL and 15 percent of those identified as students with disabilities were enrolled in a Great City School district. In contrast, only five percent of the nation's White male students were enrolled in a major urban school district.

The purpose of this report is to focus in on a critical element of the nation's achievement gap—Black males. The academic performance of Black males continues to fall behind their peers on every major assessment in the nation—ACT, SAT, and the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). And the goal of this report is to help galvanize the energies and resources of a nation that has, for too long, chosen to ignore the issue.

This report also aims to place the challenges that Black males face in a broader social context while emphasizing the critical educational dimensions of the issues. The data in this report are drawn from the U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, Common Core of Data, Public Elementary/Secondary School Universe Survey, 2009-10; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; National Center for Health Statistics; ACT; SAT; and other national databases. Not all data in the subsequent sections are reported by both race and gender, because the information in that format is not always available.

Particular attention is given to data from the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), districts participating in the Trial Urban District Assessment of NAEP, and schools that comprise the large city (LC)<sup>1</sup> variable of NAEP. Because NAEP scales are developed independently for each subject, scores cannot be compared across subjects or across grades.

Wherever possible, differences in the NAEP data were analyzed to determine whether or not they were statistically significant. Tests of significance could only be conducted with variables within the same jurisdictions (districts, large cities, or national public schools) or between years. Tests of significance could not be conducted with variables across different jurisdictions. These analyses were conducted using the NAEP Data Explorer. <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/naepdata/report.aspx>. The large cities in the nation are those with populations of 250,000 or more. In this paper, large city schools are the combined public school student populations of the nation's large cities as defined by the United States Census Bureau.

Where possible, we compare NAEP results among Black males attending schools in large cities against White males attending national public schools (NP).<sup>2</sup> This is the first such analysis to examine NAEP results by gender within race. Finally, we also report on results for students *with disabilities* (SD), students *eligible for a free or reduced-price lunch* (FRPL), and students comprising the broader national sample (NP).

This report begins with an examination of student demographics in big city school districts and across the nation. We follow that with data on six areas – readiness to learn, achievement at the national level, Black male achievement for districts in the Trial Urban District Assessment (TUDA),<sup>3</sup> college and career preparedness, school experiences, and postsecondary experiences. We examine a number of indicators in each area.

These sections are followed by a series of “Profiles of Excellence”, which highlight some of the individual successes of Black males from the Great City Schools. Finally, the study concludes with a plan of action designed to improve the academic performance of Black males.

<sup>1</sup> “Large city” is the subset of those public schools located in the urbanized areas of cities with populations of 250,000 or more. Large city is not synonymous with “inner city.” Schools in participating TUDA districts are also included in the large city results, 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. IES, *The Nation's Report Card, Trial Urban District Assessment*, Reading, 2009.

<sup>2</sup> NP includes students attending public schools across the nation.

<sup>3</sup> Representative samples of between 900 and 2,400 fourth-grade and between 800 and 2,100 eighth-grade public school students from 18 urban districts participated in the TUDA project in 2009. Eleven of the districts participated in 2007 and 2005, ten in 2003, and 6 in 2002.


# DEMOGRAPHICS

The Council of the Great City Schools represents 65 of the largest urban school districts in the country. These Great City School districts are either the largest school district in their states or have enrollments of at least 35,000 students in cities that typically have more than 250,000 residents. Most of these students, as the subsequent data will show, are eligible for the free or reduced-price lunch program and are students of color.

This study begins with a summary of the composition of the nation's Great City Schools and the portion of their enrollments that are Black males.

- In 2009, over seven million students were enrolled in the Great City Schools or about 14 percent of all public school elementary and secondary education students in the country.
- Some 34 percent of the students enrolled in the Great City School districts were Black, 36 percent were Hispanic, 20 percent White and approximately six percent were Asian or American Indian/Alaska in 2009. (Figure D1)
- About 17 percent of Great City School district students were Black males, ten percent were White males, and 18 percent were Hispanic males in 2009. (Figure D1)
- Approximately 64 percent of Great City School students were *eligible for a free or reduced-price lunch* and fourteen percent were identified as students *with disabilities*. (Figure D2)
- The percentage of Black males enrolled in Great City School districts ranged from a low of 2.1 percent in Albuquerque (NW) to a high of 49 percent in Jackson (MS). The percentage of White males enrolled in Great City School districts ranged from a low of 0.5 percent in Birmingham (AL) to a high of 30 percent in Des Moines (IA). (Figure D3)
- Approximately 29 percent of the nation's Black male students; five percent of all White male students; 20 percent of students *eligible for free or reduced-price lunch*, and 15 percent identified as students *with disabilities* were enrolled in the Great City School districts in 2009. (Figure D4)


**FIGURE D1. CGCS DEMOGRAPHIC ENROLLMENT BY RACE AND GENDER, 2009**



In 2009, 17 percent of students in the Great City Schools were Black males, 10 percent were White males and 18 percent were Hispanic males.

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, Common Core of Data, Public Elementary/Secondary School Universe Survey, 2009-10

**FIGURE D2. PERCENTAGE OF FRPL AND SD STUDENTS IN CGCS SCHOOL DISTRICTS, 2009**




In 2009, 64 percent of all Great City School students were eligible for free or reduced-price lunch (FRPL) and 14 percent identified as students with disabilities (SD).

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, Common Core of Data, Public Elementary/Secondary School Universe Survey, 2009-10




# DEMOGRAPHICS

**FIGURE D3. PERCENTAGE OF CGCS STUDENTS BY RANGE OF SELECTED GROUPS, 2009**



Source: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, Common Core of Data, Public Elementary/Secondary School Universe Survey, 2009-10

**FIGURE D4. CGCS STUDENT ENROLLMENT AS PERCENTAGE OF NATION BY GROUP, 2009**



Source: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, Common Core of Data, Public Elementary/Secondary School Universe Survey, 2009-10


# CHAPTER 2

## FACTOR I: READINESS TO LEARN

### HIGHLIGHTS


- Black mothers had infant mortality rates at least twice as high as White mothers between 2003 and 2007. (Figure 1.1)
- Black children, 17 years old and younger, were 50 percent more likely to be without private or government health insurance than White children in 2008. (Figure 1.2)
- Between 2006 and 2008, the percentage of Black males 0-4 years of age in families without health insurance was higher among those who were classified as near-poor than those living in households identified as poor or non-poor. However, there was little difference between Black males living in metropolitan areas and all Black males at various income levels (poor, near-poor, or non-poor). (Figure 1.3)
- In 2008, Black children ages 18 and under were nearly three times more likely to live in single-parent households than White children. Nearly two-thirds of all Black children lived in single-parent households. (Figure 1.4)
- In 2007, the majority of Black children under 18 lived in single-mother households. Approximately six out of 10 Black children lived with a female parent, no spouse present; compared with three out of 10 Black children living with married parents. (Figure 1.5)
- In 2005-2006, three out of four Black children at age 4 were likely to be enrolled in a non-Head Start child care program. At least one-third of Black children participated in home-based care or had no regular nonparent arrangement. (Figure 1.6)
- In 2008, the highest level of education attained by parents of Black children ages 6-18 was similar among mothers and fathers. At least one-third of these children had a parent with a high school diploma, 24 percent had a parent with some college, and less than 15 percent had a parent with a bachelor's degree. (Figure 1.7)
- Black children ages 18 and under were twice as likely as White children to live in households where no parent had full-time or year-round employment in 2008. Four out of 10 Black children lived in households where no parent had full-time or year-round employment, compared with two out of 10 White children. (Figure 1.8)
- One-third of Black children under age 18 lived in poverty, compared with 10 percent of White children and 27 percent of Hispanic children in 2007. (Figure 1.9)

**FIGURE 1.1. INFANT MORTALITY RATE BY ETHNICITY, 2003-2007**



Source: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Health Statistics


**FIGURE 1.2. PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN 17 YEARS OF AGE AND UNDER NOT COVERED BY PRIVATE OR GOVERNMENT HEALTH INSURANCE, 2008**



Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2007

# FACTOR I: READINESS TO LEARN


**FIGURE 1.3. PERCENTAGE OF BLACK MALE CHILDREN 0-4 YEARS OF AGE WITHOUT FAMILY HEALTH INSURANCE BY URBANICITY AND INCOME, 2006-2008**



Note: Poor families are defined as those with incomes below the poverty threshold. Near-poor families are those with incomes between 100 and 200 percent of the poverty threshold. Non-poor families are those with incomes 200 percent or greater than the poverty threshold.


Source: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Health Statistics

**FIGURE 1.4. PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN AGES 18 AND UNDER LIVING IN SINGLE-PARENT HOUSEHOLDS BY RACE, 2008**



Source: KIDSCOUNT; Population Reference Bureau, analysis of data from the U.S. Census Bureau, 2008 American Community Survey.


**FIGURE 1.5. PERCENTAGE OF BLACK CHILDREN UNDER AGE 18 BY LIVING ARRANGEMENTS, 2007**



In 2007, 56 percent of Black children under 18 lived with a female parent with no spouse present.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2007

**FIGURE 1.6. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF PRIMARY CARE ARRANGEMENTS OF FOUR-YEAR-OLD BLACK CHILDREN, 2005-2006**




In 2005-06, one-third of all four-year-old Black children participated in home-based care programs or had no regular nonparent care; one quarter participated in Head Start programs.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2007

# FACTOR I: READINESS TO LEARN


**FIGURE 1.7. PERCENTAGE OF BLACK CHILDREN AGES 6 TO 18 BY PARENT'S HIGHEST LEVEL OF EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT, 2008**



In 2008, one-third of Black children had a parent with a high school diploma, 24 percent had a parent with at least some college experience, and less than 15 percent had a parent who held a bachelor's degree.


Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2007

**FIGURE 1.8. PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN AGES 18 AND UNDER LIVING IN FAMILIES WHERE NO PARENT HAS FULL-TIME, YEAR-ROUND EMPLOYMENT BY RACE, 2008**



Source: KIDSCOUNT; Population Reference Bureau, analysis of data from the U.S. Census Bureau, 2008 American Community Survey.

**FIGURE 1.9. PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN UNDER AGE 18 LIVING IN POVERTY BY RACE/ETHNICITY, 2007**



Source: KIDSCOUNT; Population Reference Bureau, analysis of data from the U.S. Census Bureau, 2008 American Community Survey.



# FACTOR 2A: BLACK MALE ACHIEVEMENT ON NAEP – READING GRADE 4

## HIGHLIGHTS

The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) reading results for grade 4 are reported as average scores on a 0–500 scale. The results are reported as achievement levels (*Basic, Proficient and Advanced*<sup>4</sup>) that show what students should know and be able to do.

### Reading Grade 4


- The average reading scale score of large city (LC) fourth-grade Black students increased significantly from 193 in 2003 to 201 (+8 points) in 2009; the average reading scale score of large city (LC) fourth-grade Hispanic students increased significantly from 197 in 2003 to 202 (+5 points) in 2009; and the average reading scale score of fourth-grade White students in national public schools (NP) increased significantly from 227 in 2003 to 229 (+2 points) in 2009. (Figure 2.1)
- In 2009, the average reading scale score of large city (LC) fourth-grade Black students (201) was not significantly different from Hispanic students (202) in large cities (LC). However, Black and Hispanic scores in large cities (LC) were lower than White students (229) in national public schools (NP) (tests of significance could not be conducted). (Figure 2.1)
- The average reading scale score of large city (LC) fourth-grade Black males increased significantly from 188 in 2003 to 198 (+10 points) in 2009, while the average reading scale score of large city (LC) Hispanic males increased significantly from 194 to 199 (+5 points) over the same period. (Figure 2.2)
- In 2009, the average scale score of fourth-grade Black males (198) in large cities (LC) was not statistically different from fourth-grade Hispanic males (199) in large cities (LC). However, the average scale score of large city (LC) fourth-grade Black males (198) was significantly lower than Black females (-7points) and Hispanic females (-7points) in large cities (LC). (Figure 2.2)
- The average reading scale score of large city (LC) fourth-grade Black males increased significantly from 188 in 2003 to 198 (+10 points) in 2009, while the average reading scale score of Black male fourth-graders in national public schools (NP) increased significantly from 192 to 199 (+7 points) over the same period. (Figure 2.3)
- In 2009, the average reading scale score of large city (LC) fourth-grade Black males (198) was not significantly different from Black males (199) in national public schools (NP). (Figure 2.3)
- The average reading scale score of fourth-grade White males in national public schools (NP) increased significantly from 223 in 2003 to 226 (+3 points) in 2009, while the average reading scale score of large city (LC) Black males increased significantly from 188 to 198 (+10 points) over the same period. The gap between White males in national public schools (NP) and large city (LC) Black males narrowed from 35 points in 2003 to 28 points in 2009. (Figure 2.4)

<sup>4</sup>The cut score indicating the lower end of the score range for each level is: Basic (208), Proficient (238) and Advanced (268).

- Between 2003 and 2009, the percentage of large city (LC) fourth-grade Black males performing at or above *Proficient* in reading improved from 8 to 11 percentage points, but remained at least 27 percentage points lower than the percentage of White males in national public schools (NP) scoring at or above *Proficient* levels. (Figure 2.5)
- The average reading scale score of large city (LC) fourth-grade Black males *eligible for free or reduced-price lunch* (FRPL) increased significantly from 186 in 2003 to 195 (+9 points) in 2009, while the average reading scale score of White male fourth-graders in national public schools (NP) who were *eligible for free or reduced-price lunch* (FRPL) increased significantly from 208 to 212 (+4 points) over the same period. (Figure 2.6)
- In 2009, the average reading scale score of fourth-grade Black males in large cities (LC) who were *eligible for free or reduced-price lunch* (FRPL) was 17 points lower than fourth-grade White males in national public schools (NP) who were *eligible for free or reduced-price lunch* (FRPL). The average reading scale score of fourth-grade Black males in large cities (LC) who were *not eligible for free or reduced-price lunch* (Non-FRPL) was 1 point lower than White males in national public schools (NP) who were *eligible for free or reduced-price lunch* (FRPL) in 2009. (Figure 2.6)
- In 2009, at grade 4, the percentage of large city (LC) Black males performing at or above *Proficient* levels in reading who were *not eligible for free or reduced-price lunch* (Non-FRPL) was the same as the percentage of White males in national public schools (NP) who were *eligible for free or reduced-price lunch* (FRPL) and performing at or above *Proficient* levels. (Figure 2.7)
- The average reading scale score of large city (LC) fourth-grade Black males *with disabilities* (SD) increased significantly from 160 in 2003 to 170 (+10 points) in 2009, while the average reading scale scores of White male fourth-graders in national public schools (NP) *with disabilities* (SD) increased significantly from 193 to 200 (+7 points) over the same period. (Figure 2.8)
- In 2009, the average reading scale score of fourth-grade Black males in large cities (LC) *with disabilities* (SD) was 30 points lower than fourth-grade White males in national public schools (NP) *with disabilities* (SD). The average reading scale score for fourth-grade Black males in large cities (LC) *without disabilities* (Non-SD) was 2 points higher than White males in national public schools (NP) *with disabilities* (SD) in 2009. (Figure 2.8)
- Between 2003 and 2009, the percentage of large city (LC) fourth-grade Black males *without disabilities* (Non-SD) who were performing at or above *Proficient* levels in reading improved from nine percent to 13 percent, but remained at least four percentage points lower than the percentage White males nationwide (NP) *with disabilities* (SD) who were performing at or above *Proficient* levels. (Figure 2.9)

# FACTOR 2A: BLACK MALE ACHIEVEMENT ON NAEP – READING GRADE 4

**FIGURE 2.1. GRADE 4 NAEP READING SCALE SCORES BY ETHNICITY, 2003-2009**



Note: Large city (LC) includes students from all cities in the nation with populations of 250,000 or more including the participating TUDA districts.


NP includes students attending public schools across the nation.

\*Significantly different from Black students in large cities at  $p < .05$

\*\*\*Significantly different from 2009 at  $p < .05$

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2003, 2005, 2007, and 2009 Reading Assessments.

**FIGURE 2.2. GRADE 4 NAEP READING SCALE SCORES OF BLACK MALES AND FEMALES (LC) AND HISPANIC MALES AND FEMALES (LC), 2003-2009**



In 2009, the average scale score of fourth-grade Black males in large cities (LC) was not statistically different from fourth-grade Hispanic males in large cities (LC). However, average scale score of large city (LC) fourth-grade Black males was significantly lower than Black females and Hispanic females in large cities (LC).

Note: Large city (LC) includes students from all cities in the nation with populations of 250,000 or more including the participating TUDA districts.

NP includes students attending public schools across the nation.


\* Significantly different from Black males in large cities at  $p < .05$

\*\*\*Significantly different from 2009 at  $p < .05$

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2003, 2005, 2007, and 2009 Reading Assessments.

# FACTOR 2A: BLACK MALE ACHIEVEMENT ON NAEP – READING GRADE 4


**FIGURE 2.3. GRADE 4 NAEP READING SCALE SCORES OF BLACK MALES (LC ) VS. BLACK MALES (NP), 2003-2009**



The average reading scale score of large city (LC) fourth-grade Black males increased significantly (+10 points) from 2003 to 2009, while the average reading scale score of Black male fourth-graders in national public schools (NP) also increased significantly (+7 points) over the same period.

Note: Large city (LC) includes students from all cities in the nation with populations of 250,000 or more including the participating TUDA districts.  
 NP includes students attending public schools across the nation.  
 \* Significantly different from Black males in large cities at  $p < .05$   
 \*\*\* Significantly different from 2009 at  $p < .05$   
 Source: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2003, 2005, 2007, and 2009 Reading Assessments.


**FIGURE 2.4. GRADE 4 NAEP READING SCALE SCORES OF BLACK MALES (LC) VS. WHITE MALES (NP), 2003-2009**



Between 2003 and 2009, fourth-grade reading scale scores of large city (LC) Black males increased significantly (+10 points) and the gap between Black males (LC) and White males (NP) narrowed from 35 to 28 points.

Note: Large city (LC) includes students from all cities in the nation with populations of 250,000 or more including the participating TUDA districts.  
 NP includes students attending public schools across the nation.  
 \*\*\* Significantly different from 2009 at  $p < .05$   
 Source: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2003, 2005, 2007, and 2009 Reading Assessments.


**FIGURE 2.5. PERCENTAGE OF GRADE 4 BLACK MALES (LC) VS. WHITE MALES (NP) PERFORMING AT OR ABOVE PROFICIENT IN NAEP READING, 2003-2009**



Note: Large city (LC) includes students from all cities in the nation with populations of 250,000 or more including the participating TUDA districts.  
 NP includes students attending public schools across the nation. Source: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2003, 2005, 2007, and 2009 Reading Assessments.

# FACTOR 2A: BLACK MALE ACHIEVEMENT ON NAEP – READING GRADE 4

**FIGURE 2.6. GRADE 4 NAEP READING SCALE SCORES OF FRPL AND NON-FRPL BLACK MALES (LC) AND FRPL AND NON-FRPL WHITE MALES (NP), 2003-2009**




Note: Large city (LC) includes students from all cities in the nation with populations of 250,000 or more including the participating TUDA districts.

NP includes students attending public schools across the nation.

\*\*\* Significantly different from 2009 at  $p < .05$

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2003, 2005, 2007, and 2009 Reading Assessments.

**FIGURE 2.7. PERCENTAGE OF GRADE 4 NON-FRPL BLACK MALES (LC) VS. FRPL WHITE MALES (NP) PERFORMING AT OR ABOVE PROFICIENT IN NAEP READING, 2003-2009**



Note: Large city (LC) includes students from all cities in the nation with populations of 250,000 or more including the participating TUDA districts.


NP includes students attending public schools across the nation.

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2003, 2005, 2007, and 2009 Reading Assessments.



# FACTOR 2A: BLACK MALE ACHIEVEMENT ON NAEP – READING GRADE 4

**FIGURE 2.8. GRADE 4 NAEP READING SCALE SCORES OF SD AND NON-SD BLACK MALES (LC) AND SD AND NON-SD WHITE MALES (NP), 2003-2009**



The average reading scale score of large city (LC) fourth-grade Black males *with disabilities* (SD) increased significantly from 2003 to 2009 (+10 points), and the average reading scale score of White male fourth-graders in national public schools (NP) *with disabilities* (SD) increased significantly (+7 points) over the same period.


Note: Large city (LC) includes students from all cities in the nation with populations of 250,000 or more including the participating TUDA districts.

NP includes students attending public schools across the nation.

\*\*\* Significantly different from 2009 at  $p < .05$

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2003, 2005, 2007, and 2009 Reading Assessments.

**FIGURE 2.9. PERCENTAGE OF GRADE 4 NON-SD BLACK MALES (LC) VS. SD WHITE MALES (NP) PERFORMING AT OR ABOVE PROFICIENT IN NAEP READING, 2003-2009**



Note: Large city (LC) includes students from all cities in the nation with populations of 250,000 or more including the participating TUDA districts.

NP includes students attending public schools across the nation.

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2003, 2005, 2007, and 2009 Reading Assessments.

# FACTOR 2B: BLACK MALE ACHIEVEMENT ON NAEP – READING GRADE 8

## HIGHLIGHTS

The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) reading results for grade 8 are reported as average scores on a 0–500 scale. The results are reported as achievement levels (*Basic, Proficient and Advanced*<sup>9</sup>) that show what students should know and be able to do.

### Reading Grade 8


- The average reading scale score of large city (LC) eighth-grade Black students increased significantly from 241 in 2003 to 243 (+2 points) in 2009; the average reading scale score of large city (LC) eighth-grade Hispanic students increased significantly from 241 in 2003 to 245 (+4 points) in 2009; and the average reading scale score of eighth-grade White students in national public schools (NP) increased significantly from 270 in 2003 to 271 (+1 point) in 2009. (Figure 2.10)
- In 2009, the average reading scale score of large city (LC) eighth-grade Black students (243) was not significantly different from Hispanic students (245) in large cities (LC). However, Black and Hispanic students' scale scores in large cities (LC) were lower than White students in national public schools (NP) (271). (Tests of significance could not be conducted). (Figure 2.10)
- The average reading scale score of large city (LC) eighth-grade Black males did not change significantly between 2003 (235) and 2009 (238), and the average reading scale score of large city (LC) Hispanic males did not change significantly between 2003 (237) and 2009 (240). (Figure 2.11)
- In 2009, the average reading scale score of eighth-grade Black males (238) in large cities (LC) was significantly lower than large city (LC) eighth-grade Black females (-10 points) and significantly lower than large city (LC) Hispanic females (-12 points), but was not significantly different from large city (LC) Hispanic males (240). (Figure 2.11)
- The average reading scale score of large city (LC) eighth-grade Black males did not change significantly between 2003 (235) and 2009 (238) (+3 points) in 2009, while the average reading scale scores of Black male eighth-graders in national public schools (NP) increased significantly from 238 to 240 (+2 points) over the same period. (Figure 2.12)
- In 2009, in grade 8, the average reading scale score of large city (LC) Black males (238) was significantly different from Black males (240) in national public schools (NP). (Figure 2.12)
- The average reading scale score of eighth-grade White males in national public schools (NP) increased significantly from 265 in 2003 to 267 (+2 points) in 2009, while the average reading scale score of large city (LC) Black males was not significantly different from 2003 (235) to 2009 (238). The gap between White males in national public schools (NP) and large city (LC) Black males narrowed slightly from 30 points in 2003 to 29 points in 2009. (Figure 2.13)
- Between 2003-2009, the percentage of large city (LC) eighth-grade Black males performing at or above *Proficient* in reading remained at least 24 percentage points lower than the percentage of White males in national public schools (NP) performing at or above *Proficient* levels. (Figure 2.14)

<sup>9</sup> The cut score indicating the lower end of the score range for each level is: Basic (243), Proficient (281), and Advanced (323).

- The average reading scale score of large city (LC) eighth-grade Black males who were *eligible for free or reduced-price lunch* (FRPL) was not significantly different from 2003 (233) to 2009 (236), and the average reading scale score of White male eighth-graders in national public schools (NP) who were *eligible for free or reduced-price lunch* (FRPL) increased significantly from 251 to 253 (+2 points) over the same period. (Figure 2.15)
- In 2009, the average reading scale score of eighth-grade Black males in large cities (LC) who were *eligible for free or reduced-price lunch* (FRPL) was 17 points lower than eighth-grade White males in national public schools (NP) *eligible for free or reduced-price lunch* (FRPL). The average reading scale score of eighth-grade Black males in large cities (LC) who were *not eligible for free or reduced-price lunch* (Non-FRPL) was 7 points lower than White males in national public schools (NP) who were *eligible for free or reduced-price lunch* (FRPL) in 2009. (Figure 2.15)
- Between 2003 and 2009, the percentage of large city (LC) eighth-grade Black males who were *not eligible for free or reduced-price lunch* (Non-FRPL) and were performing at or above *Proficient* levels in reading was at least six percentage points lower than the percentage of White males nationwide (NP) who were *eligible for free or reduced-price lunch* (FRPL) and performing at or above *Proficient* levels. (Figure 2.16)
- The average reading scale score of large city (LC) eighth-grade Black males *with disabilities* (SD) was not significantly different from 2003 (203) to 2009 (208), while the average reading scale score of White male eighth-graders in national public schools (NP) *with disabilities* (SD) increased significantly from 232 to 238 (+6 points) over the same period. (Figure 2.17)
- In 2009, the average reading scale score of eighth-grade Black males in large cities (LC) *with disabilities* (SD) was 30 points lower than eighth-grade White males in national public schools (NP) *with disabilities* (SD). The average reading scale score of eighth-grade Black males in large cities (LC) *without disabilities* (Non-SD) was 5 points higher than White males in national public schools (NP) *with disabilities* (SD) in 2009. (Figure 2.17)
- In 2009, the percentage of large city (LC) Black males *without disabilities* (Non-SD) performing at or above *Proficient* levels in reading was at least two percentage points lower at grade 8 than White males nationwide (NP) *with disabilities* (SD) who were performing at or above *Proficient* levels. (Figure 2.18)

# FACTOR 2B: BLACK MALE ACHIEVEMENT ON NAEP – READING GRADE 8

**FIGURE 2.10. GRADE 8 NAEP READING SCALE SCORES BY ETHNICITY, 2003-2009**



Note: Large city (LC) includes students from all cities in the nation with populations of 250,000 or more including the participating TUDA districts.


NP includes students attending public schools across the nation.

\*Significantly different from Black students in large cities at  $p < .05$

\*\*\*Significantly different from 2009 at  $p < .05$

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2003, 2005, 2007, and 2009 Reading Assessments.

**FIGURE 2.11. GRADE 8 NAEP READING SCALE SCORES OF BLACK MALES AND FEMALES (LC) AND HISPANIC MALES AND FEMALES (LC), 2003-2009**



In 2009, the average reading scale score of eighth-grade Black males in large cities (LC) was significantly lower (10 points) than large city (LC) eighth-grade Black females and significantly lower (12 points) than large city (LC) Hispanic females while not significantly different from Hispanic males.

Note: Large city (LC) includes students from all cities in the nation with populations of 250,000 or more including the participating TUDA districts.

NP includes students attending public schools across the nation.


\* Significantly different from Black males in large cities at  $p < .05$

\*\*\*Significantly different from 2009 at  $p < .05$

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2003, 2005, 2007, and 2009 Reading Assessments.


# FACTOR 2B: BLACK MALE ACHIEVEMENT ON NAEP – READING GRADE 8

**FIGURE 2.12. GRADE 8 NAEP READING SCALE SCORES OF BLACK MALES (LC) VS. BLACK MALES (NP), 2003-2009**




Note: Large city (LC) includes students from all cities in the nation with populations of 250,000 or more including the participating TUDA districts.  
 NP includes students attending public schools across the nation.  
 \* Significant from Black males in large cities at  $p < .05$ .  
 \*\*\* Significantly different from 2009 at  $p < .05$   
 Source: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2003, 2005, 2007, and 2009 Reading Assessments.

**FIGURE 2.13. GRADE 8 NAEP READING SCALE SCORES OF BLACK MALES (LC) VS. WHITE MALES (NP), 2003-2009**



Note: Large city (LC) includes students from all cities in the nation with populations of 250,000 or more including the participating TUDA districts.  
 NP includes students attending public schools across the nation.  
 \*\*\* Significantly different from 2009 at  $p < .05$   
 Source: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2003, 2005, 2007, and 2009 Reading Assessments.

**FIGURE 2.14. PERCENTAGE OF GRADE 8 BLACK MALES (LC) VS. WHITE MALES (NP) PERFORMING AT OR ABOVE PROFICIENT IN NAEP READING, 2003-2009**




Note: Large city (LC) includes students from all cities in the nation with populations of 250,000 or more including the participating TUDA districts.  
 NP includes students attending public schools across the nation.  
 Source: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2003, 2005, 2007, and 2009 Reading Assessments.



# FACTOR 2B: BLACK MALE ACHIEVEMENT ON NAEP – READING GRADE 8

**FIGURE 2.15. GRADE 8 NAEP READING SCALE SCORES OF FRPL AND NON-FRPL BLACK MALES (LC) AND FRPL AND NON-FRPL WHITE MALES (NP), 2003-2009**




Note: Large city (LC) includes students from all cities in the nation with populations of 250,000 or more including the participating TUDA districts.

NP includes students attending public schools across the nation.

\*\*\* Significantly different from 2009 at  $p < .05$

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2003, 2005, 2007, and 2009 Reading Assessments.

**FIGURE 2.16. PERCENTAGE OF GRADE 8 NON-FRPL BLACK MALES (LC) VS. FRPL WHITE MALES (NP) PERFORMING AT OR ABOVE PROFICIENT IN NAEP READING, 2003-2009**




Note: Large city (LC) includes students from all cities in the nation with populations of 250,000 or more including the participating TUDA districts.

NP includes students attending public schools across the nation.

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2003, 2005, 2007, and 2009 Reading Assessments.

# FACTOR 2B: BLACK MALE ACHIEVEMENT ON NAEP – READING GRADE 8

**FIGURE 2.17. GRADE 8 NAEP READING SCALE SCORES OF SD AND NON-SD BLACK MALES (LC) VS. SD AND NON-SD WHITE MALES (NP), 2003-2009**



Between 2003 and 2009, the average reading scale scores of large city (LC) eighth-grade Black males *without disabilities* (Non-SD) increased significantly, but continued to fall between four to eight points higher than the scores of White males in national public schools (NP) *with disabilities* (SD).


Note: Large city (LC) includes students from all cities in the nation with populations of 250,000 or more including the participating TUDA districts.

NP includes students attending public schools across the nation.

\*\*\* Significantly different from 2009 at  $p < .05$

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2003, 2005, 2007, and 2009 Reading Assessments.

**FIGURE 2.18. PERCENTAGE OF GRADE 8 NON-SD BLACK MALES (LC) VS. SD WHITE MALES (NP) PERFORMING AT OR ABOVE PROFICIENT IN NAEP READING, 2003-2009**



Note: Large city (LC) includes students from all cities in the nation with populations of 250,000 or more including the participating TUDA districts.

NP includes students attending public schools across the nation.

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2003, 2005, 2007, and 2009 Reading Assessments.

# FACTOR 2C: BLACK MALE ACHIEVEMENT ON NAEP – MATHEMATICS GRADE 4

## HIGHLIGHTS

The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) reading results for grade 8 are reported as average scores on a 0–500 scale. The results are reported as achievement levels (*Basic, Proficient and Advanced*<sup>6</sup>) that show what students should know and be able to do.

### Mathematics Grade 4


- The average mathematics scale score of large city (LC) fourth-grade Black students increased significantly from 212 in 2003 to 219 (+7 points) in 2009; the average mathematics scale score of large city (LC) fourth-grade Hispanic students increased significantly from 219 to 226 (+7 points) in 2009; and the average mathematics scale score of fourth-grade White students in national public schools (NP) increased significantly from 243 in 2003 to 248 (+5 points) in 2009. (Figure 2.19)
- In 2009, the average mathematics scale score of large city (LC) fourth-grade Black students (219) was significantly lower than the average mathematics scale score of Hispanic students (226) in large cities (LC). Black and Hispanic students in large cities, however, scored lower than White students (248) in national public schools (NP). (Tests of significance could not be conducted.) (Figure 2.19)
- The average mathematics scale score of large city (LC) fourth-grade Black males increased significantly from 212 in 2003 to 219 (+7 points) in 2009, while the average mathematics scale score of large city (LC) Hispanic males increased significantly from 221 to 226 (+5 points) during the same period. (Figure 2.20)
- In 2009, the average mathematics scale score of fourth-grade Black males (219) in large cities (LC) was not significantly different from fourth-grade large city (LC) Black females (-1 point). However, the average scale score of large city (LC) fourth-grade Black males (219) was significantly lower than large city (LC) Hispanic females (-7 points) and Hispanic males (-7 points). (Figure 2.20)
- The average mathematics scale score of large city (LC) fourth-grade Black males increased significantly from 212 in 2003 to 219 (+7 points) in 2009, while the average mathematics scale scores of Black male fourth-graders in national public schools (NP) increased significantly from 216 to 221 (+5 points) over the same period. (Figure 2.21)
- In 2009, the average mathematics scale score of large city (LC) Black males (219) was significantly lower than Black males (221) in national public schools (NP). (Figure 2.21)
- The average mathematics scale score of fourth-grade White males in national public schools (NP) increased significantly from 244 in 2003 to 249 (+5 points) in 2009, while the average mathematics scale scores of large city (LC) Black males increased significantly (+7 points) over the same period. The gap between White males (NP) and Black males (LC) narrowed slightly from 32 points in 2003 to 30 points in 2009. (Figure 2.22)

<sup>6</sup> The cut score indicating the lower end of the score range for each level is Basic (214), Proficient (249), and Advanced (282).

- Between 2003 and 2009, the percentage of large city (LC) fourth-grade Black males performing at or above *Proficient* levels in mathematics increased 6 percentage points while the percentage of fourth-grade White males in national public schools (NP) performing at or above *Proficient* levels increased 8 percentage points. (Figure 2.23)
- The average mathematics scale score of large city (LC) fourth-grade Black males who were *eligible for free or reduced-price lunch* (FRPL) was significantly different from 2003 (210) to 2009 (217), while the average mathematics scale score of White male fourth-graders in national public schools (NP) who were *eligible for free or reduced-price lunch* (FRPL) increased significantly from 232 to 237 (+5 points) over the same period. (Figure 2.24)
- In 2009, the average mathematics scale score of fourth-grade Black males in large cities (LC) who were *eligible for free or reduced-price lunch* (FRPL) was 20 points lower than fourth-grade White males in national public schools (NP) who were *eligible for free or reduced-price lunch* (FRPL) and 8 points lower than Black males in large cities (LC) who were *not eligible for free or reduced-price lunch* (Non-FRPL) in 2009. (Figure 2.24)
- In 2009, the percentage of large city (LC) Black males who were *not eligible for free or reduced-price lunch* (Non-FRPL) and were performing at or above *Proficient* levels in mathematics was 11 percentage points lower than the percentage of White males in national public schools (NP) who were *eligible for free or reduced-price lunch* (FRPL) and were performing at or above *Proficient* levels. (Figure 2.25)
- The average mathematics scale score of large city (LC) fourth-grade Black males *with disabilities* (SD) increased significantly from 194 in 2003 to 199 (+5 points) in 2009, while the average mathematics scale score of White male fourth-graders in national public schools (NP) *with disabilities* (SD) increased significantly from 225 to 232 (+7 points) over the same period. (Figure 2.26)
- In 2009, the average mathematics scale score of fourth-grade Black males in large cities (LC) *with disabilities* (SD) was 33 points lower than fourth-grade White males in national public schools (NP) *with disabilities* (SD). The average mathematics scale score of fourth-grade Black males in large cities (LC) *without disabilities* (Non-SD) was 9 points lower than White males *with disabilities* (SD) in 2009. (Figure 2.26)
- Between 2003 and 2009, the percentage of large city (LC) fourth-grade Black males *without disabilities* (Non-SD) performing at or above *Proficient* in mathematics was at least 11 percentage points lower than the percentage of White males in national public schools (NP) *with disabilities* and who were performing at or above *Proficient* levels. (Figure 2.27)


# FACTOR 2C: BLACK MALE ACHIEVEMENT ON NAEP – MATHEMATICS GRADE 4

**FIGURE 2.19. GRADE 4 NAEP MATHEMATICS SCALE SCORES BY ETHNICITY, 2003-2009**



Note: Large city (LC) includes students from all cities in the nation with populations of 250,000 or more including the participating TUDA districts.  
 NP includes students attending public schools across the nation.  
 \*Significantly different from Black students in large cities at  $p < .05$   
 \*\*\*Significantly different from 2009 at  $p < .05$   
 Source: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2003, 2005, 2007, and 2009 Mathematics Assessments.

**FIGURE 2.20. GRADE 4 NAEP MATHEMATICS SCALE SCORES OF BLACK MALES AND FEMALES (LC) AND HISPANIC MALES AND FEMALES (LC), 2003-2009**



In 2009, the average mathematics scale score of fourth-grade Black males in large cities (LC) was not significantly different (1 point) from fourth-grade large city (LC) Black females. However, the average scale score of large city fourth-grade Black males was significantly lower than large city (LC) Hispanic females (7 points) and Hispanic males (7 points).

Note: Large city (LC) includes students from all cities in the nation with populations of 250,000 or more including the participating TUDA districts.

NP includes students attending public schools across the nation.

\* Significantly different from Black males in large cities at  $p < 0.05$


\*\*\*Significantly different from 2009 at  $p < 0.05$

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2003, 2005, 2007, and 2009 Mathematics Assessments.



# FACTOR 2C: BLACK MALE ACHIEVEMENT ON NAEP – MATHEMATICS GRADE 4


**FIGURE 2.21. GRADE 4 NAEP MATHEMATICS SCALE SCORES OF BLACK MALES (LC) VS. BLACK MALES (NP), 2003-2009**



In 2009, the average mathematics scale score of large city (LC) fourth-grade Black males was significantly higher than in 2003, but was significantly lower than fourth-grade Black males in national public schools (NP).

Note: Large city (LC) includes students from all cities in the nation with populations of 250,000 or more including the participating TUDA districts.  
 NP includes students attending public schools across the nation.  
 \* Significantly different from Black males in large cities at  $p < .05$   
 \*\*\* Significantly different from 2009 at  $p < .05$   
 Source: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2003, 2005, 2007, and 2009 Mathematics Assessments.


**FIGURE 2.22. GRADE 4 NAEP MATHEMATICS SCALE SCORES OF BLACK MALES (LC) VS. WHITE MALES (NP), 2003-2009**



The average mathematics scale score of fourth-grade White males in national public schools (NP) increased significantly (+5 points) between 2003 and 2009, while the average mathematics scale score of large city (LC) Black males increased significantly (+7 points) over the same period. The gap narrowed by two points.

Note: Large city (LC) includes students from all cities in the nation with populations of 250,000 or more including the participating TUDA districts.  
 NP includes students attending public schools across the nation.  
 \*\*\* Significantly different from 2009 at  $p < .05$   
 Source: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2003, 2005, 2007, and 2009 Mathematics Assessments.

**FIGURE 2.23. PERCENTAGE OF GRADE 4 BLACK MALES (LC) VS. WHITE MALES (NP) PERFORMING AT OR ABOVE PROFICIENT IN NAEP MATHEMATICS, 2003-2009**



Note: Large city (LC) includes students from all cities in the nation with populations of 250,000 or more including the participating TUDA districts.  
 NP includes students attending public schools across the nation.  
 Source: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2003, 2005, 2007, and 2009 Mathematics Assessments.

# FACTOR 2C: BLACK MALE ACHIEVEMENT ON NAEP – MATHEMATICS GRADE 4

**FIGURE 2.24. GRADE 4 NAEP MATHEMATICS SCALE SCORES OF FRPL AND NON-FRPL BLACK MALES (LC) AND FRPL AND NON-FRPL WHITE MALES (NP), 2003-2009**




Note: Large city (LC) includes students from all cities in the nation with populations of 250,000 or more including the participating TUDA districts.

NP includes students attending public schools across the nation.

\*\*\* Significantly different from 2009 at  $p < .05$

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2003, 2005, 2007, and 2009 Mathematics Assessments.

**FIGURE 2.25. PERCENTAGE OF GRADE 4 NON-FRPL BLACK MALES (LC) VS. FRPL WHITE MALES (NP) PERFORMING AT OR ABOVE PROFICIENT IN NAEP MATHEMATICS, 2003-2009**




Note: Large city (LC) includes students from all cities in the nation with populations of 250,000 or more including the participating TUDA districts.

NP includes students attending public schools across the nation.

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2003, 2005, 2007, and 2009 Mathematics Assessments.

# FACTOR 2C: BLACK MALE ACHIEVEMENT ON NAEP – MATHEMATICS GRADE 4

**FIGURE 2.26. GRADE 4 NAEP MATHEMATICS SCALE SCORES OF SD AND NON-SD BLACK MALES (LC) AND SD AND NON-SD WHITE MALES (NP), 2003-2009**



Between 2003 and 2009, average mathematics scale scores of large city (LC) fourth-grade Black males *without disabilities* (Non-SD) improved significantly (+8 points), but was at least 9 points lower than the score of White males in national public schools (NP) *with disabilities* (SD).


Note: Large city (LC) includes students from all cities in the nation with populations of 250,000 or more including the participating TUDA districts.

NP includes students attending public schools across the nation.

\*\*\* Significantly different from 2009 at p < .05

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2003, 2005, 2007, and 2009 Mathematics Assessments.

**FIGURE 2.27. PERCENTAGE OF GRADE 4 NON-SD BLACK MALES (LC) VS. SD WHITE MALES (NP) PERFORMING AT OR ABOVE PROFICIENT IN NAEP MATHEMATICS, 2003-2009**



Note: Large city (LC) includes students from all cities in the nation with populations of 250,000 or more including the participating TUDA districts.

NP includes students attending public schools across the nation.

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2003, 2005, 2007, and 2009 Mathematics Assessments.

# FACTOR 2D: BLACK MALE ACHIEVEMENT ON NAEP – MATHEMATICS GRADE 8

## HIGHLIGHTS

The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) mathematics results for grade 8 are reported as average scores on a 0–500 scale. The results are reported as achievement levels (*Basic, Proficient and Advanced*<sup>7</sup>) that show what students should know and be able to do.

### Mathematics Grade 8

- The average mathematics scale score of large city (LC) eighth-grade Black students increased significantly from 247 in 2003 to 256 (+9 points) in 2009; the average mathematics scale score of large city (LC) eighth-grade Hispanic students increased significantly from 256 in 2003 to 264 (+8 points) in 2009; and the average mathematics scale score of eighth-grade White students in national public schools (NP) increased significantly from 287 in 2003 to 292 (+5 points) in 2009. (Figure 2.28)
- In 2009, the average mathematics scale score of large city (LC) eighth-grade Black students (256) was significantly lower than the average mathematics scale score of large city (LC) Hispanic students (264). Black and Hispanic students in large cities, however, scored lower than White students in national public schools (NP) (292). (Tests of significance could not be conducted.) (Figure 2.28)
- The average mathematics scale score of large city (LC) eighth-grade Black males increased significantly from 247 in 2003 to 255 (+8 points) in 2009, while the average mathematics scale scores of large city (LC) Hispanic males increased significantly from 257 to 266 (+9 points) during the same period. (Figure 2.29)
- In 2009, the average mathematics scale score of eighth-grade Black males (255) in large cities (LC) was not significantly different from large city (LC) eighth-grade Black females (257) but was significantly lower than large city (LC) Hispanic males (-11 points) and Hispanic females (-7 points). (Figure 2.29)
- The average mathematics scale score of large city (LC) eighth-grade Black males increased significantly from 247 in 2003 to 255 (+8 points) in 2009, while the average mathematics scale score of Black male fourth-graders in national public schools (NP) increased significantly from 251 to 259 (+8 points) over the same period. (Figure 2.30)
- In 2009, the average scale score of large city (LC) Black males (255) was significantly different from Black males (259) in national public schools (NP). (Figure 2.30)
- The average mathematics scale score of eighth-grade White males in national public schools (NP) increased significantly from 287 in 2003 to 293 (+6 points) in 2009, while the mathematics scores of large city (LC) Black males increased significantly 247 to 255 (+8 points) over the same period. The gap between White males (NP) and Black males (LC) narrowed by two points. (Figure 2.31)


<sup>7</sup> The cut score indicating the lower end of the score range for each level is Basic (214), Proficient (249), and Advanced (282).

- Between 2003 and 2009, the percentage of large city (LC) eighth-grade Black males performing at or above *Proficient* levels in mathematics increased from 6 percent to 10 percent, while the percentage of eighth-grade White males in national public schools (NP) performing at or above *Proficient* in mathematics was 38 percent in 2003 and 44 percent in 2009. (Figure 2.32)
- The average mathematics scale score of large city (LC) eighth-grade Black males who were *eligible for free or reduced-price lunch* (FRPL) increased significantly from 243 in 2003 to 253 (+10 points) in 2009, while the average mathematics scale score of White male eighth-graders in national public schools (NP) who were *eligible for free or reduced-price lunch* (FRPL) increased significantly from 257 to 265 (+8 points) over the same period. (Figure 2.33)
- In 2009, the average mathematics scale score of eighth-grade Black males in large cities (LC) who were *eligible for free or reduced-price lunch* (FRPL) was 12 points lower than eighth-grade White males in national public schools (NP) who were *eligible for free or reduced-price lunch* (FRPL). The average mathematics scale score of eighth-grade Black males in large cities (LC) who were *not eligible for free or reduced-price lunch* (Non-FRPL) was only 12 points higher than White males who were *eligible for free or reduced-price lunch* (FRPL) in 2009. (Figure 2.33)
- Between 2003 and 2009, the percentage of large city (LC) eighth-grade Black males who were *eligible for free or reduced-price lunch* (FRPL) and were performing at or above *Proficient* in mathematics was at least 8 percentage points lower than the percentage of eighth-grade White males in national public schools (NP) who were *eligible for free or reduced-price lunch* (FRPL) and were performing at or above *Proficient* levels. (Figure 2.34)
- The average mathematics scale score of large city (LC) eighth-grade Black males *with disabilities* (SD) increased significantly from 215 in 2003 to 226 (+11 points) in 2009, while the average mathematics scale scores of White male eighth-graders in national public schools (NP) *with disabilities* (SD) increased from 256 to 263 (+7 points) over the same period. (Figure 2.35)
- In 2009, the average mathematics scale score of eighth-grade Black males in large cities (LC) *with disabilities* (SD) was 37 points lower than eighth-grade White males in national public schools (NP) *with disabilities* (SD). The average scale score of eighth-grade Black males *without disabilities* (Non-SD) was 2 points lower than White males in national public schools (NP) *with disabilities* (SD) in 2009. (Figure 2.35)
- Between 2003 and 2009, the percentage of large city (LC) eighth-grade Black males *without disabilities* (Non-SD) and who were performing at or above *Proficient* in mathematics was at least 3 percentage points lower than the percentage of White males *with disabilities* (SD) and were performing at or above *Proficient* levels. (Figure 2.36)



# FACTOR 2D: BLACK MALE ACHIEVEMENT ON NAEP – MATHEMATICS GRADE 8

**FIGURE 2.28. GRADE 8 NAEP MATHEMATICS SCALE SCORES BY ETHNICITY, 2003-2009**



Note: Large city (LC) includes students from all cities in the nation with populations of 250,000 or more including the participating TUDA districts.


NP includes students attending public schools across the nation.

\*Significantly different from Black students in large cities at  $p < 0.05$

\*\*\*Significantly different from 2009 at  $p < 0.05$

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2003, 2005, 2007, and 2009 Mathematics Assessments.

**FIGURE 2.29. GRADE 8 NAEP MATHEMATICS SCALE SCORES OF BLACK MALES AND FEMALES (LC) AND HISPANIC MALES AND FEMALES (LC), 2003-2009**



In 2009, the average mathematics scale score of eighth-grade Black males in large cities (LC) was not significantly different (2 points lower) than large city (LC) eighth-grade Black females, but was significantly lower than large city (LC) Hispanic males (11 points lower) and Hispanic females (7 points lower).

Note: Large city (LC) includes students from all cities in the nation with populations of 250,000 or more including the participating TUDA districts.

NP includes students attending public schools across the nation.


\* Significantly different from Black males in large cities at  $p < .05$

\*\*\*Significantly different from 2009 at  $p < .05$

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2003, 2005, 2007, and 2009 Mathematics Assessments.


# FACTOR 2D: BLACK MALE ACHIEVEMENT ON NAEP – MATHEMATICS GRADE 8

**FIGURE 2.30. GRADE 8 NAEP MATHEMATICS SCALE SCORES OF BLACK MALES (LC) VS. BLACK MALES (NP), 2003-2009**




Note: Large city (LC) includes students from all cities in the nation with populations of 250,000 or more including the participating TUDA districts.  
 NP includes students attending public schools across the nation.  
 \* Significantly different from Black males in large cities at  $p < .05$   
 \*\*\* Significantly different from 2009 at  $p < .05$   
 Source: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2003, 2005, 2007, and 2009 Mathematics Assessments.

**FIGURE 2.31. GRADE 8 NAEP MATHEMATICS SCALE SCORES OF BLACK MALES (LC) VS. WHITE MALES (NP), 2003-2009**



Note: Large city (LC) includes students from all cities in the nation with populations of 250,000 or more including the participating TUDA districts.  
 NP includes students attending public schools across the nation.  
 \*\*\* Significantly different from 2009 at  $p < .05$


**FIGURE 2.32. PERCENTAGE OF GRADE 8 BLACK MALES (LC) VS. WHITE MALES (NP) PERFORMING AT OR ABOVE PROFICIENT IN NAEP MATHEMATICS, 2003-2009**



Note: Large city (LC) includes students from all cities in the nation with populations of 250,000 or more including the participating TUDA districts.  
 NP includes students attending public schools across the nation.  
 Source: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2003, 2005, 2007, and 2009 Mathematics Assessments.

# FACTOR 2D: BLACK MALE ACHIEVEMENT ON NAEP – MATHEMATICS GRADE 8

**FIGURE 2.33. GRADE 8 NAEP MATHEMATICS SCALE SCORES OF FRPL AND NON-FRPL BLACK MALES (LC) AND FRPL AND NON-FRPL WHITE MALES (NP), 2003-2009**



The average mathematics scale score of large city (LC) eighth-grade Black males who were *eligible for free or reduced-price lunch* (FRPL) increased significantly from 2003 to 2009 (+10 points), while the average mathematics scale scores of White male eighth-graders in national public schools (NP) who were *eligible for free or reduced-price lunch* (FRPL) also increased significantly (+8 points) over the same period.


Note: Large city (LC) includes students from all cities in the nation with populations of 250,000 or more including the participating TUDA districts.

NP includes students attending public schools across the nation.

\*\*\* Significantly different from 2009 at  $p < .05$

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2003, 2005, 2007, and 2009 Mathematics Assessments.


**FIGURE 2.34. PERCENTAGE OF GRADE 8 NON-FRPL BLACK MALES (LC) VS. FRPL BLACK MALES (NP) PERFORMING AT OR ABOVE PROFICIENT IN NAEP MATHEMATICS, 2003- 2009**



Note: Large city (LC) includes students from all cities in the nation with populations of 250,000 or more including the participating TUDA districts.  
 NP includes students attending public schools across the nation.  
 Source: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2003, 2005, 2007, and 2009 Mathematics Assessments.

# FACTOR 2D: BLACK MALE ACHIEVEMENT ON NAEP – MATHEMATICS GRADE 8

**FIGURE 2.35. GRADE 8 NAEP MATHEMATICS SCALE SCORES OF SD AND NON-SD BLACK MALES (LC) VS. SD AND NON-SD WHITE MALES (NP), 2003-2009**



In 2009, the average scale score in mathematics of large city (LC) eighth-grade Black males *without disabilities* (Non-SD) was two points lower than the average scale score of eighth-grade White males in national public schools (NP) *with disabilities* (SD).


Note: Large city (LC) includes students from all cities in the nation with populations of 250,000 or more including the participating TUDA districts.

NP includes students attending public schools across the nation.

\*\*\* Significantly different from 2009 at  $p < .05$

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2003, 2005, 2007, and 2009 Mathematics Assessments.

**FIGURE 2.36. PERCENTAGE OF GRADE 8 NON-SD BLACK MALES (LC) VS. SD WHITE MALES (NP) PERFORMING AT OR ABOVE PROFICIENT IN NAEP MATHEMATICS, 2003- 2009**



Note: Large city (LC) includes students from all cities in the nation with populations of 250,000 or more including the participating TUDA districts.  
 NP includes students attending public schools across the nation.  
 Source: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2003, 2005, 2007, and 2009 Mathematics Assessments.



## FACTOR 3: BLACK MALE ACHIEVEMENT ON NAEP IN SELECTED BIG CITY DISTRICTS


### HIGHLIGHTS

- Between 2003 and 2009, the average reading scale scores of fourth-grade Black males increased significantly in Atlanta, Boston, Charlotte, District of Columbia and New York City. Furthermore, average scores increased significantly from 2005 to 2009 for fourth-graders in Atlanta, Austin, and District of Columbia. (Figure 3.1)
- In 2009, average NAEP reading scale scores for fourth-grade Black males in Boston and New York City were significantly higher than scale scores for Black males in national public schools (NP). Black male fourth-graders in Boston, Charlotte, Houston and New York City scored significantly higher than Black males in large cities (LC). (Figure 3.2)
- In 2009, all TUDA districts, except Charlotte, had at least 50 percent of their fourth-grade Black males performing below *Basic* levels in reading. The percentage of Black males at or above *Proficient* levels in fourth-grade reading ranged from a low of 3 percent in Cleveland and Detroit to a high of 16 percent in Charlotte. (Figure 3.3)
- Between 2003 and 2009, the average reading scale score of eighth-grade Black males increased significantly in Atlanta and New York City. Furthermore, the average scores increased significantly from 2005 to 2009 for eighth-grade students Atlanta. (Figure 3.4)
- In 2009, the average reading scale scores of eighth-grade Black males in Cleveland, Detroit, District of Columbia, Fresno, and Milwaukee were significantly lower than scale scores among Black males in national public schools (NP). None of the average reading scale scores for Black males in any TUDA district were significantly higher than score for Black males in national public schools (NP) or in the large cities (LC). (Figure 3.5)
- In 2009, at least 50 percent of eighth-grade Black males in most TUDA districts performed below *Basic* levels in reading. The percentage of Black males at or above *Proficient* levels ranged from a low of 3 percent in Milwaukee to a high of 13 percent in Austin. (Figure 3.6)
- Between 2003 and 2009, the average mathematics scale scores of fourth-grade Black males increased significantly in Atlanta, Boston, District of Columbia, and New York City. Furthermore, the average score increased significantly from 2005 to 2009 for fourth-grade students in Boston. (Figure 3.7)
- In 2009, average mathematics scale scores of fourth-grade Black males in Boston, Charlotte, and New York City were significantly higher than scale scores of fourth-grade Black males in national public schools (NP). Black males in Boston, Charlotte, Houston, and New York City scored significantly higher, on average, than large city (LC) Black males. (Figure 3.8)

- In 2009, at least 30 percent of fourth-grade Black males in most TUDA districts performed below *Basic* levels in mathematics; and in eight of the 18 districts, at least 50 percent of fourth-graders performed below *Basic* levels. The percentage of fourth-grade Black males at or above *Proficient* levels ranged from 2 percent in Detroit to 25 percent in Charlotte. (Figure 3.9)
- Between 2003 and 2009, the average mathematics scale scores of eighth-grade Black males increased significantly in Atlanta, Boston, Charlotte, and Chicago. Furthermore, average scores increased significantly from 2005 to 2009 for eighth-grade students in Atlanta, Boston, Charlotte, Chicago and Cleveland. (Figure 3.10)
- In 2009, average mathematics scale scores of eighth-grade Black males in Austin, Boston and Charlotte were significantly higher than the scores of eighth-grade Black males in national public schools (NP). Black males in Austin, Boston, Charlotte, and Houston scored, on average, significantly higher than the scores of eighth-grade Black males in large cities (LC). (Figure 3.11)
- In 2009, at least 50 percent of eighth-grade Black males in most TUDA districts performed below *Basic* levels in mathematics. The percentage of eighth-grade Black males who performed at or above *Proficient* levels ranged from 2 percent in Milwaukee to 19 percent in Austin. (Figure 3.12)

# FACTOR 3: BLACK MALE ACHIEVEMENT ON NAEP IN SELECTED BIG CITY DISTRICTS


**FIGURE 3.1. GRADE 4 NAEP READING SCALE SCORES OF BLACK MALES IN TUDA DISTRICTS, LC AND NP, 2003-2009**



Between 2003 and 2009, average reading scale scores of fourth-grade Black males increased significantly in Atlanta, Boston, Charlotte, District of Columbia (DCPS) and New York City.

\*\*\*Significantly different from 2009 at  $p < .05$   
 Source: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2003, 2005, 2007, and 2009 Reading Assessments.

**FIGURE 3.2. GRADE 4 NAEP READING SCALE SCORES OF BLACK MALES IN TUDA DISTRICTS, LC AND NP, 2009**




In 2009, the average reading scale scores of fourth-grade Black males in Boston and New York City were significantly higher than the average score for fourth-grade Black males in national public schools (NP).

\* Significantly different from large city at  $p < .05$   
 \*\* Significantly different from nation at  $p < .05$

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2003, 2005, 2007, and 2009 Reading Assessments.


# FACTOR 3: BLACK MALE ACHIEVEMENT ON NAEP IN SELECTED BIG CITY DISTRICTS

**FIGURE 3.3. GRADE 4 BLACK MALES PERFORMING BELOW BASIC AND AT OR ABOVE PROFICIENT IN NAEP READING IN TUDA DISTRICTS, LC AND NP, 2009**



Source: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2003, 2005, 2007, and 2009 Reading Assessments.

**FIGURE 3.4. GRADE 8 NAEP READING SCALE SCORES OF BLACK MALES IN TUDA DISTRICTS, LC AND NP, 2003-2009**



Between 2003 and 2009, average reading scale scores of eighth-grade Black males increased significantly in Atlanta and New York City.

\*\*\*Significantly different from 2009 at  $p < .05$   
 Source: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2003, 2005, 2007, and 2009 Reading Assessments.

# FACTOR 3: BLACK MALE ACHIEVEMENT ON NAEP IN SELECTED BIG CITY DISTRICTS


**FIGURE 3.5. GRADE 8 NAEP READING SCALE SCORES OF BLACK MALES IN TUDA DISTRICTS, LC AND NP, 2009**



In 2009, the average reading scale scores for eighth-grade Black males in Cleveland, Detroit, District of Columbia, Fresno, and Milwaukee were significantly lower than the scale scores of eighth-grade Black males in national public schools (NP).

\* Significantly different from large city at  $p < .05$   
 \*\* Significantly different from nation at  $p < .05$   
 Source: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2003, 2005, 2007, and 2009 Reading Assessments.

**FIGURE 3.6. PERCENTAGE OF GRADE 8 BLACK MALES PERFORMING BELOW BASIC AND AT OR ABOVE PROFICIENT IN NAEP READING IN TUDA DISTRICTS, LC AND NP, 2009**




In 2009, nationwide (NP) and in most TUDA districts, at least 50 percent of eighth-grade Black males performed below *Basic* levels in reading.

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2003, 2005, 2007, and 2009 Reading Assessments.



# FACTOR 3: BLACK MALE ACHIEVEMENT ON NAEP IN SELECTED BIG CITY DISTRICTS


**FIGURE 3.7. GRADE 4 NAEP MATHEMATICS SCALE SCORES OF BLACK MALES IN TUDA DISTRICTS, LC AND NP, 2003-2009**



Between 2003 and 2009, mathematics scale scores of fourth-grade Black males increased significantly in Atlanta, Boston, District of Columbia (DCPS) and New York City.

\*\*\*Significantly different from 2009 at  $p < .05$   
 Source: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2003, 2005, 2007, and 2009 Mathematics Assessments.

**FIGURE 3.8. GRADE 4 NAEP MATHEMATICS SCALE SCORES OF BLACK MALES IN TUDA DISTRICTS, LC AND NP, 2009**



In 2009, average mathematics scale scores of fourth-grade Black males in Boston, Charlotte, and New York City were higher than scale scores of fourth-grade Black males in national public schools (NP).

\* Significantly different from large city at  $p < .05$

\*\* Significantly different from nation at  $p < .05$

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2003, 2005, 2007, and 2009 Mathematics Assessments.


# FACTOR 3: BLACK MALE ACHIEVEMENT ON NAEP IN SELECTED BIG CITY DISTRICTS

**FIGURE 3.9. GRADE 4 BLACK MALES PERFORMING BELOW BASIC AND AT OR ABOVE PROFICIENT IN NAEP MATHEMATICS IN TUDA DISTRICTS, LC AND NP, 2009**



Source: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2003, 2005, 2007, and 2009 Mathematics Assessments.

**FIGURE 3.10. GRADE 8 NAEP MATHEMATICS SCALE SCORES OF BLACK MALES IN TUDA DISTRICTS, LC AND NP, 2003-2009**




Between 2003 and 2009, the average mathematics scale score of eighth-grade Black males increased significantly in Atlanta, Boston, Charlotte and Chicago.

\*\*\*Significantly different from 2009 at  $p < .05$   
 Source: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2003, 2005, 2007, and 2009 Mathematics Assessments.

## FACTOR 3: BLACK MALE ACHIEVEMENT ON NAEP IN SELECTED BIG CITY DISTRICTS

**FIGURE 3.11. GRADE 8 NAEP MATHEMATICS SCALE SCORES OF BLACK MALES IN TUDA DISTRICTS, LC AND NP, 2009**




\* Significantly different from large city at  $p < .05$

\*\* Significantly different from nation at  $p < .05$

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2003, 2005, 2007, and 2009 Mathematics Assessments.

**FIGURE 3.12. GRADE 8 BLACK MALES PERFORMING BELOW BASIC AND AT OR ABOVE PROFICIENT IN NAEP MATHEMATICS IN TUDA DISTRICTS, LC AND NP, 2009**



In 2009, at least 50 percent of eighth-grade Black males in most TUDA districts and nationwide (NP) performed below *Basic* levels in mathematics.


Source: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2003, 2005, 2007, and 2009 Mathematics Assessments.

## FACTOR 4: COLLEGE AND CAREER PREPAREDNESS

### HIGHLIGHTS


- In 2008, Black males were nearly twice as likely as White males to drop out of high school—9 percent of Black males, compared with 5 percent of White males. (Figure 4.1)
- In 2007, Black students were less likely to graduate on time from public high school (completing grades 9 through 12 in four years) than White students. Eight out of 10 White students graduated from public high schools in four years, compared with six out of 10 Black students. (Figure 4.2)
- In 2008, Advanced Placement test takers were more likely to be White students than Black students. Approximately 60 percent of AP test takers were White, 15 percent Hispanic, 10 percent Asian and 8 percent Black. (Figure 4.3)
- In 2009, the average SAT scores of Black males were lower than the average scores of White males in critical reading, mathematics, and writing. The gap between White and Black students taking the SAT was 104 points in critical reading, 120 points in mathematics, and 99 points in writing. (Figure 4.4)
- In 2009, the average ACT score for Black students were below the average score for White students in English, mathematics, and reading. The gap between White and Black students was six points in English, five points in mathematics, and six points in reading. (Figure 4.5)
- In 2009, few Black students met the ACT college readiness benchmark in reading, mathematics, or English. At least three times as many White students as Black students met the college readiness standards for reading; four times as many for mathematics; and twice as many for English. (Figure 4.6)
- In 2009, Black males were less likely than White males to enroll in a two-year or four-year college after high school graduation. Three out of 10 Black males enrolled in a four-year institution, compared with four out of 10 White males. (Figure 4.7)

**FIGURE 4.1. HIGH SCHOOL DROPOUT RATES FOR MALES BY ETHNICITY, 2005-2008**



Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Census Bureau, Current Population Survey (CPS), October 1967 through October 2008.

**FIGURE 4.2. AVERAGE FRESHMAN GRADUATION RATES FOR PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS BY ETHNICITY, 2007**




Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data (CCD), "State Nonfiscal Survey of Public Elementary/Secondary Education," 1986-87 through 2007-08



# FACTOR 4: COLLEGE AND CAREER PREPAREDNESS


**FIGURE 4.3. PERCENTAGE OF HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS TAKING ADVANCED PLACEMENT EXAMS BY ETHNICITY, 2008**



In 2008, Black students were more than seven times less likely to take an Advanced Placement exam than White students.

Source: The College Board, The 5th Annual Advanced Placement Report to the Nation, 2009 [www.collegeboard.com](http://www.collegeboard.com)  
 Note: Because some AP Exam takers identify their ethnicity as "Other" or do not provide ethnicity data, this figure only represents 94.4 percent of the AP population


**FIGURE 4.4. AVERAGE SAT SCORES FOR MALES BY RACE, 2009**



In 2009, average SAT scores for Black males were below the national averages and below scores for White males in critical reading, mathematics and writing.


Source: The College Board, Total Group Profile Report, 2009 [www.collegeboard.com](http://www.collegeboard.com)

**FIGURE 4.5. AVERAGE ACT SCORES FOR STUDENTS BY RACE, 2009**



Source: ACT Profile Report–National: Graduating Class 2010, www.act.org


**FIGURE 4.6. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS MEETING ACT COLLEGE READINESS BENCHMARK SCORES BY RACE, 2009**



Source: ACT Profile Report–National: Graduating Class 2010, www.act.org

## FACTOR 4: COLLEGE AND CAREER PREPAREDNESS

**FIGURE 4.7. PERCENTAGE OF BLACK AND WHITE MALES ENROLLED IN A TWO-YEAR OR FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE AFTER HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION, 2009**



Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Census Bureau, Current Population Survey (CPS), October, 1967 through 2008




## FACTOR 5: SCHOOL EXPERIENCE

### HIGHLIGHTS

- In 2004, Black high school seniors were less likely to participate in academic clubs than their classmates. About 45 percent of Black students participated in sports activities, 17 percent in academic clubs and 24 percent participated in extracurricular music activities. (Figure 5.1)
- In 2004, students with a low socioeconomic status were less likely to participate in academic clubs, sports, and extracurricular music activities than their classmates. Sixteen percent of students in low socioeconomic status, 20 percent in middle socioeconomic status, and 28 percent in high socioeconomic status participated in academic clubs. (Figure 5.2)
- In 2007, Black students and poor students were more likely to be retained during their K-8 school careers than their classmates. At least 23 percent of students who were retained were poor, and 16 percent were Black, compared with 5 percent who were not poor and 8 percent who were White. (Figure 5.3)
- In 2006, Black students were three times more likely than White students, two times more likely than Hispanic and American Indian students, and five times more likely than Asian students to be suspended from school. About 15 percent of Black students and 5 percent of White students were suspended. (Figure 5.4)
- In 2008, public schools in cities reported higher rates of violent and seriously violent crimes than did public schools in the suburbs, towns, and rural areas in 2008. (Figure 5.5)
- In 2008, public schools with more than 50 percent minority enrollments reported higher rates of crime than did schools with fewer minority enrollments in 2008. (Figure 5.6)
- The higher the rate of violent incidents reported in public schools; the higher the percentage of FRPL students attending those schools. In 2008, public schools with over 75 percent of their students *eligible for free or reduced-price lunch* reported three times more violent or serious violent crime than did schools with 0-25 percent of their students *eligible for free or reduced-price lunch*. (Figure 5.7)
- In 2008, gang activities were more likely to be reported by public schools in cities; public schools with a high percentage of minority students; and public schools with a high percentage of FRPL students than other types of public schools. (Figure 5.8)


**FIGURE 5.1. PERCENTAGE OF HIGH SCHOOL SENIORS PARTICIPATING IN SCHOOL-SPONSORED EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES BY RACE/ETHNICITY, 2004**



In 2004, Black high school seniors were less likely than their classmates to participate in academic clubs and more likely to participate in extracurricular music activities.

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Education Longitudinal Study of 2002/2004

**FIGURE 5.2. PERCENTAGE OF HIGH SCHOOL SENIORS PARTICIPATING IN SCHOOL-SPONSORED EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES BY SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS, 2004**




In 2004, the higher the socioeconomic status of a high school senior the more likely the student was to participate in academic clubs, sports, and extracurricular music activities.

Note: Socioeconomic status (SES) was measured by a composite score on parental education and occupations, and family income. Low= bottom quartile; high= top quartile

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Education Longitudinal Study of 2002/2004

# FACTOR 5: SCHOOL EXPERIENCE


**FIGURE 5.3. PERCENTAGE OF KINDERGARTEN THROUGH GRADE 8 STUDENTS RETAINED IN A GRADE DURING THEIR SCHOOL CAREER, 2007**



In 2007, poor, Black students were more likely than their classmates to be retained during their K-8 school careers.

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Parent Survey, Before- and After-School Programs Survey, and Parent and Family Involvement in Education Survey of the 1996–2007 NHES


**FIGURE 5.4. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS SUSPENDED FROM PUBLIC ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS BY RACE/ETHNICITY, 2006**



In 2006, Black students were three times more likely than White students, two times more likely than Hispanic and American Indian students and five times more likely than Asian students to be suspended from school.


Source: U.S. Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights, Civil Rights Data Collection: 2006

**FIGURE 5.5. RATES OF VIOLENT INCIDENTS IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS BY URBANICITY, 2008**



Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, School Survey on Crime and Safety (SSOCS), 2008

**FIGURE 5.6. RATES OF VIOLENT INCIDENTS IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS BY MINORITY ENROLLMENT, 2008**




Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, School Survey on Crime and Safety (SSOCS), 2008




# FACTOR 5: SCHOOL EXPERIENCE

**FIGURE 5.7. RATES OF VIOLENT INCIDENTS IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS BY FREE OR REDUCED-PRICE LUNCH (FRPL) ENROLLMENT, 2008**



Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, School Survey on Crime and Safety (SSOCS), 2008

**FIGURE 5.8. PERCENTAGE OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS REPORTING GANG ACTIVITIES DURING SCHOOL YEAR, 2008**



In 2008, gang activities were more likely to be reported by public schools in cities; public schools with a high percentage of minority students; and public schools with a high percentage of FRPL students than other types of public schools.


Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, School Survey on Crime and Safety (SSOCS), 2008

## FACTOR 6: POSTSECONDARY EXPERIENCES

### HIGHLIGHTS


- In 2001, graduation rates for White males were consistently higher than national averages. The graduation rates were at least 50 percent higher for Whites males than for Black males. Approximately 15 percent of Black males graduated in four years and about one-third graduated in five years, compared with 33 percent of White males who graduated in four years and half who graduated in five years. (Figure 6.1)
- In the second quarter of 2010, the unemployment rate for Black males ages 20 and over was twice as high as the unemployment rate for White males of the same age. Black males had a double-digit unemployment rate (17.3 percent), while the unemployment rate for White males was in the single digits (8.6 percent) and below the national average (9.6 percent). (Figure 6.2)
- In 2008, Black males who graduated from college were more likely to earn bachelor's degrees in business than in any other field of study. Approximately 30 percent earned a degree in business, 10 percent in social sciences and history, and fewer than 10 percent earned degrees in all other reported areas. (Figure 6.3)
- In 2008, nearly 50 percent of Black males receiving a professional degree studied law, while 17 percent studied medicine and 4 percent studied dentistry. (Figure 6.4)
- In 2009, approximately 20 percent of Black males age 18 or over had either attained some college or had a college degree. Ten percent of Black males had earned bachelor's degrees, compared with 18 percent of White males. Four percent of Black males had earned master's degrees, compared with 6 percent of White males. (Figure 6.5)
- In 2006, Black males ages 18 and over were more likely to have a lower income than White males with similar educational backgrounds. The wage gap between Black and White males not graduating from high school was approximately \$5,000, compared with a gap of over \$20,000 among those with a master's degree. (Figure 6.6)
- In 2008, Black males ages 16 and over in the labor force were more likely to have an occupation in the production, transportation and the material-moving fields (26 percent) than in the management and professional fields (about 23 percent). Some 13 percent worked in natural resources, construction, and maintenance. (Figure 6.7)
- In 2008, Black males ages 18 and over accounted for 5 percent of the total college student population and 36 percent of the total prison population. (Figure 6.8)
- In 2008, Black males ages 18 and over were imprisoned at a rate six and a half times higher than White males. (Figure 6.9)
- In 2008, Black males accounted for at least 41 percent of the prison population ages 18 through 34; White males accounted for approximately 27 percent of the inmates in that age range. (Figure 6.10)

**FIGURE 6.1. COLLEGE GRADUATION RATES FOR FIRST-TIME POSTSECONDARY STUDENTS IN FULL-TIME DEGREE SEEKING 4-YEAR INSTITUTIONS, 2001**



Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2007-2008


**FIGURE 6.2. UNEMPLOYMENT RATES FOR BLACK AND WHITE MALES AGES 20 AND OVER, SECOND QUARTER 2010**



Source: U.S. Department of Labor, U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics


## FACTOR 6: POSTSECONDARY EXPERIENCES

**FIGURE 6.3. BACHELOR'S DEGREES CONFERRED ON BLACK MALES BY FIELD OF STUDY, 2008**




Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2007-2008

**FIGURE 6.4. PROFESSIONAL DEGREES CONFERRED ON BLACK MALES BY FIELD OF STUDY, 2008**



Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2009


**FIGURE 6.5. EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT OF MALE POPULATION 18 YEARS AND OVER BY RACE, 2009**



Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2009


# FACTOR 6: POSTSECONDARY EXPERIENCES

**FIGURE 6.6. INCOME BY EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT OF BLACK AND WHITE MALES AGES 18 AND OVER, 2006**



Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Census Bureau, Current Population Survey (CPS), October, 1967 through 2008


**FIGURE 6.7. PERCENTAGE OF BLACK MALES AGES 16 AND OVER IN THE LABOR FORCE BY OCCUPATION, 2008**



In 2008, Black males were more likely to have an occupation in the production, transportation, and material-moving fields than in management and professional fields.

Source: Current Population survey, U.S. Department of Labor, U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and U.S. Department of Commerce, Census Bureau, Current Population Survey (CPS), October, 1967 through 2008

**FIGURE 6.8. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF BLACK AND WHITE MALES AGES 18 AND OVER IN COLLEGE AND PRISON POPULATION, 2008**




In 2008, Black males ages 18 and over accounted for 5 percent of the college population but 36 percent of the prison population.

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Prison Inmates at Midyear, Current Population Survey 2009




# FACTOR 6: POSTSECONDARY EXPERIENCES

**FIGURE 6.9. IMPRISONMENT RATE PER 100,000 PERSONS IN THE U.S. RESIDENT POPULATION OF BLACK AND WHITE MALES AGES 18 AND OVER, 2008**



Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Prison Inmates at Midyear, Current Population Survey 2009

**FIGURE 6.10. PERCENTAGE OF BLACK AND WHITE MALE PRISONERS UNDER STATE AND FEDERAL JURISDICTION BY AGE, 2008**



Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Prison Inmates at Midyear, Current Population Survey 2009

# CHAPTER 3

## PROFILES OF EXCELLENCE

**“TO ACCOMPLISH GREAT THINGS, WE MUST NOT ONLY ACT, BUT ALSO DREAM; NOT ONLY PLAN, BUT ALSO BELIEVE.”**

~ ANATOLE FRANCE

Despite the discouraging data on the social and educational conditions and outcomes of Black males there is hope. In this section, we highlight young Black men from Council districts who stood out among their peers. Their brief profiles show that, with the appropriate support, a school that promotes excellence, and adults that nourish their growth, success is possible.

### **LEANGELO HALL, MIAMI-DADE (FLORIDA) PUBLIC SCHOOLS, CORAL REEF SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL**

Recently, the Council named winners of the Bernard Harris Math and Science Scholarship. The scholarship is awarded to four seniors in high school (a Black male, a Black female, a Hispanic male, and a Hispanic female). One of this year's recipients was proof that, with high standards and determination, anyone can achieve their goal. Leangelo Hall, of Miami-Dade County Public Schools' Coral Reef Senior High, was raised by a single mother and is one of five children. For him, his family background and past were not excuses to fail. Leangelo's drive led him to excel in each of his classes. Aside from his academic achievement, he was heavily involved in community service, from a tutoring program he founded in 2008 for K-8 students to organizing events to assist refugees in Darfur. Leangelo showed that there was always time to help those who need it. His good deeds and hard work did not go unnoticed; Leangelo was accepted by four Ivy-League institutions—Harvard, Yale, Cornell, and Princeton—as well as Stanford. Leangelo is currently attending Princeton University.

### **KELVIN LEWIS FREEMAN II, COLUMBUS (OHIO) CITY SCHOOLS, FORT HAYES HIGH SCHOOL**

Another applicant for the Bernard Harris scholarship left an impression on the judges. Kelvin Lewis Freeman II of Columbus City Schools' Fort Hayes High School demonstrated that potential could take you a long way. Kelvin's enthusiasm towards education and his compassion towards people led to his growth in high school. Aside from being a leader in his school, Kelvin was also an athlete, a singer, and a volunteer. His ability to manage his time and academics showed his commitment to excellence. In one of his recommendations, his high school counselor commented that he “works with purpose and intensity, viewing that time not as drudgery but as an opportunity for improvement.” Kelvin was accepted by his top college choices: University of Dayton, Ohio State University, Case Western University, University of Cincinnati, and Miami University. He is currently attending the University of Dayton.

### **JAMIE BUTLER, ORANGE COUNTY (FLORIDA) PUBLIC SCHOOLS, JONES HIGH SCHOOL**

At Orange County Public Schools' Jones High School, Jamie Butler viewed education as the only key to success. He faced many obstacles, watching his family struggle financially and then ultimately enduring the death of his father when he was 13 years old. However, those obstacles did not stop Jamie. In his senior year, he was the Jones Class of 2010 student government association's president as well as the president of SECME (the pre-engineering club). According to a recent press release from Orange County, Jamie recalls being told by naysayers that he would become another “Black statistic—dropout.” Proving them wrong, he was accepted by six universities—Florida Institute of Technology, Florida Memorial, University of Central Florida, Florida A&M University, Morehouse College, Georgia Tech, and University of Rochester. Currently, Jamie is attending the University of Central Florida pursuing a degree in electrical engineering. He also aspires to become Governor of the State of Florida.

### **JORDAN SMILEY, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC SCHOOLS, ANACOSTIA SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL**

In the nation's capital, Jordan Smiley from Anacostia Senior High School was the first in his immediate family to graduate high school and go on to college. He was a member of the National Honor Society and the Achiever's Society and served as the student government president. Not only was Jordan a scholar and school leader but he was also an all-star captain of his football team. With a 3.3 grade point average and a rank of third in his class, Jordan definitely defied the stereotypes of young Black men growing up in the D.C. area. Jordan was clearly a role model in his school. Aware of his influence, he took on a project his senior year to register students for the ACT test in an effort to get more of his African-American classmates into college. For his achievements, Jordan was accepted by Tuskegee University, Hampton University, Morehouse College, and Clark Atlanta University. He is currently attending Hampton University.

### **DEVIN GUILLORY, EAST BATON ROUGE (LOUISIANA) PARISH, MCKINLEY HIGH SCHOOL**

Devin Guillory was one of only two African-American high school seniors from East Baton Rouge to be chosen as a National Achievement Scholarship winner. Devin has been described as talented with "both brawn and brains." Aside from making stellar grades, he was an impressive athlete at his school, playing both football and running track. However, his love for math superseded his love for athletics. At McKinley, he quickly fulfilled all of his math requirements and began taking classes at Louisiana State University. In addition to his course requirements at LSU, Devin agreed to tutor both LSU and McKinley students. Clearly Devin was not afraid of a challenge. Even as a fourth-grader, Devin dreamed of attending Stanford University, one of the nation's top colleges. In fact, he desired it so much that he placed a photo of the school on his refrigerator. That dream carried him through: Not only is he currently attending Stanford, but he also received a full scholarship. He was also accepted by Harvard College, Cornell University, Carnegie Mellon, Georgia Tech, Florida A&M, and University of Oklahoma.

### **CHANCELLOR SMITH, OMAHA (NEBRASKA) PUBLIC SCHOOLS, OMAHA NORTH MAGNET HIGH SCHOOL**

Chancellor Smith, from Omaha Public Schools, credits the Boys and Girls Club of Omaha for making him the person he is today. Growing up, Chancellor had very little contact with his abusive father and was raised by his mother and grandmother. This forced him to become the man of the house at an early age. Chancellor confidently took on this role, but when his grandmother passed away and his younger brother was seriously injured in an accident, life became more difficult. He states, "Growing up in a neighborhood where sexually transmitted diseases and poverty were the norm I knew I had to make a change in my life." Chancellor needed guidance, so he sought out the Boys and Girls Club, where he became a part of a male mentoring program that provided him with positive male role models. The program taught him how to make smart choices and most importantly, how to be a man. Today, Chancellor encourages youth at Boys and Girls Clubs to make better choices. The first member of his family to attend college, Chancellor is a student at the University of Nebraska at Lincoln.

### **DEONTE BRIDGES, ATLANTA (GEORGIA) PUBLIC SCHOOLS, BOOKER T. WASHINGTON HIGH SCHOOL**

At an Atlanta Public Schools' high-school graduation, Deonte Bridges became an instant inspiration for Black youth across the nation as the first Black male valedictorian in a decade from Booker T. Washington High School. Like many, he faced struggles in his life, from coping with his older brother's sudden death to being held at gunpoint to dealing with his mother's leukemia diagnosis. In his speech, he said that "life for [him] has been no crystal stair." With each of these challenges, Deonte never gave up. His unshakable attitude and his thirst for excellence helped earn him his college acceptance letters and receive enough funding to pay for any undergraduate and graduate university of his choice. Deonte received a number of prestigious scholarships, including the Gates Millennium Scholarship. He attends Emory University.



# CHAPTER 4

## A PLAN OF ACTION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Improving the quality of education for Black males in America is a national imperative. The current state of affairs, if left unaddressed, not only threatens to devastate more lives but affects the ability of Black males to care for their current and future families.

To begin addressing these issues more effectively, the Council of the Great City Schools is launching a renewed research effort that the organization hopes will yield more effective strategies than have been used in the past. Typically, the Council would review existing data, identify districts making more progress than others, and study how these more successful districts were producing their gains. But the data we examined, particularly NAEP data, suggest that few major city school districts are realizing outsized results with their Black male students, so the Council is going to take a different approach than is normally the case.

The Council will continue to analyze new and secondary data on the quality of education for Black males attending schools in the nation's largest urban districts, but the organization will also work to assemble the best thinking from around the country on what needs to be done (a) to improve the life circumstances of Black males, (b) to promote these strategies among the nation's major city school districts, (c) and to marshal the energy and commitment of like-minded individuals and groups to ensure progress.

In particular, the Council will move to--

- Convene a panel of 10 to 15 esteemed school district, state, national, and university leaders, as well as civic and faith-based leaders and governmental officials, who are concerned about the education of Black males. This panel of leaders would serve as a governing board and would provide advice and guidance to the Council on the formulation of strategies for improvement. The panel would identify critical academic and nonacademic challenges and barriers to educating Black males. And it would provide guidance on the direction and development of a national strategy.
- Identify one or more scholars to write papers that would not only describe the challenges but also offer recommendations and solutions.
- Have urban school board members, superintendents, and other senior staff and teachers from Council member districts review each paper.
- Ask reviewers to comment on the promise and feasibility of the recommendations, and have scholars revise or extend their proposals accordingly.
- Convene a major conference to publicly discuss the recommendations and direction.
- Compile all recommendations, strategies, and proposals into a final report.
- Urge the Council's board of directors ( who consist of the superintendent and one school board member from each Council district) to move forward on the recommendations.
- Marshal organizations, individuals, and agencies in support of a "Call to Action" to improve the attainment of the nation's Black males.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Convene a White House conference on the status of Black males and develop an overall call to action and strategic direction for improvement.
2. Encourage Congress, as it reauthorizes the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), to establish an explicit program with financial aid that would help public schools close achievement gaps. The program should include both educational strategies and social supports for Black males.
3. Marshal the energies and commitment of national and local organizations with an interest and stake in seeing improvement to coordinate their efforts on behalf of Black male youth. Such groups might include the Boys and Girls Clubs, 100 Black Men, the National Urban League, the NBA, the music industry, and others.
4. Build a nationwide network of support, particularly in the nation's major cities, to mentor and support individual Black male young people and their families.
5. Establish an ongoing network of mentoring, internship, and career experiences for adolescent Black males with the private sector in the nation's major cities.
6. Expand the number of Black male counselors in the nation's urban schools in order to provide social, psychological, and college/career guidance and direction to Black male students.
7. Encourage local, state, and national educators/researchers to disaggregate academic and nonacademic data by gender and race/ethnicity so that valid comparisons can be made between Black males and their peers.
8. Ensure that Black male students are taking the requisite courses at the appropriate level of rigor beginning in late elementary school, at least, to ensure that they are on track academically for high school graduation.
9. Work with the higher education community to ensure appropriate academic and social supports for Black male students in higher education.
10. Encourage school district leaders, especially in the big cities, to better target their instructional programming, interventions, and afterschool initiatives to address the specific academic and social needs of Black male students. School boards and superintendents should be asking for regular updates on the status and progress of their initiatives for these students.
11. Create a cadre of individuals to work in Black communities to address issues of violence and disruption both on the streets and in school.





# APPENDIX

| School District   | TOTAL # of Students | Black |        | White |        | Hispanic |        | Asian |        | Amer. Indian/Alaskan |        | FRPL | SD  |
|---|---------------------|-------|--------|-------|--------|----------|--------|-------|--------|----------------------|--------|------|-----|
|   |                     | Male  | Female | Male  | Female | Male     | Female | Male  | Female | Male                 | Female |      |     |
| <b>NATION</b>   | 49,708,595          | 8.4%  | 8.2%   | 27.6% | 26.1%  | 11.3%    | 10.8%  | 2.4%  | 2.3%   | 0.6%                 | 0.6%   | 44%  | 13% |
| <b>Albuquerque Public Schools</b>                       | 95,026              | 2.1%  | 1.9%   | 16.1% | 14.9%  | 29.0%    | 28.2%  | 1.2%  | 1.2%   | 2.7%                 | 2.7%   | 52%  | 14% |
| <b>Anchorage School District</b>                        | 48,837              | 3.2%  | 2.9%   | 25.6% | 23.6%  | 5.2%     | 4.9%   | 4.7%  | 4.6%   | 4.5%                 | 4.2%   | 33%  | 14% |
| <b>Atlanta Public Schools</b>                           | 49,032              | 40.9% | 41.9%  | 5.2%  | 5.1%   | 2.4%     | 2.4%   | 0.4%  | 0.4%   | 0.0%                 | 0.0%   | 76%  | 9%  |
| <b>Austin ISD</b>                                       | 83,319              | 6.0%  | 5.7%   | 13.4% | 12.4%  | 30.1%    | 28.7%  | 1.7%  | 1.7%   | 0.1%                 | 0.1%   | 63%  | 9%  |
| <b>Baltimore City Public Schools</b>                    | 82,266              | 44.3% | 44.1%  | 4.0%  | 3.8%   | 1.4%     | 1.4%   | 0.4%  | 0.4%   | 0.1%                 | 0.1%   | 73%  | 17% |
| <b>Birmingham City</b>                                  | 27,438              | 48.6% | 47.9%  | 0.5%  | 0.5%   | 1.2%     | 1.1%   | 0.1%  | 0.1%   | 0.0%                 | 0.0%   | 82%  | 13% |
| <b>Boston Public Schools</b>                            | 55,923              | 19.8% | 18.1%  | 6.9%  | 6.4%   | 19.7%    | 18.4%  | 4.4%  | 4.1%   | 0.2%                 | 0.2%   | 74%  | 21% |
| <b>Broward County Public Schools</b>                    | 256,351             | 19.3% | 18.6%  | 15.4% | 14.0%  | 13.4%    | 12.6%  | 1.8%  | 1.7%   | 0.1%                 | 0.1%   | 48%  | 12% |
| <b>Buffalo City School District</b>                     | 34,538              | 28.3% | 28.7%  | 12.3% | 11.6%  | 7.3%     | 7.5%   | 1.3%  | 1.4%   | 0.6%                 | 0.8%   | 82%  | 25% |
| <b>Caddo Parish School District</b>                     | 42,610              | 32.4% | 32.0%  | 16.6% | 16.2%  | 0.7%     | 0.7%   | 0.6%  | 0.5%   | 0.1%                 | 0.1%   | 63%  | 11% |
| <b>Charleston County School District</b>                | 42,303              | 24.9% | 25.0%  | 21.9% | 20.4%  | 2.9%     | 2.6%   | 0.8%  | 0.8%   | 0.2%                 | 0.1%   | 50%  | 11% |
| <b>Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools</b>                    | 134,060             | 22.6% | 22.9%  | 17.0% | 16.7%  | 7.8%     | 7.7%   | 2.3%  | 2.3%   | 0.3%                 | 0.3%   | 46%  | 11% |
| <b>Cincinnati Public Schools</b>                        | 35,344              | 35.1% | 33.9%  | 11.5% | 12.1%  | 1.0%     | 0.9%   | 0.4%  | 0.4%   | 0.0%                 | 0.1%   | 57%  | 21% |
| <b>Chicago Public Schools</b>                           | 421,430             | 23.3% | 23.2%  | 4.3%  | 4.6%   | 20.2%    | 20.7%  | 1.7%  | 1.8%   | 0.1%                 | 0.1%   | 73%  | 12% |
| <b>Clark County School District</b>                     | 312,761             | 7.4%  | 7.0%   | 18.3% | 17.1%  | 20.6%    | 19.5%  | 4.9%  | 4.5%   | 0.4%                 | 0.4%   | 40%  | 10% |
| <b>Cleveland Metropolitan School District</b>           | 49,148              | 35.2% | 34.3%  | 7.7%  | 7.4%   | 6.2%     | 5.6%   | 0.3%  | 0.3%   | 0.1%                 | 0.1%   | 100% | 20% |
| <b>Columbus City Schools</b>                            | 53,536              | 30.8% | 30.0%  | 14.2% | 13.3%  | 3.0%     | 2.9%   | 1.0%  | 0.9%   | 0.1%                 | 0.1%   | 70%  | 16% |
| <b>Dallas ISD</b>                                       | 157,332             | 13.9% | 13.8%  | 2.3%  | 2.3%   | 33.8%    | 32.7%  | 0.5%  | 0.5%   | 0.1%                 | 0.1%   | 86%  | 7%  |
| <b>Dayton Public Schools</b>                            | 15,566              | 35.0% | 33.6%  | 12.9% | 11.5%  | 1.6%     | 1.2%   | 0.1%  | 0.3%   | 0.0%                 | 0.0%   | 72%  | 20% |
| <b>Denver Public Schools</b>                            | 74,176              | 8.5%  | 8.7%   | 11.6% | 11.1%  | 28.3%    | 27.2%  | 1.6%  | 1.8%   | 0.5%                 | 0.6%   | 66%  | 12% |
| <b>Des Moines Independent Community School District</b> | 30,810              | 9.8%  | 9.2%   | 30.0% | 27.8%  | 8.9%     | 8.3%   | 2.6%  | 2.7%   | 0.3%                 | 0.3%   | 56%  | 18% |
| <b>Detroit Public Schools</b>                           | 94,497              | 44.4% | 44.0%  | 1.3%  | 1.2%   | 4.1%     | 3.8%   | 0.4%  | 0.4%   | 0.2%                 | 0.2%   | 77%  | 16% |
| <b>District Of Columbia Public Schools</b>              | 44,331              | 38.5% | 38.7%  | 4.0%  | 3.8%   | 6.1%     | 6.0%   | 1.0%  | 1.1%   | 0.0%                 | 0.0%   | 69%  | 19% |
| <b>Duval County Public Schools</b>                      | 122,606             | 22.2% | 21.9%  | 20.5% | 19.7%  | 3.5%     | 3.4%   | 2.1%  | 2.0%   | 0.1%                 | 0.1%   | 46%  | 14% |
| <b>East Baton Rouge Parish</b>                          | 43,869              | 41.5% | 41.5%  | 6.0%  | 5.7%   | 1.4%     | 1.3%   | 1.3%  | 1.2%   | 0.0%                 | 0.0%   | 82%  | 11% |
| <b>Fort Worth ISD</b>                                   | 79,285              | 12.8% | 12.3%  | 7.0%  | 6.5%   | 30.1%    | 29.4%  | 0.9%  | 0.8%   | 0.1%                 | 0.1%   | 72%  | 8%  |
| <b>Fresno Unified School District</b>                   | 76,617              | 5.3%  | 5.4%   | 7.1%  | 6.8%   | 30.5%    | 29.6%  | 7.1%  | 6.8%   | 0.4%                 | 0.3%   | 79%  | 10% |
| <b>Guilford County Schools</b>                          | 71,525              | 23.2% | 22.6%  | 20.4% | 19.1%  | 4.5%     | 4.4%   | 2.7%  | 2.6%   | 0.3%                 | 0.2%   | 46%  | 15% |
| <b>Hillsborough County School District</b>              | 192,007             | 11.2% | 10.7%  | 21.2% | 20.0%  | 14.3%    | 13.6%  | 1.5%  | 1.6%   | 0.1%                 | 0.1%   | 52%  | 15% |
| <b>Houston ISD</b>                                      | 200,252             | 14.1% | 13.7%  | 4.0%  | 3.8%   | 31.2%    | 29.9%  | 1.7%  | 1.6%   | 0.0%                 | 0.0%   | 63%  | 8%  |
| <b>Indianapolis Public Schools</b>                      | 34,050              | 29.0% | 27.7%  | 12.0% | 11.0%  | 7.9%     | 7.0%   | 0.1%  | 0.2%   | 0.1%                 | 0.1%   | 83%  | 20% |
| <b>Jackson Public Schools</b>                           | 30,587              | 49.0% | 48.6%  | 0.9%  | 0.7%   | 0.3%     | 0.4%   | 0.1%  | 0.1%   | 0.0%                 | 0.0%   | 86%  | 11% |
| <b>Jefferson County Public Schools</b>                  | 98,774              | 18.3% | 17.7%  | 26.6% | 25.4%  | 2.6%     | 2.4%   | 1.3%  | 1.2%   | 0.1%                 | 0.1%   | 56%  | 14% |
| <b>Kansas City School District</b>                      | 19,788              | 32.2% | 33.0%  | 4.4%  | 4.2%   | 12.3%    | 11.4%  | 1.0%  | 1.2%   | 0.1%                 | 0.1%   | 71%  | 11% |
| <b>Little Rock School District</b>                      | 26,146              | 33.9% | 34.6%  | 10.8% | 10.9%  | 4.1%     | 3.6%   | 0.9%  | 0.9%   | 0.1%                 | 0.2%   | 65%  | 10% |
| <b>Long Beach Unified</b>                               | 87,311              | 8.5%  | 8.6%   | 8.3%  | 7.8%   | 26.3%    | 25.4%  | 6.1%  | 5.8%   | 0.1%                 | 0.1%   | 68%  | 9%  |

| School District                       | TOTAL # of Students | Black        |              | White        |              | Hispanic    |             | Asian        |              | Amer. Indian/ Alaskan |             | FRPL       | SD         |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|-----------------------|-------------|------------|------------|
|                                       |                     | Male         | Female       | Male         | Female       | Male        | Female      | Male         | Female       | Male                  | Female      |            |            |
| Los Angeles Unified                   | 684,143             | 5.3%         | 5.2%         | 4.6%         | 4.1%         | 37.4%       | 36.0%       | 3.1%         | 2.9%         | 0.2%                  | 0.1%        | 75%        | 12%        |
| Memphis City School District          | 111,954             | 43.2%        | 42.6%        | 3.7%         | 3.3%         | 3.1%        | 2.8%        | 0.7%         | 0.6%         | 0.1%                  | 0.0%        | 69%        | 12%        |
| Metropolitan Nashville Public Schools | 74,312              | 24.0%        | 24.0%        | 17.2%        | 16.1%        | 7.7%        | 7.4%        | 1.8%         | 1.7%         | 0.1%                  | 0.1%        | 65%        | 11%        |
| Miami-Dade County Public Schools      | 345,525             | 13.1%        | 12.6%        | 4.7%         | 4.4%         | 32.2%       | 30.4%       | 0.6%         | 0.6%         | 0.1%                  | 0.0%        | 63%        | 11%        |
| Milwaukee Public Schools              | 85,381              | 28.9%        | 28.0%        | 7.8%         | 7.3%         | 11.6%       | 10.9%       | 2.3%         | 2.3%         | 0.4%                  | 0.4%        | 77%        | 18%        |
| Minneapolis Public Schools            | 34,448              | 19.6%        | 18.9%        | 15.7%        | 14.5%        | 9.3%        | 8.7%        | 4.3%         | 4.4%         | 2.3%                  | 2.4%        | 63%        | 18%        |
| New Orleans Parish                    | 10,109              | 34.5%        | 42.0%        | 7.9%         | 7.2%         | 1.3%        | 1.3%        | 2.8%         | 2.9%         | 0.0%                  | 0.1%        | 69%        | 7%         |
| New York City Department of Education | 1,038,741           | 14.1%        | 14.2%        | 6.9%         | 6.4%         | 18.7%       | 18.2%       | 7.1%         | 6.5%         | 0.2%                  | 0.2%        | 67%        | 16%        |
| Newark Public Schools                 | 39,991              | 29.3%        | 27.7%        | 3.8%         | 3.8%         | 17.8%       | 16.6%       | 0.4%         | 0.4%         | 0.0%                  | 0.1%        | 82%        | 15%        |
| Norfolk City Public Schools           | 34,431              | 32.0%        | 31.4%        | 12.2%        | 11.2%        | 2.0%        | 2.0%        | 1.3%         | 1.2%         | 0.1%                  | 0.1%        | 58%        | 14%        |
| Oakland Unified School District       | 46,516              | 17.8%        | 17.0%        | 3.3%         | 3.2%         | 19.3%       | 18.0%       | 7.4%         | 6.8%         | 0.2%                  | 0.2%        | 68%        | 10%        |
| Oklahoma City Public Schools          | 41,089              | 15.5%        | 15.0%        | 11.3%        | 10.3%        | 20.1%       | 19.6%       | 1.6%         | 1.4%         | 2.6%                  | 2.5%        | 85%        | 13%        |
| Omaha Public Schools                  | 48,014              | 16.0%        | 15.5%        | 20.5%        | 19.2%        | 13.1%       | 12.2%       | 1.1%         | 1.1%         | 0.7%                  | 0.7%        | 62%        | 16%        |
| Orange County Public Schools          | 172,257             | 13.8%        | 13.5%        | 17.3%        | 16.3%        | 16.0%       | 15.2%       | 2.2%         | 2.1%         | 0.2%                  | 0.2%        | 49%        | 14%        |
| Palm Beach County Public Schools      | 170,757             | 14.6%        | 14.2%        | 20.3%        | 18.8%        | 12.4%       | 11.7%       | 1.4%         | 1.3%         | 0.2%                  | 0.2%        | 44%        | 16%        |
| The School District of Philadelphia   | 159,867             | 31.2%        | 30.2%        | 7.1%         | 6.3%         | 8.7%        | 8.2%        | 3.2%         | 3.1%         | 0.1%                  | 0.1%        | 73%        | 16%        |
| Pittsburgh Public Schools             | 27,945              | 28.7%        | 28.4%        | 17.8%        | 17.1%        | 0.6%        | 0.6%        | 0.9%         | 0.9%         | 0.1%                  | 0.1%        | 60%        | 23%        |
| Portland Public Schools               | 43,064              | 7.3%         | 7.3%         | 27.9%        | 27.3%        | 6.9%        | 6.5%        | 5.2%         | 5.4%         | 0.7%                  | 0.8%        | 44%        | 16%        |
| Providence Public Schools             | 23,450              | 11.4%        | 10.9%        | 6.1%         | 5.7%         | 30.5%       | 29.2%       | 3.1%         | 2.6%         | 0.3%                  | 0.3%        | 87%        | 20%        |
| Richmond Public Schools               | 23,177              | 43.2%        | 43.2%        | 4.0%         | 3.8%         | 2.4%        | 2.3%        | 0.4%         | 0.3%         | 0.0%                  | 0.0%        | 66%        | 20%        |
| Rochester City School District        | 32,973              | 32.9%        | 31.7%        | 5.6%         | 5.2%         | 10.8%       | 10.9%       | 1.3%         | 1.0%         | 0.1%                  | 0.2%        | 82%        | 20%        |
| Sacramento City Unified               | 47,784              | 10.2%        | 10.7%        | 10.8%        | 10.3%        | 16.6%       | 16.4%       | 11.1%        | 10.4%        | 0.6%                  | 0.6%        | 65%        | 11%        |
| San Diego Unified                     | 131,890             | 6.8%         | 6.4%         | 13.0%        | 12.3%        | 22.7%       | 21.7%       | 8.0%         | 7.5%         | 0.3%                  | 0.3%        | 63%        | 12%        |
| San Francisco Unified                 | 55,183              | 6.2%         | 6.1%         | 5.7%         | 5.1%         | 12.3%       | 10.9%       | 24.1%        | 23.0%        | 0.3%                  | 0.3%        | 56%        | 11%        |
| Seattle Public Schools                | 45,968              | 10.5%        | 10.6%        | 22.5%        | 20.9%        | 6.1%        | 5.6%        | 11.1%        | 10.9%        | 1.0%                  | 0.9%        | 39%        | 13%        |
| St. Louis City Public Schools         | 27,421              | 41.1%        | 39.7%        | 7.5%         | 6.3%         | 1.4%        | 1.3%        | 1.2%         | 1.2%         | 0.1%                  | 0.1%        | 64%        | 18%        |
| St. Paul Public Schools               | 38,255              | 15.4%        | 14.4%        | 13.1%        | 11.9%        | 7.1%        | 6.6%        | 15.5%        | 14.2%        | 0.9%                  | 0.8%        | 70%        | 18%        |
| Toledo Public Schools                 | 26,516              | 23.7%        | 21.9%        | 21.4%        | 19.5%        | 4.5%        | 4.0%        | 0.3%         | 0.3%         | 0.0%                  | 0.0%        | 63%        | 18%        |
| Wichita Public Schools                | 47,260              | 9.9%         | 9.7%         | 19.4%        | 18.7%        | 12.3%       | 11.7%       | 2.8%         | 2.7%         | 1.2%                  | 1.3%        | 70%        | 14%        |
| <b>CGCS as Percent Of Nation</b>      | <b>14%</b>          | <b>29.0%</b> | <b>29.5%</b> | <b>22.9%</b> | <b>23.1%</b> | <b>5.2%</b> | <b>5.2%</b> | <b>19.1%</b> | <b>18.9%</b> | <b>6.2%</b>           | <b>6.2%</b> | <b>20%</b> | <b>15%</b> |
| <b>Average</b>                        |                     | <b>17%</b>   | <b>17%</b>   | <b>10%</b>   | <b>10%</b>   | <b>18%</b>  | <b>18%</b>  | <b>3%</b>    | <b>3%</b>    | <b>0.3%</b>           | <b>0.3%</b> | <b>64%</b> | <b>14%</b> |









## **THE COUNCIL OF THE GREAT CITY SCHOOLS**

1301 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Suite 702  
Washington, DC 20004

202-393-2427  
202-393-2400 (fax)  
[www.cgcs.org](http://www.cgcs.org)