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INTRODUCTION

Over the years, the nation’s large urban school districts have consistently learned from the progress of their peer districts across the country. Great City School districts that have embraced the challenge of educating America’s urban children have recognized the value of benchmarking their performance and growth against the progress of others.

In 2002, the board of directors of the Council of the Great City Schools (Council) authorized what became known as the Performance Measurement and Benchmarking Project to develop and implement key performance indicators across the member school districts in operations, business services, finances, human resources, and technology. These performance indicators in operations have evolved over the years and are now reported annually by the Council in its Managing for Results in America’s Great City Schools series. However, one critical element was not included in these annual reports: academic performance.

In the same year, 2002, six member districts of the Council began participating voluntarily in the Trial Urban District Assessment (TUDA) of the National Assessment of Educational Progress. The purpose of this participation was to gauge performance across state lines, compare progress, and ascertain what reforms seemed to be working. As of 2019, there will be 27 Council member districts participating in TUDA. Of course, not all Council member districts are eligible for TUDA, and TUDA results do not provide all the academic comparisons that member districts would like to make.

Because of that information gap, the board of directors took the next step in authorizing the development of Academic Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) in October 2014. To put the board’s wishes into place, teams of educators from Council member districts came together to begin drafting initial indicators in general instruction, special education, English language learners, and a number of academic cost indicators. A lengthy list of potential indicators developed by the teams was refined and narrowed to a smaller set for piloting in 2015. Eight member districts participated in the pilot.

Based on the pilot, data-collection surveys and the indicators themselves were further refined, and all Council member districts were asked to participate in a full-scale pilot of the Academic Key Performance Indicators in 2016. A third pilot was conducted in 2017 and included the collection of data across three school years. The 2021 report presents an updated set of data through school year 2019-20. This report presents a number of different ways that member districts can analyze the data themselves by disaggregating results, showing trends, and combining variables. This year, a companion online dashboard was released that added the ability to conduct several comparisons and analysis beyond what is presented in this report. To access this system, go to www.edwires.org.

This report focuses on the data collection and analysis of the following Academic KPIs:

- Pre-K enrollment relative to Kindergarten enrollment
- Algebra I completion rates for credit by grade 9
- Ninth grade course failure rates — at least one core course
- Ninth graders with B average (GPA) or better
- Absentee rates by grade level
- Suspension rates
- Instructional days missed per 100 students due to suspensions
- AP participation rates
- AP-equivalent participation rates
- AP exam pass rates
- Four-year graduation rate
METHODOLOGY AND ANALYSIS

A. Methodology

Developing the KPIs

This study sought to answer the following questions:

1. Is it feasible to develop Academic KPIs and collect data on them across member urban school districts?
2. Are comparisons between districts on academic performance measures valid and reliable?
3. Do districts collect and maintain requested KPI data in a way that they can easily retrieve and format them?
4. Are data collection tools clear and easy to use?
5. Do the results of data analysis provide valuable insights into district academic performance and student achievement?
6. How should the indicators be refined going forward?

To answer these questions, Council staff organized a process to develop and collect KPIs in three phases. The first phase involved the development of academic performance and cost KPIs. The second phase involved a small pilot of performance and cost KPIs in eight districts. These districts included Albuquerque, Atlanta, Austin, Baltimore, Houston, Los Angeles, Kansas City (MO), and Milwaukee. The final phase assessed the viability of collecting comparable performance indicators across all Council member districts.

During the first phase, three advisory groups were formed and convened to develop the academic and cost indicators. These groups included administrators from Council member districts in the areas of curriculum and instruction, English language learners, and special education. Representatives from each area formed three homogeneous advisory groups. After several meetings, the groups submitted a list of potential KPIs on academic indicators as well as financial expenditure indicators in each area. Finally, a literature review was conducted to identify variables that predicted student outcomes and could be used to formulate KPIs, and to identify past efforts by others to benchmark performance and costs.

The indicators and costs were then reviewed by a team of general education, special education, English language learner, finance, and research department representatives to determine the feasibility of collecting comparable data across districts. The review included the relative value of each indicator, the data collection burden of the indicator, and the ability to disaggregate the data by student group (e.g., ELL, students with disabilities, ethnicity, gender, etc.). The original list of KPIs was then narrowed from 200 key performance indicators to approximately 58 performance and cost measures.

During phase two of the process, the Council team piloted the data collection instruments and the KPI definitions in 2015 with the eight member school districts listed above. Throughout the piloting process, data-collection tools and definitions were continuously revised based on feedback from participating districts and results from an initial data analysis effort.

Phase three of the pilot involved a full-scale data-collection effort to assess the viability of the indicators across a larger number of Council member districts. After revising indicator definitions and the survey instrument based on the pilot, the Council team developed two methodologies by which to collect the data. The first methodology involved an on-line survey, and the second methodology involved Excel data sheets that district staff could populate with their information. The purpose of this phase of the work was to test the potential of collecting academic performance indicators across all districts. The cost indicators
developed in phase 1 and phase 2 were deferred to future data collection efforts, while the Council staff devoted time to the development of the performance indicators.

The current phase of the work, which has resulted in this report, involved updating the indicators and working with member districts on the accuracy of their data across multiple years.

This report illustrates the current use of the performance indicators as viable measures of student achievement outcomes across all member districts. The data are based on results from about 47 member districts. Not all member districts completed all KPIs, but the charts and tables summarize the data from all respondents.

B. Analysis

Organizing and Presenting the Data

The analysis presented here is divided into four sections: 1) elementary achievement indicators, 2) secondary achievement indicators, 3) attendance indicators, and 4) disciplinary indicators. Not all data were presented or analyzed, but the recently developed online system allows for extensive analysis. Finally, data are reported here by district using codes. For each one, these codes correspond to the codes used in the non-instructional KPIs. In the graphs, each bar represents a responding school district.
Elementary Achievement Indicators

The current early childhood KPI divides the pre-K enrollment reported on the KPI data survey by the kindergarten enrollment. This gives a preliminary proxy measure of the size of districts’ pre-K program relative to kindergarten enrollment. Figures 1.1 to 1.24 show the relationship between Pre-K and Kindergarten enrollments and how they have changed between 2016-17 and 2019-20. The data is also disaggregated by a number of demographic variables.
1.1 Pre-K Enrollment as a Percent of Kindergarten Enrollment for Students, 2019-20
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Pre-K Enrollment as a Percent of Kindergarten Enrollment for Students

Note: Higher values and larger increases are desired

- Figure 1.1: Total number of pre-K Students divided by total number kindergarten Students, 2019-20
- Figure 1.2: Percentage Point Change in Pre-K Enrollment as a Percent of Kindergarten Enrollment for Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 1.3: Trends in Pre-K Enrollment as a Percent of Kindergarten Enrollment for Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20

1.2 Percentage Point Change in Pre-K Enrollment as a Percent of Kindergarten Enrollment for Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20

1.3 Trends in Pre-K Enrollment as a Percent of Kindergarten Enrollment for Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20

Best Quartile for Overall Performance (2019-20):
- Arlington
- Austin
- Dallas
- District of Columbia
- Fort Worth
- Milwaukee
- New York
- Pittsburgh
- Richmond
- San Antonio
- Tulsa

Best Quartile for Change in Performance (2016-17 to 2019-20):
- Austin
- Boston
- Clark County
- Dallas
- Fort Worth
- Miami
- New York
- Tulsa
- Wichita
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1.4 Pre-K Enrollment as a Percent of Kindergarten Enrollment for Black Male Students, 2019-20

Median 73.8%
Pre-K Enrollment as a Percent of Kindergarten Enrollment for Black Male Students

Note: Higher values and larger increases are desired

- Figure 1.4: Total number of pre-K Black Male Students divided by total number kindergarten Black Male Students, 2019-20
- Figure 1.5: Percentage Point Change in Pre-K Enrollment as a Percent of Kindergarten Enrollment for Black Male Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 1.6: Trends in Pre-K Enrollment as a Percent of Kindergarten Enrollment for Black Male Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20

1.5 Percentage Point Change in Pre-K Enrollment as a Percent of Kindergarten Enrollment for Black Male Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20

1.6 Trends in Pre-K Enrollment as a Percent of Kindergarten Enrollment for Black Male Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20

Best Quartile for Overall Performance (2019-20)
- Austin
- Charleston
- Dallas
- District of Columbia
- Fort Worth
- Milwaukee
- New York
- Newark
- Richmond
- San Antonio
- San Francisco

Best Quartile for Change in Performance (2016-17 to 2019-20)
- Austin
- Clark County
- Des Moines
- Miami
- New York
- Oklahoma City
- Portland
- San Antonio
- Tulsa

Median 3.7
1.7 Pre-K Enrollment as a Percent of Kindergarten Enrollment for Black Female Students, 2019-20

Pre-K Enrollment as a Percent of Kindergarten Enrollment for Black Female Students

Median 63.9%
Pre-K Enrollment as a Percent of Kindergarten Enrollment for Black Female Students

Note: Higher values and larger increases are desired

- Figure 1.7: Total number of pre-K Black Female Students divided by total number kindergarten Black Female Students, 2019-20
- Figure 1.8: Percentage Point Change in Pre-K Enrollment as a Percent of Kindergarten Enrollment for Black Female Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 1.9: Trends in Pre-K Enrollment as a Percent of Kindergarten Enrollment for Black Female Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20

1.8 Percentage Point Change in Pre-K Enrollment as a Percent of Kindergarten Enrollment for Black Female Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20

1.9 Trends in Pre-K Enrollment as a Percent of Kindergarten Enrollment for Black Female Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20

Best Quartile for Overall Performance (2019-20)
- Austin
- Charleston
- Dallas
- District of Columbia
- Fort Worth
- Milwaukee
- New York
- Newark
- Pittsburgh
- Richmond
- San Antonio

Best Quartile for Change in Performance (2016-17 to 2019-20)
- Austin
- Chicago
- Clark County
- Dallas
- Fort Worth
- Miami
- New York
- Portland
- Tulsa
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1.10 Pre-K Enrollment as a Percent of Kindergarten Enrollment for Hispanic Male Students, 2019-20

Median 61.5%

Pre-K Enrollment as a Percent of Kindergarten Enrollment for Hispanic Male Students
Pre-K Enrollment as a Percent of Kindergarten Enrollment for Hispanic Male Students

Note: Higher values and larger increases are desired

- Figure 1.10: Total number of pre-K Hispanic Male Students divided by total number kindergarten Hispanic Male Students, 2019-20
- Figure 1.11: Percentage Point Change in Pre-K Enrollment as a Percent of Kindergarten Enrollment for Hispanic Male Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 1.12: Trends in Pre-K Enrollment as a Percent of Kindergarten Enrollment for Hispanic Male Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20

1.11 Percentage Point Change in Pre-K Enrollment as a Percent of Kindergarten Enrollment for Hispanic Male Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20

1.12 Trends in Pre-K Enrollment as a Percent of Kindergarten Enrollment for Hispanic Male Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20

Best Quartile for Overall Performance (2019-20)
- Austin
- Boston
- Charleston
- Dallas
- District of Columbia
- Fort Worth
- Milwaukee
- Minneapolis
- New York
- San Antonio
- Tulsa

Best Quartile for Change in Performance (2016-17 to 2019-20)
- Austin
- Boston
- Clark County
- Cleveland
- Milwaukee
- New York
- Pinellas
- Portland
- Tulsa
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1.13 Pre-K Enrollment as a Percent of Kindergarten Enrollment for Hispanic Female Students, 2019-20

Pre-K Enrollment as a Percent of Kindergarten Enrollment for Hispanic Female Students

Median 58.9%
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Pre-K Enrollment as a Percent of Kindergarten Enrollment for Hispanic Female Students

Note: Higher values and larger increases are desired

- Figure 1.13: Total number of pre-K Hispanic Female Students divided by total number kindergarten Hispanic Female Students, 2019-20
- Figure 1.14: Percentage Point Change in Pre-K Enrollment as a Percent of Kindergarten Enrollment for Hispanic Female Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 1.15: Trends in Pre-K Enrollment as a Percent of Kindergarten Enrollment for Hispanic Female Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20

1.15 Trends in Pre-K Enrollment as a Percent of Kindergarten Enrollment for Hispanic Female Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20
1.6 Pre-K Enrollment as a Percent of Kindergarten Enrollment for Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students, 2019-20
Pre-K Enrollment as a Percent of Kindergarten Enrollment for Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students

Note: Higher values and larger increases are desired

- Figure 1.16: Total number of pre-K Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students divided by total number kindergarten Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students, 2019-20
- Figure 1.17: Percentage Point Change in Pre-K Enrollment as a Percent of Kindergarten Enrollment for Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 1.18: Trends in Pre-K Enrollment as a Percent of Kindergarten Enrollment for Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20

1.17 Percentage Point Change in Pre-K Enrollment as a Percent of Kindergarten Enrollment for Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20

1.18 Trends in Pre-K Enrollment as a Percent of Kindergarten Enrollment for Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20

Best Quartile for Overall Performance (2019-20)
- Arlington
- Austin
- Dallas
- District of Columbia
- Fort Worth
- Kansas City
- Milwaukee
- New York
- Pittsburgh
- Richmond
- San Antonio

Best Quartile for Change in Performance (2016-17 to 2019-20)
- Austin
- Clark County
- Dayton
- Des Moines
- Fort Worth
- New York
- Oklahoma City
- Portland
- Tulsa
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Pre-K Enrollment as a Percent of Kindergarten Enrollment for Students with Disabilities, 2019-20
Pre-K Enrollment as a Percent of Kindergarten Enrollment for Students with Disabilities

Note: Higher values and larger increases are desired

- Figure 1.19: Total number of pre-K Students with Disabilities divided by total number kindergarten Students with Disabilities, 2019-20
- Figure 1.20: Percentage Point Change in Pre-K Enrollment as a Percent of Kindergarten Enrollment for Students with Disabilities, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 1.21: Trends in Pre-K Enrollment as a Percent of Kindergarten Enrollment for Students with Disabilities, 2016-17 to 2019-20

1.20 Percentage Point Change in Pre-K Enrollment as a Percent of Kindergarten Enrollment for Students with Disabilities, 2016-17 to 2019-20

1.21 Trends in Pre-K Enrollment as a Percent of Kindergarten Enrollment for Students with Disabilities, 2016-17 to 2019-20

Best Quartile for Overall Performance (2019-20)
- Broward County
- Clark County
- Cleveland
- District of Columbia
- Duval County
- Hillsborough County
- Kansas City
- Milwaukee
- Orange County
- Toledo

Best Quartile for Change in Performance (2016-17 to 2019-20)
- Des Moines
- Miami
- Milwaukee
- Nashville
- New York
- Orange County
- San Antonio
- Wichita
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1.22 Pre-K Enrollment as a Percent of Kindergarten Enrollment for English Language Learners, 2019-20

The Council of The Great City Schools
Pre-K Enrollment as a Percent of Kindergarten Enrollment for English Language Learners

Note: Higher values and larger increases are desired

- Figure 1.22: Total number of pre-K English Language Learners divided by total number kindergarten English Language Learners, 2019-20
- Figure 1.23: Percentage Point Change in Pre-K Enrollment as a Percent of Kindergarten Enrollment for English Language Learners, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 1.24: Trends in Pre-K Enrollment as a Percent of Kindergarten Enrollment for English Language Learners, 2016-17 to 2019-20

1.24 Trends in Pre-K Enrollment as a Percent of Kindergarten Enrollment for English Language Learners, 2016-17 to 2019-20

Best Quartile for Overall Performance (2019-20)
- Arlington
- Austin
- Boston
- Charleston
- Dallas
- District of Columbia
- San Antonio

Best Quartile for Change in Performance (2016-17 to 2019-20)
- Austin
- Boston
- Broward County
- Dallas
- Tulsa
- Median 2.5
Secondary Achievement Indicators

Secondary achievement indicators included:

- Ninth-Grade Course Failures and GPAs, by Subgroup
- Algebra I/Integrated Math I (or equivalent) by Grade Nine
- Advanced Placement Course Enrollment
- AP Exam Scores
- Four-Year Graduation Rates

Figures 2.1 to 2.24 show the percentage of ninth grade students by district who have failed one or more core (mathematics, science, English language arts, or social studies) courses during the ninth grade year. The indicator is based on research demonstrating the relationship between core course failures in the ninth grade and eventual high school graduation.

Figures 2.25 to 2.48 show the percentage of ninth grade students with a B or better grade point average.

Figures 2.49 to 2.72 show the percentage of first time ninth grade students successfully completing Algebra I or equivalent by the end of grades seven, eight, or nine. The counts in each grade do not overlap or duplicate one another. Completion of this course has been shown to effectively predict graduation rates.

Figures 2.73 to 2.96 and 2.97 to 2.120 compare district performance on advanced placement (AP) indicators, including the percent of secondary school students who took one or more AP courses and the percent of all AP exam scores by district that were three or higher, meaning that they qualified for college credit.

Figures 2.121 to 2.144 report the four year cohort graduation rates of each district.
2.1 Percentage of Ninth Grade Students Who Failed One or More Core Courses, 2019-20
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Percentage of Ninth Grade Students Who Failed One or More Core Courses

Note: Lower values and larger decreases are desired

- Figure 2.1: Total number of ninth grade Students with at least one core course failure divided by the total number of ninth grade Students, 2019-20
- Figure 2.2: Percentage Point Change in Ninth Grade Students Who Failed One or More Core Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 2.3: Trends in Ninth Grade Students Who Failed One or More Core Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20

2.3 Trends in Ninth Grade Students Who Failed One or More Core Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20

![Graph showing trends in percentage of ninth grade students who failed one or more core courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20.](image)
2.4 Percentage of Ninth Grade Black Male Students Who Failed One or More Core Courses, 2019-20

KPIID | Percentage of Ninth Grade Black Male Students Who Failed One or More Core Courses
---|---
0 | 0.0%
1 | 2.4%
2 | 4.6%
3 | 6.8%
4 | 8.9%
5 | 11.1%
6 | 13.3%
7 | 15.5%
8 | 17.7%
9 | 19.9%
10 | 22.0%
11 | 24.2%
12 | 26.4%
13 | 28.6%
14 | 30.7%
15 | 32.9%
16 | 35.1%
17 | 37.3%
18 | 39.4%
19 | 41.6%
20 | 43.8%
21 | 46.0%
22 | 48.2%
23 | 50.4%
24 | 52.5%
25 | 54.7%
26 | 56.9%
27 | 59.1%
28 | 61.3%
29 | 63.5%
30 | 65.7%
31 | 67.9%
32 | 70.1%
33 | 72.3%
34 | 74.5%
35 | 76.7%
36 | 78.9%
37 | 81.1%
38 | 83.3%
39 | 85.5%
40 | 87.7%
41 | 90.0%
42 | 92.2%
43 | 94.4%
44 | 96.6%
45 | 98.8%
46 | 101.0%
47 | 103.2%
48 | 105.4%
49 | 107.7%
50 | 109.9%
51 | 112.2%
52 | 114.4%
53 | 116.7%
54 | 118.9%
55 | 121.2%
56 | 123.4%
57 | 125.7%
58 | 127.9%
59 | 130.2%
60 | 132.4%
61 | 134.7%
62 | 136.9%
63 | 139.2%
64 | 141.4%
65 | 143.7%
66 | 146.0%
67 | 148.2%
68 | 150.5%
69 | 152.7%
70 | 155.0%
71 | 157.3%
72 | 159.5%
73 | 161.8%
74 | 164.1%
75 | 166.4%
76 | 168.7%

Median 35.6%
Percentage of Ninth Grade Black Male Students Who Failed One or More Core Courses

Note: Lower values and larger decreases are desired

- Figure 2.4: Total number of ninth grade Black Male Students with at least one core course failure divided by the total number of ninth grade Black Male Students, 2019-20
- Figure 2.5: Percentage Point Change in Ninth Grade Black Male Students Who Failed One or More Core Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 2.6: Trends in Ninth Grade Black Male Students Who Failed One or More Core Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20

2.6 Trends in Ninth Grade Black Male Students Who Failed One or More Core Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20

Best Quartile for Overall Performance (2019-20)
- Broward County
- Charlotte-Mecklenburg
- Chicago
- Jackson
- Jefferson
- Long Beach
- Minneapolis
- Orange County
- Richmond
- San Antonio
- Seattle

Best Quartile for Change in Performance (2016-17 to 2019-20)
- Clark County
- Cleveland
- Dayton
- Norfolk
- Portland
- San Antonio
- Seattle
- Wichita
### Percentage of Ninth Grade Black Female Students Who Failed One or More Core Courses, 2019-20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPI ID</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Council of The Great City Schools

Academic Key Performance Indicators 2021
Percentage of Ninth Grade Black Female Students Who Failed One or More Core Courses

Note: Lower values and larger decreases are desired

- Figure 2.7: Total number of ninth grade Black Female Students with at least one core course failure divided by the total number of ninth grade Black Female Students, 2019-20
- Figure 2.8: Percentage Point Change in Ninth Grade Black Female Students Who Failed One or More Core Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 2.9: Trends in Ninth Grade Black Female Students Who Failed One or More Core Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20

2.8 Percentage Point Change in Ninth Grade Black Female Students Who Failed One or More Core Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20

2.9 Trends in Ninth Grade Black Female Students Who Failed One or More Core Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20

Best Quartile for Overall Performance
(2019-20)
- Broward County
- Charlotte-Mecklenburg
- Chicago
- Guilford County
- Jackson
- Jefferson
- Long Beach
- Orange County
- Palm Beach
- Richmond
- San Antonio

Best Quartile for Change in Performance
(2016-17 to 2019-20)
- Clark County
- Cleveland
- Dayton
- Jefferson
- Norfolk
- San Antonio
- Wichita

The Council of The Great City Schools
Academic Key Performance Indicators 2021
Percentage of Ninth Grade Hispanic Male Students Who Failed One or More Core Courses

Note: Lower values and larger decreases are desired

- Figure 2.10: Total number of ninth grade Hispanic Male Students with at least one core course failure divided by the total number of ninth grade Hispanic Male Students, 2019-20
- Figure 2.11: Percentage Point Change in Ninth Grade Hispanic Male Students Who Failed One or More Core Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 2.12: Trends in Ninth Grade Hispanic Male Students Who Failed One or More Core Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20

2.12 Trends in Ninth Grade Hispanic Male Students Who Failed One or More Core Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20

Best Quartile for Overall Performance (2019-20)
- Broward County
- Charlotte-Mecklenburg
- Chicago
- Cincinnati
- Fort Worth
- Jefferson
- Miami
- Orange County
- Pinellas
- Richmond
- Seattle

Best Quartile for Change in Performance (2016-17 to 2019-20)
- Cleveland
- Dayton
- Fort Worth
- Norfolk
- Oklahoma City
- Seattle
- Wichita
2.13 Percentage of Ninth Grade Hispanic Female Students Who Failed One or More Core Courses, 2019-20

The Council of The Great City Schools

Academic Key Performance Indicators 2021
Percentage of Ninth Grade Hispanic Female Students Who Failed One or More Core Courses

Note: Lower values and larger decreases are desired

- Figure 2.13: Total number of ninth grade Hispanic Female Students with at least one core course failure divided by the total number of ninth grade Hispanic Female Students, 2019-20
- Figure 2.14: Percentage Point Change in Ninth Grade Hispanic Female Students Who Failed One or More Core Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 2.15: Trends in Ninth Grade Hispanic Female Students Who Failed One or More Core Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20

2.14 Percentage Point Change in Ninth Grade Hispanic Female Students Who Failed One or More Core Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20

2.15 Trends in Ninth Grade Hispanic Female Students Who Failed One or More Core Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20

Best Quartile for Overall Performance (2019-20)
- Broward County
- Charlotte-Mecklenburg
- Chicago
- Cincinnati
- Guilford County
- Jefferson
- Miami
- Minneapolis
- Orange County
- Pinellas
- Richmond

Best Quartile for Change in Performance (2016-17 to 2019-20)
- Cleveland
- Dayton
- Detroit
- Milwaukee
- Norfolk
- Portland
- Wichita
2.16 Percentage of Ninth Grade Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students Who Failed One or More Core Courses, 2019-20

Median 33.0%
Percentage of Ninth Grade Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students Who Failed One or More Core Courses

Note: Lower values and larger decreases are desired

- Figure 2.16: Total number of ninth grade Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students with at least one core course failure divided by the total number of ninth grade Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students, 2019-20
- Figure 2.17: Percentage Point Change in Ninth Grade Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students Who Failed One or More Core Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 2.18: Trends in Ninth Grade Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students Who Failed One or More Core Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20

2.17 Percentage Point Change in Ninth Grade Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students Who Failed One or More Core Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20

2.18 Trends in Ninth Grade Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students Who Failed One or More Core Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20

Best Quartile for Overall Performance (2019-20)
- Broward County
- Chicago
- Jackson
- Jefferson
- Miami
- Minneapolis
- Orange County
- Richmond
- San Francisco
- Seattle

Best Quartile for Change in Performance (2016-17 to 2019-20)
- Austin
- Cleveland
- Dayton
- Jefferson
- Norfolk
- Wichita

The Council of The Great City Schools
Academic Key Performance Indicators 2021
2.19 Percentage of Ninth Grade Students with Disabilities Who Failed One or More Core Courses, 2019-20

The Council of The Great City Schools

Academic Key Performance Indicators 2021
Percentage of Ninth Grade Students with Disabilities Who Failed One or More Core Courses

Note: Lower values and larger decreases are desired

- Figure 2.19: Total number of ninth grade Students with Disabilities with at least one core course failure divided by the total number of ninth grade Students with Disabilities, 2019-20
- Figure 2.20: Percentage Point Change in Ninth Grade Students with Disabilities Who Failed One or More Core Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 2.21: Trends in Ninth Grade Students with Disabilities Who Failed One or More Core Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20

2.21 Trends in Ninth Grade Students with Disabilities Who Failed One or More Core Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20

Best Quartile for Overall Performance (2019-20)
- Broward County
- Charlotte-Mecklenburg
- Chicago
- Cincinnati
- Jackson
- Miami
- Minneapolis
- Oklahoma City
- Orange County
- Richmond
- Seattle

Best Quartile for Change in Performance (2016-17 to 2019-20)
- Austin
- Cleveland
- Dallas
- Jefferson
- Norfolk
- Oklahoma City
- Orange County
- Wichita

The Council of The Great City Schools

Academic Key Performance Indicators 2021
2.22 Percentage of Ninth Grade English Language Learners Who Failed One or More Core Courses, 2019-20

The Council of The Great City Schools

Academic Key Performance Indicators 2021
Percentage of Ninth Grade English Language Learners Who Failed One or More Core Courses

Note: Lower values and larger decreases are desired

- Figure 2.22: Total number of ninth grade English Language Learners with at least one core course failure divided by the total number of ninth grade English Language Learners, 2019-20
- Figure 2.23: Percentage Point Change in Ninth Grade English Language Learners Who Failed One or More Core Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 2.24: Trends in Ninth Grade English Language Learners Who Failed One or More Core Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20

2.24 Trends in Ninth Grade English Language Learners Who Failed One or More Core Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20

Best Quartile for Overall Performance (2019-20)
- Broward County
- Charlotte-Mecklenburg
- Chicago
- Cincinnati
- Dayton
- Fort Worth
- Jefferson
- Minneapolis
- Orange County
- Pinellas
- Seattle

Best Quartile for Change in Performance (2016-17 to 2019-20)
- Austin
- Dayton
- Long Beach
- Norfolk
- Oklahoma City
- Pinellas
- Portland

2.23 Percentage Point Change in Ninth Grade English Language Learners Who Failed One or More Core Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20
Percentage of Ninth Grade Students with B Average GPA or Better in All Grade Nine Courses

Note: Higher values and larger increases are desired

- Figure 2.25: Total number of all ninth grade students with B average GPA or better divided by the total number of ninth grade students, 2019-20
- Figure 2.26: Percentage Point Change in Ninth Grade Students with B Average GPA or Better in All Grade Nine Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 2.27: Trends in Ninth Grade Students with B Average GPA or Better in All Grade Nine Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20
Percentage of Ninth Grade Black Male Students with B Average GPA or Better in All Grade Nine Courses, 2019-20

Median 23.4%
Percentage of Ninth Grade Black Male Students with B Average GPA or Better in All Grade Nine Courses

Note: Higher values and larger increases are desired

- Figure 2.28: Total number of all ninth grade Black Male Students with B average GPA or better divided by the total number of ninth grade Black Male Students, 2019-20
- Figure 2.29: Percentage Point Change in Ninth Grade Black Male Students with B Average GPA or Better in All Grade Nine Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 2.30: Trends in Ninth Grade Black Male Students with B Average GPA or Better in All Grade Nine Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20

2.30 Trends in Ninth Grade Black Male Students with B Average GPA or Better in All Grade Nine Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20

Best Quartile for Overall Performance (2019-20)
- Arlington
- Dallas
- Fort Worth
- Guilford County
- Hillsborough County
- Jackson
- Miami
- San Antonio
- San Diego
- Seattle
- Tulsa

Best Quartile for Change in Performance (2016-17 to 2019-20)
- Baltimore City
- Chicago
- Dallas
- Guilford County
- Norfolk
- Oklahoma City
- San Antonio
- Seattle

The Council of The Great City Schools
Academic Key Performance Indicators 2021
2.31 Percentage of Ninth Grade Black Female Students with B Average GPA or Better in All Grade Nine Courses, 2019-20

The Council of The Great City Schools

Academic Key Performance Indicators 2021
Percentage of Ninth Grade Black Female Students with B Average GPA or Better in All Grade Nine Courses

Note: Higher values and larger increases are desired

- Figure 2.31: Total number of all ninth grade Black Female Students with B average GPA or better divided by the total number of ninth grade Black Female Students, 2019-20
- Figure 2.32: Percentage Point Change in Ninth Grade Black Female Students with B Average GPA or Better in All Grade Nine Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 2.33: Trends in Ninth Grade Black Female Students with B Average GPA or Better in All Grade Nine Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20

2.33 Trends in Ninth Grade Black Female Students with B Average GPA or Better in All Grade Nine Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20
2.34 Percentage of Ninth Grade Hispanic Male Students with B Average GPA or Better in All Grade Nine Courses, 2019-20

The Council of The Great City Schools

Academic Key Performance Indicators 2021
Percentage of Ninth Grade Hispanic Male Students with B Average GPA or Better in All Grade Nine Courses

Note: Higher values and larger increases are desired

- Figure 2.34: Total number of all ninth grade Hispanic Male Students with B average GPA or better divided by the total number of ninth grade Hispanic Male Students, 2019-20
- Figure 2.35: Percentage Point Change in Ninth Grade Hispanic Male Students with B Average GPA or Better in All Grade Nine Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 2.36: Trends in Ninth Grade Hispanic Male Students with B Average GPA or Better in All Grade Nine Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20

2.36 Trends in Ninth Grade Hispanic Male Students with B Average GPA or Better in All Grade Nine Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20

Best Quartile for Overall Performance (2019-20)
- Arlington
- Broward County
- Chicago
- Dallas
- Fort Worth
- Guilford County
- Miami
- Pittsburgh
- Portland
- San Antonio
- Seattle

Best Quartile for Change in Performance (2016-17 to 2019-20)
- Chicago
- Guilford County
- Nashville
- Oklahoma City
- Pinellas
- Portland
- Seattle

The Council of The Great City Schools

Academic Key Performance Indicators 2021
2.37 Percentage of Ninth Grade Hispanic Female Students with B Average GPA or Better in All Grade Nine Courses, 2019-20

The Council of The Great City Schools

Academic Key Performance Indicators 2021
Percentage of Ninth Grade Hispanic Female Students with B Average GPA or Better in All Grade Nine Courses

Note: Higher values and larger increases are desired

- Figure 2.37: Total number of all ninth grade Hispanic Female Students with B average GPA or better divided by the total number of ninth grade Hispanic Female Students, 2019-20
- Figure 2.38: Percentage Point Change in Ninth Grade Hispanic Female Students with B Average GPA or Better in All Grade Nine Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 2.39: Trends in Ninth Grade Hispanic Female Students with B Average GPA or Better in All Grade Nine Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20

2.38 Percentage Point Change in Ninth Grade Hispanic Female Students with B Average GPA or Better in All Grade Nine Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20

2.39 Trends in Ninth Grade Hispanic Female Students with B Average GPA or Better in All Grade Nine Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20

Best Quartile for Overall Performance (2019-20)
- Arlington
- Chicago
- Dallas
- Fort Worth
- Guilford County
- Miami
- Oklahoma City
- Pittsburgh
- Portland
- San Antonio
- Seattle

Best Quartile for Change in Performance (2016-17 to 2019-20)
- Broward County
- Chicago
- Cincinnati
- Guilford County
- Norfolk
- Oklahoma City
- Seattle
Percentage of Ninth Grade Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students with B Average GPA or Better in All Grade Nine Courses, 2019-20

Median 37.3%
Percentage of Ninth Grade Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students with B Average GPA or Better in All Grade Nine Courses

Note: Higher values and larger increases are desired

- Figure 2.40: Total number of all ninth grade Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students with B average GPA or better divided by the total number of ninth grade Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students, 2019-20
- Figure 2.41: Percentage Point Change in Ninth Grade Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students with B Average GPA or Better in All Grade Nine Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 2.42: Trends in Ninth Grade Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students with B Average GPA or Better in All Grade Nine Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20

2.41 Percentage Point Change in Ninth Grade Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students with B Average GPA or Better in All Grade Nine Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPIID</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.42 Trends in Ninth Grade Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students with B Average GPA or Better in All Grade Nine Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20

- Upper Quartile
- Lower Quartile

Best Quartile for Overall Performance (2019-20)
- Arlington
- Chicago
- Dallas
- Fort Worth
- Jackson
- Miami
- Portland
- San Antonio
- San Francisco
- Seattle

Best Quartile for Change in Performance (2016-17 to 2019-20)
- Chicago
- Des Moines
- Nashville
- New York
- Norfolk
- Seattle

The Council of The Great City Schools
2.43 Percentage of Ninth Grade Students with Disabilities with B Average GPA or Better in All Grade Nine Courses, 2019-20

The Council of The Great City Schools

Academic Key Performance Indicators 2021
Percentage of Ninth Grade Students with Disabilities with B Average GPA or Better in All Grade Nine Courses

Note: Higher values and larger increases are desired

- Figure 2.43: Total number of all ninth grade Students with Disabilities with B average GPA or better divided by the total number of ninth grade Students with Disabilities, 2019-20
- Figure 2.44: Percentage Point Change in Ninth Grade Students with Disabilities with B Average GPA or Better in All Grade Nine Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 2.45: Trends in Ninth Grade Students with Disabilities with B Average GPA or Better in All Grade Nine Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20

2.45 Trends in Ninth Grade Students with Disabilities with B Average GPA or Better in All Grade Nine Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20

Best Quartile for Overall Performance (2019-20)
- Austin
- Dallas
- Fort Worth
- Guilford County
- Hillsborough County
- Miami
- New York
- Portland
- San Antonio
- San Francisco
- Seattle

Best Quartile for Change in Performance (2016-17 to 2019-20)
- Austin
- Chicago
- Guilford County
- New York
- Oklahoma City
- Portland
- Seattle
- Median 5.7

2.44 Percentage Point Change in Ninth Grade Students with Disabilities with B Average GPA or Better in All Grade Nine Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20
Percentage of Ninth Grade English Language Learners with B Average GPA or Better in All Grade Nine Courses, 2019-20

Median 28.7%
Percentage of Ninth Grade English Language Learners with B Average GPA or Better in All Grade Nine Courses

Note: Higher values and larger increases are desired

- Figure 2.46: Total number of all ninth grade English Language Learners with B average GPA or better divided by the total number of ninth grade English Language Learners, 2019-20
- Figure 2.47: Percentage Point Change in Ninth Grade English Language Learners with B Average GPA or Better in All Grade Nine Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 2.48: Trends in Ninth Grade English Language Learners with B Average GPA or Better in All Grade Nine Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20

2.47 Percentage Point Change in Ninth Grade English Language Learners with B Average GPA or Better in All Grade Nine Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20

2.48 Trends in Ninth Grade English Language Learners with B Average GPA or Better in All Grade Nine Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20

Best Quartile for Overall Performance
(2019-20)
- Chicago
- Dallas
- Jackson
- Miami
- New York
- Oklahoma City
- Pittsburgh
- Portland
- San Antonio
- San Francisco
- Seattle

Best Quartile for Change in Performance
(2016-17 to 2019-20)
- Chicago
- Dayton
- Guilford County
- New York
- Oklahoma City
- Seattle

The Council of The Great City Schools
Academic Key Performance Indicators 2021
2.49 Percentage of Students Who Completed Algebra I/Integrated Math by the End of Ninth Grade, 2019-20
Percentage of Students Who Completed Algebra I/Integrated Math by the End of Ninth Grade

Note: Higher values and larger increases are desired

- Figure 2.49: Total number of Students that completed Algebra I or equivalent in seventh, eighth, or ninth grade respectively, divided by the total number of Students in each grade, 2019-20
- Figure 2.50: Percentage Point Change in Students Who Completed Algebra I/Integrated Math by the End of Ninth Grade, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 2.51: Trends in Students Who Completed Algebra I/Integrated Math by the End of Ninth Grade, 2016-17 to 2019-20

2.50 Percentage Point Change in Students Who Completed Algebra I/Integrated Math by the End of Ninth Grade, 2016-17 to 2019-20

2.51 Trends in Students Who Completed Algebra I/Integrated Math by the End of Ninth Grade, 2016-17 to 2019-20

Best Quartile for Overall Performance

- Detroit
- Fort Worth
- Guilford County
- Jefferson
- Los Angeles
- Minneapolis
- Newark
- Pinellas
- Richmond
- Seattle

Best Quartile for Change in Performance

- Arlington
- Austin
- Dayton
- Detroit
- Los Angeles
- New York
- Oklahoma City
- Orange County
- Median 3.1

The Council of The Great City Schools

Academic Key Performance Indicators 2021
2.52 Percentage of Black Male Students Who Completed Algebra I/Integrated Math by the End of Ninth Grade, 2019-20
Percentage of Black Male Students Who Completed Algebra I/Integrated Math by the End of Ninth Grade

Note: Higher values and larger increases are desired.

- Figure 2.52: Total number of Black Male Students that completed Algebra I or equivalent in seventh, eighth, or ninth grade respectively, divided by the total number of Black Male Students in each grade, 2019-20
- Figure 2.53: Percentage Point Change in Black Male Students Who Completed Algebra I/Integrated Math by the End of Ninth Grade, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 2.54: Trends in Black Male Students Who Completed Algebra I/Integrated Math by the End of Ninth Grade, 2016-17 to 2019-20

2.53 Percentage Point Change in Black Male Students Who Completed Algebra I/Integrated Math by the End of Ninth Grade, 2016-17 to 2019-20

KPIID
- 20
- 0
- 20

Percentage Point Change

Median 5.1

-20.2
-14.6
-10.8
-9.3
-5.6
-5.0
-4.7
-1.5
-0.8
-0.5
-2.9

Lower Quartile

Upper Quartile

Best Quartile for Overall Performance
(2019-20)
- Arlington
- Detroit
- Fort Worth
- Guilford County
- Jefferson
- Los Angeles
- Minneapolis
- Newark
- Richmond
- Seattle

Best Quartile for Change in Performance
(2016-17 to 2019-20)
- Arlington
- Detroit
- Los Angeles
- Milwaukee
- New York
- Portland
- San Antonio
- Seattle
Percentage of Black Female Students Who Completed Algebra I/Integrated Math by the End of Ninth Grade, 2019-20

The Council of The Great City Schools

Academic Key Performance Indicators 2021
Percentage of Black Female Students Who Completed Algebra I/Integrated Math by the End of Ninth Grade

Note: Higher values and larger increases are desired

- Figure 2.55: Total number of Black Female Students that completed Algebra I or equivalent in seventh, eighth, or ninth grade respectively, divided by the total number of Black Female Students in each grade, 2019-20
- Figure 2.56: Percentage Point Change in Black Female Students Who Completed Algebra I/Integrated Math by the End of Ninth Grade, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 2.57: Trends in Black Female Students Who Completed Algebra I/Integrated Math by the End of Ninth Grade, 2016-17 to 2019-20

2.56 Percentage Point Change in Black Female Students Who Completed Algebra I/Integrated Math by the End of Ninth Grade, 2016-17 to 2019-20

2.57 Trends in Black Female Students Who Completed Algebra I/Integrated Math by the End of Ninth Grade, 2016-17 to 2019-20

Best Quartile for Overall Performance (2019-20)
- Fort Worth
- Guilford County
- Jefferson
- Los Angeles
- Minneapolis
- Newark
- Richmond
- San Antonio
- Seattle
- Tulsa

Best Quartile for Change in Performance (2016-17 to 2019-20)
- Fort Worth
- Los Angeles
- Milwaukee
- New York
- Oklahoma City
- Portland
- San Antonio
- Seattle
Percentage of Hispanic Male Students Who Completed Algebra I/Integrated Math by the End of Ninth Grade, 2019-20

The Council of The Great City Schools

Academic Key Performance Indicators 2021
Percentage of Hispanic Male Students Who Completed Algebra I/Integrated Math by the End of Ninth Grade

Note: Higher values and larger increases are desired

- Figure 2.58: Total number of Hispanic Male Students that completed Algebra I or equivalent in seventh, eighth, or ninth grade respectively, divided by the total number of Hispanic Male Students in each grade, 2019-20
- Figure 2.59: Percentage Point Change in Hispanic Male Students Who Completed Algebra I/Integrated Math by the End of Ninth Grade, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 2.60: Trends in Hispanic Male Students Who Completed Algebra I/Integrated Math by the End of Ninth Grade, 2016-17 to 2019-20

2.59 Percentage Point Change in Hispanic Male Students Who Completed Algebra I/Integrated Math by the End of Ninth Grade, 2016-17 to 2019-20

2.60 Trends in Hispanic Male Students Who Completed Algebra I/Integrated Math by the End of Ninth Grade, 2016-17 to 2019-20

Best Quartile for Overall Performance (2019-20)
- Dallas
- Detroit
- Fort Worth
- Guilford County
- Jefferson
- Los Angeles
- Minneapolis
- Newark
- Pinellas
- Tulsa

Best Quartile for Change in Performance (2016-17 to 2019-20)
- Arlington
- Cleveland
- Detroit
- Los Angeles
- New York
- Oklahoma City
- San Antonio
- Seattle

The Council of The Great City Schools

Academic Key Performance Indicators 2021
Percentage of Hispanic Female Students Who Completed Algebra I/Integrated Math by the End of Ninth Grade

Note: Higher values and larger increases are desired

- Figure 2.61: Total number of Hispanic Female Students who completed Algebra I or equivalent in seventh, eighth, or ninth grade respectively, divided by the total number of Hispanic Female Students in each grade, 2019-20
- Figure 2.62: Percentage Point Change in Hispanic Female Students Who Completed Algebra I/Integrated Math by the End of Ninth Grade, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 2.63: Trends in Hispanic Female Students Who Completed Algebra I/Integrated Math by the End of Ninth Grade, 2016-17 to 2019-20

2.62 Percentage Point Change in Hispanic Female Students Who Completed Algebra I/Integrated Math by the End of Ninth Grade, 2016-17 to 2019-20

2.63 Trends in Hispanic Female Students Who Completed Algebra I/Integrated Math by the End of Ninth Grade, 2016-17 to 2019-20

Best Quartile for Overall Performance (2019-20)
- Dallas
- Fort Worth
- Guilford County
- Jefferson
- Kansas City
- Los Angeles
- Minneapolis
- Newark
- Pinellas
- Tulsa

Best Quartile for Change in Performance (2016-17 to 2019-20)
- Arlington
- Austin
- Cleveland
- Dayton
- New York
- Oklahoma City
- San Antonio
- Seattle

The Council of The Great City Schools
2.64 Percentage of Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students Who Completed Algebra I/Integrated Math by the End of Ninth Grade, 2019-20

Percentage of Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students Who Completed Algebra I/Integrated Math by the End of Seventh Grade
Percentage of Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students Who Completed Algebra I/Integrated Math by the End of Eighth Grade
Percentage of Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students Who Completed Algebra I/Integrated Math by the End of Ninth Grade

The Council of The Great City Schools

Academic Key Performance Indicators 2021
Percentage of Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students Who Completed Algebra I/Integrated Math by the End of Ninth Grade

Note: Higher values and larger increases are desired

- Figure 2.64: Total number of Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students that completed Algebra I or equivalent in seventh, eighth, or ninth grade respectively, divided by the total number of Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students in each grade, 2019-20
- Figure 2.65: Percentage Point Change in Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students Who Completed Algebra I/Integrated Math by the End of Ninth Grade, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 2.66: Trends in Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students Who Completed Algebra I/Integrated Math by the End of Ninth Grade, 2016-17 to 2019-20

2.66 Trends in Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students Who Completed Algebra I/Integrated Math by the End of Ninth Grade, 2016-17 to 2019-20

![Graph showing trends and quartiles for FRPL students completing Algebra I/Integrated Math by the end of ninth grade.]

Best Quartile for Overall Performance (2019-20)
- Dallas
- Fort Worth
- Jefferson
- Los Angeles
- Minneapolis
- Newark
- San Antonio
- Seattle
- Tulsa

Best Quartile for Change in Performance (2016-17 to 2019-20)
- Arlington
- Austin
- Dayton
- New York
- Oklahoma City
- San Antonio
- Seattle

The Council of The Great City Schools

Academic Key Performance Indicators 2021
2.67 Percentage of Students with Disabilities Who Completed Algebra I/Integrated Math by the End of Ninth Grade, 2019-20

The Council of The Great City Schools

Academic Key Performance Indicators 2021
Percentage of Students with Disabilities Who Completed Algebra I/Integrated Math by the End of Ninth Grade

Note: Higher values and larger increases are desired

- Figure 2.67: Total number of Students with Disabilities that completed Algebra I or equivalent in seventh, eighth, or ninth grade respectively, divided by the total number of Students with Disabilities in each grade, 2019-20
- Figure 2.68: Percentage Point Change in Students with Disabilities Who Completed Algebra I/Integrated Math by the End of Ninth Grade, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 2.69: Trends in Students with Disabilities Who Completed Algebra I/Integrated Math by the End of Ninth Grade, 2016-17 to 2019-20

2.68 Percentage Point Change in Students with Disabilities Who Completed Algebra I/Integrated Math by the End of Ninth Grade, 2016-17 to 2019-20

2.69 Trends in Students with Disabilities Who Completed Algebra I/Integrated Math by the End of Ninth Grade, 2016-17 to 2019-20

Best Quartile for Overall Performance (2019-20)
- Arlington
- Austin
- Chicago
- Dallas
- Jefferson
- Kansas City
- Los Angeles
- Pinellas
- San Antonio
- Tulsa

Best Quartile for Change in Performance (2016-17 to 2019-20)
- Arlington
- Austin
- Dallas
- Milwaukee
- New York
- San Antonio
- Seattle
- Toledo
- Median 9.3
### Percentage of English Language Learners Who Completed Algebra I/Integrated Math by the End of Ninth Grade, 2019-20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPIID</th>
<th>Percentage of English Language Learners Who Completed Algebra I/Integrated Math by the End of Seventh Grade</th>
<th>Percentage of English Language Learners Who Completed Algebra I/Integrated Math by the End of Eighth Grade</th>
<th>Percentage of English Language Learners Who Completed Algebra I/Integrated Math by the End of Ninth Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
<td>69.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>82.7%</td>
<td>84.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>83.4%</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>84.3%</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>72.3%</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
<td>72.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>83.6%</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>79.3%</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>82.7%</td>
<td>79.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>73.4%</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>73.4%</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>75.1%</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>57.3%</td>
<td>57.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Percentage of English Language Learners Who Completed Algebra I/Integrated Math by the End of Ninth Grade

Note: Higher values and larger increases are desired

- Figure 2.70: Total number of English Language Learners that completed Algebra I or equivalent in seventh, eighth, or ninth grade respectively, divided by the total number of English Language Learners in each grade, 2019-20
- Figure 2.71: Percentage Point Change in English Language Learners Who Completed Algebra I/Integrated Math by the End of Ninth Grade, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 2.72: Trends in English Language Learners Who Completed Algebra I/Integrated Math by the End of Ninth Grade, 2016-17 to 2019-20

2.71 Percentage Point Change in English Language Learners Who Completed Algebra I/Integrated Math by the End of Ninth Grade, 2016-17 to 2019-20

2.72 Trends in English Language Learners Who Completed Algebra I/Integrated Math by the End of Ninth Grade, 2016-17 to 2019-20

Best Quartile for Overall Performance (2019-20)
- Dallas
- Fort Worth County
- Jefferson
- Kansas City
- Los Angeles
- Minneapolis
- Newark
- Pinellas
- San Antonio

Best Quartile for Change in Performance (2016-17 to 2019-20)
- Arlington
- Austin
- Dayton
- Fort Worth
- Los Angeles
- New York
- San Antonio
- Seattle
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2.73 Percentage of Students Who Took One or More AP Courses, 2019-20
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Percentage of Students Who Took One or More AP Courses

Note: Higher values and larger increases are desired

- Figure 2.73: Total number of secondary Students taking at least one AP course divided by the total number of secondary Students, 2019-20
- Figure 2.74: Percentage Point Change in Students Who Took One or More AP Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 2.75: Trends in Students Who Took One or More AP Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20

2.74 Percentage Point Change in Students Who Took One or More AP Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20

2.75 Trends in Students Who Took One or More AP Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20

Best Quartile for Overall Performance (2019-20)
- Arlington
- Austin
- Dallas
- Fort Worth
- Long Beach
- Orange County
- Richmond
- San Antonio
- San Diego
- San Francisco
- Seattle
- Tulsa

Best Quartile for Change in Performance (2016-17 to 2019-20)
- Austin
- Baltimore City
- Chicago
- Dallas
- New York
- Pinellas
- San Antonio
- Seattle
- San Diego
- San Francisco
- Seattle
2.76 Percentage of Black Male Students Who Took One or More AP Courses, 2019-20
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Percentage of Black Male Students Who Took One or More AP Courses

Note: Higher values and larger increases are desired

- Figure 2.76: Total number of secondary Black Male Students taking at least one AP course divided by the total number of secondary Black Male Students, 2019-20
- Figure 2.77: Percentage Point Change in Black Male Students Who Took One or More AP Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 2.78: Trends in Black Male Students Who Took One or More AP Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20

2.78 Trends in Black Male Students Who Took One or More AP Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20

Best Quartile for Overall Performance (2019-20)
- Arlington
- Dallas
- District of Columbia
- Jackson
- Long Beach
- New York
- Orange County
- Pinellas
- San Antonio
- San Diego
- Seattle
- Tulsa

Best Quartile for Change in Performance (2016-17 to 2019-20)
- Baltimore City
- Chicago
- Dallas
- Guilford County
- New York
- Pinellas
- San Antonio
- Seattle

2.77 Percentage Point Change in Black Male Students Who Took One or More AP Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20
The Council of The Great City Schools
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Percentage of Black Female Students Who Took One or More AP Courses

Note: Higher values and larger increases are desired

- Figure 2.79: Total number of secondary Black Female Students taking at least one AP course divided by the total number of secondary Black Female Students, 2019-20
- Figure 2.80: Percentage Point Change in Black Female Students Who Took One or More AP Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 2.81: Trends in Black Female Students Who Took One or More AP Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20

2.81 Trends in Black Female Students Who Took One or More AP Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20

2.80 Percentage Point Change in Black Female Students Who Took One or More AP Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20

Best Quartile for Overall Performance (2019-20)
- Arlington
- Dallas
- District of Columbia
- Fort Worth
- Jackson
- Long Beach
- Los Angeles
- New York
- San Antonio
- San Diego
- Seattle
- Tulsa

Best Quartile for Change in Performance (2016-17 to 2019-20)
- Arlington
- Baltimore City
- Chicago
- Guilford County
- New York
- Pinellas
- San Antonio
- Seattle
- Median 0.1
2.82 Percentage of Hispanic Male Students Who Took One or More AP Courses, 2019-20
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Percentage of Hispanic Male Students Who Took One or More AP Courses

Note: Higher values and larger increases are desired

- Figure 2.82: Total number of secondary Hispanic Male Students taking at least one AP course divided by the total number of secondary Hispanic Male Students, 2019-20
- Figure 2.83: Percentage Point Change in Hispanic Male Students Who Took One or More AP Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 2.84: Trends in Hispanic Male Students Who Took One or More AP Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20

2.84 Trends in Hispanic Male Students Who Took One or More AP Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20

Best Quartile for Overall Performance (2019-20)
- Arlington
- Dallas
- District of Columbia
- Fort Worth
- Jackson
- Long Beach
- Miami
- Orange County
- Richmond
- San Antonio
- Seattle
- Tulsa

Best Quartile for Change in Performance (2016-17 to 2019-20)
- Chicago
- Clark County
- Dallas
- Guilford County
- New York
- Pinellas
- San Antonio
- Seattle

Median 0.8
2.85 Percentage of Hispanic Female Students Who Took One or More AP Courses, 2019-20
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Percentage of Hispanic Female Students Who Took One or More AP Courses

Note: Higher values and larger increases are desired

- Figure 2.85: Total number of secondary Hispanic Female Students taking at least one AP course divided by the total number of secondary Hispanic Female Students, 2019-20
- Figure 2.86: Percentage Point Change in Hispanic Female Students Who Took One or More AP Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 2.87: Trends in Hispanic Female Students Who Took One or More AP Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20

2.86 Percentage Point Change in Hispanic Female Students Who Took One or More AP Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20

2.87 Trends in Hispanic Female Students Who Took One or More AP Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20

Best Quartile for Overall Performance (2019-20)
- Arlington
- Austin
- Dallas
- District of Columbia
- Fort Worth
- Jackson
- Long Beach
- Miami
- Orange County
- San Antonio
- Seattle
- Tulsa

Best Quartile for Change in Performance (2016-17 to 2019-20)
- Baltimore City
- Chicago
- Cleveland
- Dallas
- Guilford County
- New York
- San Antonio
- Seattle
- Median 0.5
2.88 Percentage of Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students Who Took One or More AP Courses, 2019-20
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Percentage of Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students Who Took One or More AP Courses

Note: Higher values and larger increases are desired

- Figure 2.88: Total number of secondary Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students taking at least one AP course divided by the total number of secondary Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students, 2019-20
- Figure 2.89: Percentage Point Change in Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students Who Took One or More AP Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 2.90: Trends in Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students Who Took One or More AP Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20

2.89 Percentage Point Change in Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students Who Took One or More AP Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20

2.90 Trends in Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students Who Took One or More AP Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20

Best Quartile for Overall Performance (2019-20)
- Arlington
- Dallas
- Fort Worth
- Jackson
- Long Beach
- Miami
- Orange County
- San Antonio
- San Francisco
- Seattle
- Tulsa

Best Quartile for Change in Performance (2016-17 to 2019-20)
- Baltimore City
- Chicago
- Dallas
- Nashville
- New York
- Pinellas
- San Antonio
- Seattle
- Median 1.3
Percentage of Students with Disabilities Who Took One or More AP Courses

Note: Higher values and larger increases are desired

- Figure 2.91: Total number of secondary Students with Disabilities taking at least one AP course divided by the total number of secondary Students with Disabilities, 2019-20
- Figure 2.92: Percentage Point Change in Students with Disabilities Who Took One or More AP Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 2.93: Trends in Students with Disabilities Who Took One or More AP Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20

**2.92 Percentage Point Change in Students with Disabilities Who Took One or More AP Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPIID</th>
<th>Percentage Point Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Upper Quartile**

- Austin
- Dallas
- District of Columbia
- Jackson
- Minneapolis
- New York

**Lower Quartile**

- Richmond
- San Antonio
- San Francisco
- Seattle
- Tulsa

Best Quartile for Overall Performance (2019-20)

- Austin
- Chicago
- Dallas
- New York

Best Quartile for Change in Performance (2016-17 to 2019-20)

- Norfolk
- San Antonio
- Seattle

Median 0.6
2.94 Percentage of English Language Learners Who Took One or More AP Courses, 2019-20
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Percentage of English Language Learners Who Took One or More AP Courses

Median 8.0%
Percentage of English Language Learners Who Took One or More AP Courses

Note: Higher values and larger increases are desired

- Figure 2.94: Total number of secondary English Language Learners taking at least one AP course divided by the total number of secondary English Language Learners, 2019-20
- Figure 2.95: Percentage Point Change in English Language Learners Who Took One or More AP Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 2.96: Trends in English Language Learners Who Took One or More AP Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20

2.95 Percentage Point Change in English Language Learners Who Took One or More AP Courses, 2016-17 to 2019-20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPIID</th>
<th>16-17</th>
<th>17-18</th>
<th>18-19</th>
<th>19-20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Median 1.7
- Upper Quartile 8.8%
- Lower Quartile 4.1%
- Best Quartile for Overall Performance (2019-20)
  - Arlington
  - Austin
  - Dallas
  - Detroit
  - District of Columbia
  - Fort Worth
  - Jackson
  - Orange County
  - San Antonio
  - San Francisco
  - Seattle

- Best Quartile for Change in Performance (2016-17 to 2019-20)
  - Austin
  - Chicago
  - Dallas
  - Fort Worth
  - Orange County
  - Pinellas
  - San Antonio
  - Seattle

Arlington
Austin
Dallas
Detroit
District of Columbia
Fort Worth
Jackson
Orange County
San Antonio
San Francisco
Seattle

The Council of The Great City Schools
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2.97 Percentage of All AP Exam Scores That Were Three or Higher by Students, 2019-20
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Percentage of All AP Exam Scores That Were Three or Higher by Students

Note: Higher values and larger increases are desired

- Figure 2.97: Total number of AP exam scores that were three or higher by Students divided by the total number of AP exam scores, 2019-20
- Figure 2.98: Percentage Point Change in All AP Exam Scores That Were Three or Higher by Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 2.99: Trends in All AP Exam Scores That Were Three or Higher by Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20

2.98 Percentage Point Change in All AP Exam Scores That Were Three or Higher by Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20

2.99 Trends in All AP Exam Scores That Were Three or Higher by Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20

Best Quartile for Overall Performance (2019-20)
- Austin
- Broward County
- Charleston
- Cincinnati
- Miami
- Palm Beach
- Pittsburgh
- Portland
- San Diego
- San Francisco
- Seattle

Best Quartile for Change in Performance (2016-17 to 2019-20)
- Detroit
- Miami
- Milwaukee
- Oklahoma City
- Orange County
- Pittsburgh
- San Antonio
- Toledo
- Wichita

The Council of The Great City Schools
Academic Key Performance Indicators 2021
2.100 Percentage of All AP Exam Scores That Were Three or Higher by Black Male Students, 2019-20
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Percentage of All AP Exam Scores That Were Three or Higher by Black Male Students

Note: Higher values and larger increases are desired

- Figure 2.100: Total number of AP exam scores that were three or higher by Black Male Students divided by the total number of AP exam scores, 2019-20
- Figure 2.101: Percentage Point Change in All AP Exam Scores That Were Three or Higher by Black Male Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 2.102: Trends in All AP Exam Scores That Were Three or Higher by Black Male Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20

2.101 Percentage Point Change in All AP Exam Scores That Were Three or Higher by Black Male Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>-5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>-4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>-2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-20</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.102 Trends in All AP Exam Scores That Were Three or Higher by Black Male Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20

Best Quartile for Overall Performance (2019-20):
- Austin
- Broward County
- Charleston
- Clark County
- Jefferson
- Miami
- Palm Beach
- Pittsburgh
- San Francisco
- Seattle

Best Quartile for Change in Performance (2016-17 to 2019-20):
- Austin
- Broward County
- Dayton
- Fort Worth
- Jefferson
- Orange County
- Pittsburgh
- Toledo

Median 7.7
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2.103 Percentage of All AP Exam Scores That Were Three or Higher by Black Female Students, 2019-20

The Council of The Great City Schools

Academic Key Performance Indicators 2021
Percentage of All AP Exam Scores That Were Three or Higher by Black Female Students

Note: Higher values and larger increases are desired

- Figure 2.103: Total number of AP exam scores that were three or higher by Black Female Students divided by the total number of AP exam scores, 2019-20
- Figure 2.104: Percentage Point Change in All AP Exam Scores That Were Three or Higher by Black Female Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 2.105: Trends in All AP Exam Scores That Were Three or Higher by Black Female Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20

2.105 Trends in All AP Exam Scores That Were Three or Higher by Black Female Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20

Best Quartile for Overall Performance (2019-20)
- Austin
- Boston
- Broward County
- Charleston
- Cincinnati
- Clark County
- Miami
- Orange County
- Palm Beach
- Portland
- Seattle

Best Quartile for Change in Performance (2016-17 to 2019-20)
- Austin
- Broward County
- Chicago
- Detroit
- Fort Worth
- Orange County
- Pittsburgh
- San Antonio
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2.106 Percentage of All AP Exam Scores That Were Three or Higher by Hispanic Male Students, 2019-20
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Percentage of All AP Exam Scores That Were Three or Higher by Hispanic Male Students

Note: Higher values and larger increases are desired

- Figure 2.106: Total number of AP exam scores that were three or higher by Hispanic Male Students divided by the total number of AP exam scores, 2019-20
- Figure 2.107: Percentage Point Change in All AP Exam Scores That Were Three or Higher by Hispanic Male Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 2.108: Trends in All AP Exam Scores That Were Three or Higher by Hispanic Male Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20

2.107 Percentage Point Change in All AP Exam Scores That Were Three or Higher by Hispanic Male Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20

2.108 Trends in All AP Exam Scores That Were Three or Higher by Hispanic Male Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20

Best Quartile for Overall Performance (2019-20)
- Austin
- Broward County
- Charleston
- Detroit
- District of Columbia
- Miami
- Nashville
- Newark
- Palm Beach
- San Francisco
- Seattle

Best Quartile for Change in Performance (2016-17 to 2019-20)
- Austin
- Detroit
- Nashville
- Oklahoma City
- Orange County
- San Antonio
- Seattle
- Wichita

The Council of The Great City Schools
Academic Key Performance Indicators 2021
Percentage of All AP Exam Scores That Were Three or Higher by Hispanic Female Students

Note: Higher values and larger increases are desired

- Figure 2.109: Total number of AP exam scores that were three or higher by Hispanic Female Students divided by the total number of AP exam scores, 2019-20
- Figure 2.110: Percentage Point Change in All AP Exam Scores That Were Three or Higher by Hispanic Female Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 2.111: Trends in All AP Exam Scores That Were Three or Higher by Hispanic Female Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20

2.111 Trends in All AP Exam Scores That Were Three or Higher by Hispanic Female Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20

Best Quartile for Overall Performance (2019-20)
- Austin
- Broward County
- Charleston
- Cincinnati
- Miami
- Newark
- Palm Beach
- Portland
- San Francisco
- Seattle

Best Quartile for Change in Performance (2016-17 to 2019-20)
- Austin
- Detroit
- Miami
- Milwaukee
- Orange County
- San Antonio
- Seattle
- Wichita

The Council of The Great City Schools

Academic Key Performance Indicators 2021
2.112 Percentage of All AP Exam Scores That Were Three or Higher by Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students, 2019-20

The Council of The Great City Schools

Academic Key Performance Indicators 2021
Percentage of All AP Exam Scores That Were Three or Higher by Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students

Note: Higher values and larger increases are desired

- Figure 2.112: Total number of AP exam scores that were three or higher by Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students divided by the total number of AP exam scores, 2019-20
- Figure 2.113: Percentage Point Change in All AP Exam Scores That Were Three or Higher by Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 2.114: Trends in All AP Exam Scores That Were Three or Higher by Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20

2.113 Percentage Point Change in All AP Exam Scores That Were Three or Higher by Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20

2.114 Trends in All AP Exam Scores That Were Three or Higher by Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20

Best Quartile for Overall Performance (2019-20)
- Austin
- Boston
- Broward County
- Charleston
- Des Moines
- Miami
- New York
- Palm Beach
- Portland
- San Francisco

Best Quartile for Change in Performance (2016-17 to 2019-20)
- Austin
- Detroit
- Jefferson
- Milwaukee
- Orange County
- Pittsburgh
- San Antonio
- Wichita
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Academic Key Performance Indicators 2021
2.115 Percentage of All AP Exam Scores That Were Three or Higher by Students with Disabilities, 2019-20

The Council of The Great City Schools

Academic Key Performance Indicators 2021
Percentage of All AP Exam Scores That Were Three or Higher by Students with Disabilities

Note: Higher values and larger increases are desired

- Figure 2.115: Total number of AP exam scores that were three or higher by Students with Disabilities divided by the total number of AP exam scores, 2019-20
- Figure 2.116: Percentage Point Change in All AP Exam Scores That Were Three or Higher by Students with Disabilities, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 2.117: Trends in All AP Exam Scores That Were Three or Higher by Students with Disabilities, 2016-17 to 2019-20

2.117 Trends in All AP Exam Scores That Were Three or Higher by Students with Disabilities, 2016-17 to 2019-20
2.118 Percentage of All AP Exam Scores That Were Three or Higher by English Language Learners, 2019-20

The Council of The Great City Schools

Academic Key Performance Indicators 2021
Percentage of All AP Exam Scores That Were Three or Higher by English Language Learners

Note: Higher values and larger increases are desired

- Figure 2.118: Total number of AP exam scores that were three or higher by English Language Learners divided by the total number of AP exam scores, 2019-20
- Figure 2.119: Percentage Point Change in All AP Exam Scores That Were Three or Higher by English Language Learners, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 2.120: Trends in All AP Exam Scores That Were Three or Higher by English Language Learners, 2016-17 to 2019-20

2.119 Percentage Point Change in All AP Exam Scores That Were Three or Higher by English Language Learners, 2016-17 to 2019-20

2.120 Trends in All AP Exam Scores That Were Three or Higher by English Language Learners, 2016-17 to 2019-20

Best Quartile for Overall Performance (2019-20)
- Broward County
- Fresno
- Los Angeles
- Miami
- New York
- Newark
- Orange County
- Palm Beach
- San Francisco

Best Quartile for Change in Performance (2016-17 to 2019-20)
- Austin
- Cincinnati
- Detroit
- Fort Worth
- Fresno
- Milwaukee
- Nashville
Four Year Cohort Graduation Rate for Students

Note: Higher values and larger increases are desired

- Figure 2.121: Formulas for the calculation of graduation rates are based on the state methodology required for federal reporting, 2019-20
- Figure 2.122: Percentage Point Change in Four Year Cohort Graduation Rate for Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 2.123: Trends in Four Year Cohort Graduation Rate for Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20

2.123 Trends in Four Year Cohort Graduation Rate for Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20

Best Quartile for Overall Performance (2019-20)
- Arlington
- Austin
- Broward County
- Duval County
- Long Beach
- Miami
- Orange County
- Palm Beach
- Pinellas
- Tulsa

Best Quartile for Change in Performance (2016-17 to 2019-20)
- Broward County
- Cleveland
- Duval County
- Miami
- Pinellas
- Seattle
- Toledo
- Wichita

The Council of The Great City Schools

Academic Key Performance Indicators 2021
2.124 Four Year Cohort Graduation Rate for Black Male Students, 2019-20

The Council of The Great City Schools

Academic Key Performance Indicators 2021
Four Year Cohort Graduation Rate for Black Male Students

Note: Higher values and larger increases are desired

- Figure 2.124: Formulas for the calculation of graduation rates are based on the state methodology required for federal reporting, 2019-20
- Figure 2.125: Percentage Point Change in Four Year Cohort Graduation Rate for Black Male Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 2.126: Trends in Four Year Cohort Graduation Rate for Black Male Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20

2.126 Trends in Four Year Cohort Graduation Rate for Black Male Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20

Best Quartile for Overall Performance (2019-20)
- Arlington
- Austin
- Broward County
- Duval County
- Guilford County
- Long Beach
- Norfolk
- Palm Beach
- Tulsa

Best Quartile for Change in Performance (2016-17 to 2019-20)
- Broward County
- Duval County
- Hillsborough County
- Miami
- Palm Beach
- Pinellas
- Toledo

KPIID
- 107

Academic Key Performance Indicators 2021
2.127 Four Year Cohort Graduation Rate for Black Female Students, 2019-20

The Council of The Great City Schools

Academic Key Performance Indicators 2021
Four Year Cohort Graduation Rate for Black Female Students

Note: Higher values and larger increases are desired

- Figure 2.127: Formulas for the calculation of graduation rates are based on the state methodology required for federal reporting, 2019-20
- Figure 2.128: Percentage Point Change in Four Year Cohort Graduation Rate for Black Female Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 2.129: Trends in Four Year Cohort Graduation Rate for Black Female Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20

2.128 Percentage Point Change in Four Year Cohort Graduation Rate for Black Female Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20

2.129 Trends in Four Year Cohort Graduation Rate for Black Female Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20

Best Quartile for Overall Performance (2019-20)
- Arlington
- Austin
- Broward County
- Charlotte-Mecklenburg
- Duval County
- Guilford County
- Long Beach
- Miami
- Palm Beach
- Pinellas

Best Quartile for Change in Performance (2016-17 to 2019-20)
- Dayton
- Duval County
- Miami
- Pinellas
- Portland
- Seattle
- Toledo
- Median 3.9
2.130 Four Year Cohort Graduation Rate for Hispanic Male Students, 2019-20

Four Year Cohort Graduation Rate for Hispanic Male Students

Median 77.1%
Four Year Cohort Graduation Rate for Hispanic Male Students

Note: Higher values and larger increases are desired

- Figure 2.130: Formulas for the calculation of graduation rates are based on the state methodology required for federal reporting, 2019-20
- Figure 2.131: Percentage Point Change in Four Year Cohort Graduation Rate for Hispanic Male Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 2.132: Trends in Four Year Cohort Graduation Rate for Hispanic Male Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20

2.132 Trends in Four Year Cohort Graduation Rate for Hispanic Male Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20

Best Quartile for Overall Performance (2019-20)
- Arlington
- Austin
- Broward County
- Duval County
- Long Beach
- Miami
- Orange County
- Palm Beach
- Pinellas
- Tulsa

Best Quartile for Change in Performance (2016-17 to 2019-20)
- Cleveland
- Duval County
- Long Beach
- Miami
- Pinellas
- Portland
- Toledo

2.131 Percentage Point Change in Four Year Cohort Graduation Rate for Hispanic Male Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20

Percentage Point Change
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The Council of The Great City Schools
Academic Key Performance Indicators 2021
2.133 Four Year Cohort Graduation Rate for Hispanic Female Students, 2019-20

Median 85.1%
Four Year Cohort Graduation Rate for Hispanic Female Students

Note: Higher values and larger increases are desired

- Figure 2.133: Formulas for the calculation of graduation rates are based on the state methodology required for federal reporting, 2019-20
- Figure 2.134: Percentage Point Change in Four Year Cohort Graduation Rate for Hispanic Female Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 2.135: Trends in Four Year Cohort Graduation Rate for Hispanic Female Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20

2.134 Percentage Point Change in Four Year Cohort Graduation Rate for Hispanic Female Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20

2.135 Trends in Four Year Cohort Graduation Rate for Hispanic Female Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20

Best Quartile for Overall Performance (2019-20)
- Arlington
- Austin
- Broward County
- Duval County
- Fort Worth
- Long Beach
- Miami
- Orange County
- Palm Beach
- Pinellas

Best Quartile for Change in Performance (2016-17 to 2019-20)
- Duval County
- Hillsborough County
- Miami
- Pinellas
- Seattle
- Toledo
- Wichita

The Council of The Great City Schools
Academic Key Performance Indicators 2021
2.136 Four Year Cohort Graduation Rate for Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students, 2019-20

The Council of The Great City Schools

Academic Key Performance Indicators 2021
Four Year Cohort Graduation Rate for Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students

Note: Higher values and larger increases are desired

- Figure 2.136: Formulas for the calculation of graduation rates are based on the state methodology required for federal reporting, 2019-20
- Figure 2.137: Percentage Point Change in Four Year Cohort Graduation Rate for Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 2.138: Trends in Four Year Cohort Graduation Rate for Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20

2.137 Percentage Point Change in Four Year Cohort Graduation Rate for Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20

2.138 Trends in Four Year Cohort Graduation Rate for Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20

Best Quartile for Overall Performance (2019-20)
- Arlington
- Austin
- Fort Worth
- Long Beach
- Miami
- Norfolk
- Orange County
- Palm Beach
- Tulsa

Best Quartile for Change in Performance (2016-17 to 2019-20)
- Broward County
- Duval County
- Miami
- Norfolk
- Pinellas
- Seattle
- Toledo

The Council of The Great City Schools

Academic Key Performance Indicators 2021
Four Year Cohort Graduation Rate for Students with Disabilities, 2019-20

Median 69.7%
Four Year Cohort Graduation Rate for Students with Disabilities

Note: Higher values and larger increases are desired

- Figure 2.139: Formulas for the calculation of graduation rates are based on the state methodology required for federal reporting, 2019-20
- Figure 2.140: Percentage Point Change in Four Year Cohort Graduation Rate for Students with Disabilities, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 2.141: Trends in Four Year Cohort Graduation Rate for Students with Disabilities, 2016-17 to 2019-20

2.141 Trends in Four Year Cohort Graduation Rate for Students with Disabilities, 2016-17 to 2019-20

- Austin
- Broward County
- Duval County
- Hillsborough County
- Miami
- Norfolk
- Orange County
- Palm Beach
- Pinellas
- Tulsa

Best Quartile for Overall Performance
(2019-20)

Best Quartile for Change in Performance
(2016-17 to 2019-20)
2.142 Four Year Cohort Graduation Rate for English Language Learners, 2019-20

Four Year Cohort Graduation Rate for English Language Learners

Median 75.4%

The Council of The Great City Schools
Four Year Cohort Graduation Rate for English Language Learners

Note: Higher values and larger increases are desired

- Figure 2.142: Formulas for the calculation of graduation rates are based on the state methodology required for federal reporting, 2019-20
- Figure 2.143: Percentage Point Change in Four Year Cohort Graduation Rate for English Language Learners, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 2.144: Trends in Four Year Cohort Graduation Rate for English Language Learners, 2016-17 to 2019-20

2.143 Percentage Point Change in Four Year Cohort Graduation Rate for English Language Learners, 2016-17 to 2019-20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-20</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.144 Trends in Four Year Cohort Graduation Rate for English Language Learners, 2016-17 to 2019-20

- Upper Quartile
- Lower Quartile

Best Quartile for Overall Performance (2019-20)
- Austin
- Broward County
- Duval County
- Hillsborough County
- Miami
- Norfolk
- Palm Beach
- Pinellas
- Toledo
- Tulsa

Best Quartile for Change in Performance (2016-17 to 2019-20)
- Broward County
- Cleveland
- Dayton
- Norfolk
- Palm Beach
- Pinellas
- Pittsburgh
- Toledo

Median 13.1
Attendance Indicators

Attendance measures were collected on students in grades three, six, eight, and nine who were absent from school. Comparisons across districts are made for students who were absent cumulatively over the course of the school year for five to nine days, ten to nineteen days, and twenty or more days. The unit of analysis here is the number of students who missed school for the specified lengths of time. Figures 3.1 through 3.32 illustrate how districts compare on their absence rates in the specified grades. The total number of days missed is divided by the total number of students enrolled in that grade during the school year at any point.
3.1 Percentage of Grade 3 Students Absent, 2019-20
### 3.2 Percentage of Grade 6 Students Absent, 2019-20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Grade 6 Students Absent 5-9 Days</th>
<th>Percentage of Grade 6 Students Absent 10-19 Days</th>
<th>Percentage of Grade 6 Students Absent 20+ Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3 Percentage of Grade 8 Students Absent, 2019-20

The Council of The Great City Schools

Academic Key Performance Indicators 2021
3.4 Percentage of Grade 9 Students Absent, 2019-20
3.5 Percentage of Grade 3 Black Male Students Absent, 2019-20

The Council of The Great City Schools

Academic Key Performance Indicators 2021
3.7 Percentage of Grade 8 Black Male Students Absent, 2019-20

The Council of The Great City Schools

Academic Key Performance Indicators 2021
3.8 Percentage of Grade 9 Black Male Students Absent, 2019-20

KPIID

Percentage of Grade 9 Black Male Students Absent 5-9 Days

Percentage of Grade 9 Black Male Students Absent 10-19 Days

Percentage of Grade 9 Black Male Students Absent 20+ Days

The Council of The Great City Schools

Academic Key Performance Indicators 2021
3.9 Percentage of Grade 3 Black Female Students Absent, 2019-20

The Council of The Great City Schools

Academic Key Performance Indicators 2021
### 3.10 Percentage of Grade 6 Black Female Students Absent, 2019-20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPIID</th>
<th>Percentage of Grade 6 Black Female Students Absent 5-9 Days</th>
<th>Percentage of Grade 6 Black Female Students Absent 10-19 Days</th>
<th>Percentage of Grade 6 Black Female Students Absent 20+ Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.11 Percentage of Grade 8 Black Female Students Absent, 2019-20
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3.12 Percentage of Grade 9 Black Female Students Absent, 2019-20
### Percentage of Grade 3 Hispanic Male Students Absent, 2019-20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPIID</th>
<th>Percentage of Grade 3 Hispanic Male Students Absent 5-9 Days</th>
<th>Percentage of Grade 3 Hispanic Male Students Absent 10-19 Days</th>
<th>Percentage of Grade 3 Hispanic Male Students Absent 20+ Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### 3.14 Percentage of Grade 6 Hispanic Male Students Absent, 2019-20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPI ID</th>
<th>Percentage of Grade 6 Hispanic Male Students Absent 5-9 Days</th>
<th>Percentage of Grade 6 Hispanic Male Students Absent 10-19 Days</th>
<th>Percentage of Grade 6 Hispanic Male Students Absent 20+ Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Percentage of Grade 3 Hispanic Female Students Absent, 2019-20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPIID</th>
<th>Percentage of Grade 3 Hispanic Female Students Absent 5-9 Days</th>
<th>Percentage of Grade 3 Hispanic Female Students Absent 10-19 Days</th>
<th>Percentage of Grade 3 Hispanic Female Students Absent 20+ Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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3.19 Percentage of Grade 8 Hispanic Female Students Absent, 2019-20
3.20 Percentage of Grade 9 Hispanic Female Students Absent, 2019-20

The graph shows the percentage of Grade 9 Hispanic female students absent for 5-9 days, 10-19 days, and 20+ days from academic key performance indicators.

The data indicates a range of percentages for each category, with some values exceeding 20%. The highest percentage is 41.0% for 5-9 days, and the lowest is 5.5% for 20+ days.
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### 3.22 Percentage of Grade 6 Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students Absent, 2019-20

#### Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPIID</th>
<th>Percentage of Grade 6 FRPL Students Absent 5-9 Days</th>
<th>Percentage of Grade 6 FRPL Students Absent 10-19 Days</th>
<th>Percentage of Grade 6 FRPL Students Absent 20+ Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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3.24 Percentage of Grade 9 Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students Absent, 2019-20
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### Percentage of Grade 3 Students with Disabilities Absent, 2019-20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPI ID</th>
<th>Percentage of Grade 3 Students with Disabilities Absent 5-9 Days</th>
<th>Percentage of Grade 3 Students with Disabilities Absent 10-19 Days</th>
<th>Percentage of Grade 3 Students with Disabilities Absent 20+ Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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# 3.27 Percentage of Grade 8 Students with Disabilities Absent, 2019-20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPIID</th>
<th>Percentage of Grade 8 Students with Disabilities Absent 5-9 Days</th>
<th>Percentage of Grade 8 Students with Disabilities Absent 10-19 Days</th>
<th>Percentage of Grade 8 Students with Disabilities Absent 20+ Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.28 Percentage of Grade 9 Students with Disabilities Absent, 2019-20
3.31 Percentage of Grade 8 English Language Learners Absent, 2019-20
3.32 Percentage of Grade 9 English Language Learners Absent, 2019-20
**Discipline Indicators**

The discipline indicators in this section focus on out-of-school suspensions. The two KPIs for discipline include the percentage of students suspended for 1 to 5 days, 6 to 10 days, 11 to 19 days, or 20 or more days in the school year, and the total number of instructional days missed due to suspension for the year. Figures 4.1 to 4.24 show the percentage of students who were suspended out-of-school for 1 to 5 days, 6 to 10 days, 11 to 19 days, and more than 20 days cumulatively over the course of the school year. The unit of analysis is students. Figures 4.25 to 4.48 show the number of instructional days missed per 100 students in each district. These data allow districts to compare numbers of lost instructional days independent of overall district enrollment. The unit of analysis is number of days suspended per 100 students.
### 4.1 Percentage of Students with Out-of-School Suspensions, 2019-20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPIID</th>
<th>Percentage of Students Suspended 1-5 Days</th>
<th>Percentage of Students Suspended 6-10 Days</th>
<th>Percentage of Students Suspended 11-19 Days</th>
<th>Percentage of Students Suspended 20+ Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Percentage of Students with Out-of-School Suspensions

Note: Lower values and larger decreases are desired

- Figure 4.1: Total number of Students suspended for specified lengths of time divided by the total number of Students, 2019-20
- Figure 4.2: Percentage Point Change in Students with Out-of-School Suspensions, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 4.3: Trends in Students with Out-of-School Suspensions, 2016-17 to 2019-20

4.2 Percentage Point Change in Students with Out-of-School Suspensions, 2016-17 to 2019-20

4.3 Trends in Students with Out-of-School Suspensions, 2016-17 to 2019-20

Best Quartile for Overall Performance
(2019-20)
- Boston
- Broward County
- Chicago
- Clark County
- Los Angeles
- Miami
- New York
- Newark
- San Diego
- San Francisco
- Seattle

Best Quartile for Change in Performance
(2016-17 to 2019-20)
- Clark County
- Dallas
- Dayton
- Detroit
- Fort Worth
- San Antonio
- Toledo
- Wichita
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Academic Key Performance Indicators 2021
4.4 Percentage of Black Male Students with Out-of-School Suspensions, 2019-20
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Academic Key Performance Indicators 2021
Percentage of Black Male Students with Out-of-School Suspensions

Note: Lower values and larger decreases are desired

- Figure 4.4: Total number of Black Male Students suspended for specified lengths of time divided by the total number of Black Male Students, 2019-20
- Figure 4.5: Percentage Point Change in Black Male Students with Out-of-School Suspensions, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 4.6: Trends in Black Male Students with Out-of-School Suspensions, 2016-17 to 2019-20

4.5 Percentage Point Change in Black Male Students with Out-of-School Suspensions, 2016-17 to 2019-20

4.6 Trends in Black Male Students with Out-of-School Suspensions, 2016-17 to 2019-20

Best Quartile for Overall Performance (2019-20)
- Baltimore City
- Boston
- Broward County
- Chicago
- Clark County
- District of Columbia
- Los Angeles
- Miami
- New York
- Newark
- Seattle

Best Quartile for Change in Performance (2016-17 to 2019-20)
- Dallas
- Dayton
- Des Moines
- Detroit
- San Antonio
- Seattle
- Toledo
- Wichita
Percentage of Black Female Students with Out-of-School Suspensions, 2019-20
Percentage of Black Female Students with Out-of-School Suspensions

Note: Lower values and larger decreases are desired

- Figure 4.7: Total number of Black Female Students suspended for specified lengths of time divided by the total number of Black Female Students, 2019-20
- Figure 4.8: Percentage Point Change in Black Female Students with Out-of-School Suspensions, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 4.9: Trends in Black Female Students with Out-of-School Suspensions, 2016-17 to 2019-20

4.9 Trends in Black Female Students with Out-of-School Suspensions, 2016-17 to 2019-20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Lower Quartile</th>
<th>Upper Quartile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-20</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Best Quartile for Overall Performance (2019-20)
- Boston
- Broward County
- Chicago
- Clark County
- Long Beach
- Los Angeles
- Miami
- New York
- Newark
- San Diego
- Seattle

Best Quartile for Change in Performance (2016-17 to 2019-20)
- Clark County
- Dallas
- Dayton
- Detroit
- Fort Worth
- San Antonio
- Toledo
- Wichita

4.8 Percentage Point Change in Black Female Students with Out-of-School Suspensions, 2016-17 to 2019-20

KPIID

- Median
- % Lower
- % Upper

Percentage Point Change

Boston
Broward County
Chicago
Clark County
Long Beach
Los Angeles
Miami
New York
Newark
San Diego
Seattle
Clark County
Dallas
Dayton
Detroit
Fort Worth
San Antonio
Toledo
Wichita
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4.10 Percentage of Hispanic Male Students with Out-of-School Suspensions, 2019-20
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Academic Key Performance Indicators 2021
Percentage of Hispanic Male Students with Out-of-School Suspensions

Note: Lower values and larger decreases are desired

- Figure 4.10: Total number of Hispanic Male Students suspended for specified lengths of time divided by the total number of Hispanic Male Students, 2019-20
- Figure 4.11: Percentage Point Change in Hispanic Male Students with Out-of-School Suspensions, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 4.12: Trends in Hispanic Male Students with Out-of-School Suspensions, 2016-17 to 2019-20

4.12 Trends in Hispanic Male Students with Out-of-School Suspensions, 2016-17 to 2019-20

Best Quartile for Overall Performance (2019-20)
- Broward County
- Chicago
- Clark County
- District of Columbia
- Long Beach
- Los Angeles
- Miami
- New York
- Newark
- Pittsburgh
- Seattle

Best Quartile for Change in Performance (2016-17 to 2019-20)
- Clark County
- Cleveland
- Detroit
- Fort Worth
- Fresno
- San Antonio
- Seattle
- Wichita
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4.13 Percentage of Hispanic Female Students with Out-of-School Suspensions, 2019-20
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Percentage of Hispanic Female Students with Out-of-School Suspensions

Note: Lower values and larger decreases are desired

- Figure 4.13: Total number of Hispanic Female Students suspended for specified lengths of time divided by the total number of Hispanic Female Students, 2019-20
- Figure 4.14: Percentage Point Change in Hispanic Female Students with Out-of-School Suspensions, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 4.15: Trends in Hispanic Female Students with Out-of-School Suspensions, 2016-17 to 2019-20

4.14 Percentage Point Change in Hispanic Female Students with Out-of-School Suspensions, 2016-17 to 2019-20

KPIID
-2 -1 0 1
Percentage Point Change
-1.6 -1.3 -1.2 -1.2 -0.9 -0.8 -0.6 -0.6 -0.5 -0.5 -0.5 -0.5 -0.3 -0.2 -0.2 -0.1 -0.1 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.1 0.3 0.3 0.3 1.1

Best Quartile for Overall Performance
(B2019-20)
- Broward County
- Chicago
- Clark County
- District of Columbia
- Long Beach
- Los Angeles
- Miami
- New York
- Newark
- San Francisco
- Seattle

Best Quartile for Change in Performance
(2016-17 to 2019-20)
- Clark County
- Cleveland
- Dallas
- Detroit
- Fresno
- Milwaukee
- San Antonio
- Wichita
4.16 Percentage of Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students with Out-of-School Suspensions, 2019-20
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Academic Key Performance Indicators 2021
Percentage of Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students with Out-of-School Suspensions

Note: Lower values and larger decreases are desired

- Figure 4.16: Total number of Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students suspended for specified lengths of time divided by the total number of Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students, 2019-20
- Figure 4.17: Percentage Point Change in Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students with Out-of-School Suspensions, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 4.18: Trends in Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students with Out-of-School Suspensions, 2016-17 to 2019-20

4.17 Percentage Point Change in Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students with Out-of-School Suspensions, 2016-17 to 2019-20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPIID</th>
<th>Percentage Point Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>-5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>-5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>-5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>-5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>-5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>-5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>-5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>-5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>-5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>-5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>-5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>-5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>-5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>-5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>-5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>-5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Best Quartile for Overall Performance (2019-20)
- Boston
- Broward County
- Chicago
- Clark County
- Long Beach
- Los Angeles
- Miami
- New York
- Newark
- San Francisco
- Seattle

Best Quartile for Change in Performance (2016-17 to 2019-20)
- Dayton
- Detroit
- Jefferson
- Norfolk
- San Antonio
- Toledo
- Wichita
4.19 Percentage of Students with Disabilities with Out-of-School Suspensions, 2019-20
Percentage of Students with Disabilities with Out-of-School Suspensions

Note: Lower values and larger decreases are desired

- Figure 4.19: Total number of Students with Disabilities suspended for specified lengths of time divided by the total number of Students with Disabilities, 2019-20
- Figure 4.20: Percentage Point Change in Students with Disabilities with Out-of-School Suspensions, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 4.21: Trends in Students with Disabilities with Out-of-School Suspensions, 2016-17 to 2019-20

4.20 Percentage Point Change in Students with Disabilities with Out-of-School Suspensions, 2016-17 to 2019-20

4.21 Trends in Students with Disabilities with Out-of-School Suspensions, 2016-17 to 2019-20

Best Quartile for Overall Performance (2019-20)
- Boston
- Broward County
- Chicago
- Clark County
- Los Angeles
- Miami
- New York
- Newark
- San Diego
- San Francisco
- Seattle

Best Quartile for Change in Performance (2016-17 to 2019-20)
- Dallas
- Dayton
- Des Moines
- Detroit
- Nashville
- San Antonio
- Toledo
- Wichita
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Academic Key Performance Indicators 2021
### Percentage of English Language Learners with Out-of-School Suspensions

Note: Lower values and larger decreases are desired

- Figure 4.22: Total number of English Language Learners suspended for specified lengths of time divided by the total number of English Language Learners, 2019-20
- Figure 4.23: Percentage Point Change in English Language Learners with Out-of-School Suspensions, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 4.24: Trends in English Language Learners with Out-of-School Suspensions, 2016-17 to 2019-20

#### 4.24 Trends in English Language Learners with Out-of-School Suspensions, 2016-17 to 2019-20

- **Best Quartile for Overall Performance**
  - (2019-20)
  - Boston
  - Broward County
  - Chicago
  - Clark County
  - District of Columbia
  - Los Angeles
  - Miami
  - New York
  - Newark
  - San Francisco
  - Seattle

- **Best Quartile for Change in Performance**
  - (2016-17 to 2019-20)
  - Clark County
  - Cleveland
  - Dayton
  - Detroit
  - Jefferson
  - Long Beach
  - Toledo
  - Wichita

---
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4.25 Number of Instructional Days Missed Due to Out-of-School Suspensions per 100 Students, 2019-20

Number of Instructional Days Missed Due to Out-of-School Suspensions per 100 Students

Median 15.2
Number of Instructional Days Missed Due to Out-of-School Suspensions per 100 Students

Note: Lower values and larger decreases are desired

- Figure 4.25: Total number of instructional days missed due to out-of-school suspensions divided by total student enrollment multiplied by 100, 2019-20
- Figure 4.26: Difference in Number of Instructional Days Missed Due to Out-of-School Suspensions per 100 Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 4.27: Trends in Number of Instructional Days Missed Due to Out-of-School Suspensions per 100 Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20

4.26 Difference in Number of Instructional Days Missed Due to Out-of-School Suspensions per 100 Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20

4.27 Trends in Number of Instructional Days Missed Due to Out-of-School Suspensions per 100 Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20

Best Quartile for Overall Performance (2019-20)
- Broward County
- Chicago
- Clark County
- Los Angeles
- Miami
- New York
- Newark
- Portland
- San Francisco
- Seattle

Best Quartile for Change in Performance (2016-17 to 2019-20)
- Clark County
- Cleveland
- Dallas
- Detroit
- Jefferson
- Nashville
- Toledo

The Council of The Great City Schools
4.28 Number of Instructional Days Missed Due to Out-of-School Suspensions per 100 Black Male Students, 2019-20
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Number of Instructional Days Missed Due to Out-of-School Suspensions per 100 Black Male Students

Note: Lower values and larger decreases are desired

- Figure 4.28: Total number of instructional days missed due to out-of-school suspensions divided by total student enrollment multiplied by 100, 2019-20
- Figure 4.29: Difference in Number of Instructional Days Missed Due to Out-of-School Suspensions per 100 Black Male Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 4.30: Trends in Number of Instructional Days Missed Due to Out-of-School Suspensions per 100 Black Male Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20

4.29 Difference in Number of Instructional Days Missed Due to Out-of-School Suspensions per 100 Black Male Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPIID</th>
<th>Percentage Point Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>−97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>−97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>−54.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>−34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>−33.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>−33.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>−34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>−21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>−23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>−24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>−19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>−19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>−21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>−19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>−18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>−16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>−10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>−10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>−10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>−12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>−11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>−11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>−11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>−11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>−11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>−11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>−11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>−11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>−11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>−11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>−11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>−11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>−11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>−11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>−11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>−11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>−11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>−11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>−11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>−11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>−11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>−11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>−11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>−11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>−11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>−11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>−11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>−11.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.30 Trends in Number of Instructional Days Missed Due to Out-of-School Suspensions per 100 Black Male Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20

Best Quartile for Overall Performance (2019-20)
- Boston
- Broward County
- Chicago
- Clark County
- Long Beach
- Los Angeles
- Miami
- New York
- Newark
- Seattle

Best Quartile for Change in Performance (2016-17 to 2019-20)
- Clark County
- Dallas
- Detroit
- Jefferson
- Seattle
- Toledo
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPIID</th>
<th>Number of Instructional Days Missed Due to Out-of-School Suspensions per 100 Black Female Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>44.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>80.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>111.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Number of Instructional Days Missed Due to Out-of-School Suspensions per 100 Black Female Students

Note: Lower values and larger decreases are desired

- Figure 4.31: Total number of instructional days missed due to out-of-school suspensions divided by total student enrollment multiplied by 100, 2019-20
- Figure 4.32: Difference in Number of Instructional Days Missed Due to Out-of-School Suspensions per 100 Black Female Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 4.33: Trends in Number of Instructional Days Missed Due to Out-of-School Suspensions per 100 Black Female Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20

4.32 Difference in Number of Instructional Days Missed Due to Out-of-School Suspensions per 100 Black Female Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20

KPI ID
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4.33 Trends in Number of Instructional Days Missed Due to Out-of-School Suspensions per 100 Black Female Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20

Best Quartile for Overall Performance
(2019-20)
- Boston
- Broward County
- Chicago
- Clark County
- Long Beach
- Los Angeles
- Miami
- New York
- Newark
- Seattle

Best Quartile for Change in Performance
(2016-17 to 2019-20)
- Clark County
- Cleveland
- Detroit
- Fort Worth
- Jefferson
- Seattle
4.34 Number of Instructional Days Missed Due to Out-of-School Suspensions per 100 Hispanic Male Students, 2019-20

Number of Instructional Days Missed Due to Out-of-School Suspensions per 100 Hispanic Male Students

Median 11.3
Number of Instructional Days Missed Due to Out-of-School Suspensions per 100 Hispanic Male Students

Note: Lower values and larger decreases are desired

- Figure 4.34: Total number of instructional days missed due to out-of-school suspensions divided by total student enrollment multiplied by 100, 2019-20
- Figure 4.35: Difference in Number of Instructional Days Missed Due to Out-of-School Suspensions per 100 Hispanic Male Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 4.36: Trends in Number of Instructional Days Missed Due to Out-of-School Suspensions per 100 Hispanic Male Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20

4.35 Difference in Number of Instructional Days Missed Due to Out-of-School Suspensions per 100 Hispanic Male Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20

4.36 Trends in Number of Instructional Days Missed Due to Out-of-School Suspensions per 100 Hispanic Male Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20

Best Quartile for Overall Performance (2019-20)
- Broward County
- Chicago
- Clark County
- Dayton
- Los Angeles
- Miami
- New York
- Newark
- Pinellas
- Pittsburgh

Best Quartile for Change in Performance (2016-17 to 2019-20)
- Austin
- Clark County
- Cleveland
- Dallas
- Fresno
- Jefferson
- Seattle
- Fresno
- Jefferson
- Seattle
4.37 Number of Instructional Days Missed Due to Out-of-School Suspensions per 100 Hispanic Female Students, 2019-20
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Number of Instructional Days Missed Due to Out-of-School Suspensions per 100 Hispanic Female Students

Note: Lower values and larger decreases are desired

- Figure 4.37: Total number of instructional days missed due to out-of-school suspensions divided by total student enrollment multiplied by 100, 2019-20
- Figure 4.38: Difference in Number of Instructional Days Missed Due to Out-of-School Suspensions per 100 Hispanic Female Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 4.39: Trends in Number of Instructional Days Missed Due to Out-of-School Suspensions per 100 Hispanic Female Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20

4.38 Difference in Number of Instructional Days Missed Due to Out-of-School Suspensions per 100 Hispanic Female Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPIID</th>
<th>−10</th>
<th>−5</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>35</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>45</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>55</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>65</th>
<th>70</th>
<th>75</th>
<th>80</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Point Change</td>
<td>−18</td>
<td>−9.9</td>
<td>−7.0</td>
<td>−6.6</td>
<td>−4.9</td>
<td>−4.3</td>
<td>−4.3</td>
<td>−3.9</td>
<td>−3.6</td>
<td>−3.3</td>
<td>−2.7</td>
<td>−2.3</td>
<td>−2.0</td>
<td>−1.5</td>
<td>−1.2</td>
<td>−1.1</td>
<td>−0.9</td>
<td>−0.6</td>
<td>−0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>−2.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>Median 1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.39 Trends in Number of Instructional Days Missed Due to Out-of-School Suspensions per 100 Hispanic Female Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20

Best Quartile for Overall Performance (2019-20)
- Broward County
- Chicago
- Clark County
- District of Columbia
- Long Beach
- Los Angeles
- Miami
- New York
- Newark
- San Francisco

Best Quartile for Change in Performance (2016-17 to 2019-20)
- Austin
- Clark County
- Cleveland
- Dallas
- Jefferson
- Milwaukee
- Seattle
4.40 Number of Instructional Days Missed Due to Out-of-School Suspensions per 100 Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students, 2019-20

Number of Instructional Days Missed Due to Out-of-School Suspensions per 100 Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students

Median 16.8
Number of Instructional Days Missed Due to Out-of-School Suspensions per 100 Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students

Note: Lower values and larger decreases are desired
- Figure 4.40: Total number of instructional days missed due to out-of-school suspensions divided by total student enrollment multiplied by 100, 2019-20
- Figure 4.41: Difference in Number of Instructional Days Missed Due to Out-of-School Suspensions per 100 Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 4.42: Trends in Number of Instructional Days Missed Due to Out-of-School Suspensions per 100 Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20

4.41 Difference in Number of Instructional Days Missed Due to Out-of-School Suspensions per 100 Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20

4.42 Trends in Number of Instructional Days Missed Due to Out-of-School Suspensions per 100 Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) Students, 2016-17 to 2019-20
4.43 Number of Instructional Days Missed Due to Out-of-School Suspensions per 100 Students with Disabilities, 2019-20
Number of Instructional Days Missed Due to Out-of-School Suspensions per 100 Students with Disabilities

Note: Lower values and larger decreases are desired

- Figure 4.43: Total number of instructional days missed due to out-of-school suspensions divided by total student enrollment multiplied by 100, 2019-20
- Figure 4.44: Difference in Number of Instructional Days Missed Due to Out-of-School Suspensions per 100 Students with Disabilities, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 4.45: Trends in Number of Instructional Days Missed Due to Out-of-School Suspensions per 100 Students with Disabilities, 2016-17 to 2019-20

4.44 Difference in Number of Instructional Days Missed Due to Out-of-School Suspensions per 100 Students with Disabilities, 2016-17 to 2019-20

4.45 Trends in Number of Instructional Days Missed Due to Out-of-School Suspensions per 100 Students with Disabilities, 2016-17 to 2019-20

Best Quartile for Overall Performance (2019-20)
- Boston
- Broward County
- Chicago
- Clark County
- Long Beach
- Los Angeles
- Miami
- New York
- Newark
- San Francisco

Best Quartile for Change in Performance (2016-17 to 2019-20)
- Detroit
- Fort Worth
- Fresno
- Guilford County
- Jefferson
- Nashville
- Toledo
- Medium -10.2
Number of Instructional Days Missed Due to Out-of-School Suspensions per 100 English Language Learners, 2019-20
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Number of Instructional Days Missed Due to Out-of-School Suspensions per 100 English Language Learners

Note: Lower values and larger decreases are desired

- Figure 4.46: Total number of instructional days missed due to out-of-school suspensions divided by total student enrollment multiplied by 100, 2019-20
- Figure 4.47: Difference in Number of Instructional Days Missed Due to Out-of-School Suspensions per 100 English Language Learners, 2016-17 to 2019-20
- Figure 4.48: Trends in Number of Instructional Days Missed Due to Out-of-School Suspensions per 100 English Language Learners, 2016-17 to 2019-20

### 4.47 Difference in Number of Instructional Days Missed Due to Out-of-School Suspensions per 100 English Language Learners, 2016-17 to 2019-20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPIID</th>
<th>Percentage Point Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>−30</td>
<td>−25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>−20</td>
<td>−17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>−10</td>
<td>−14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>−13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>−12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>−9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>−8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>−8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>−7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>−7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>−5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>−3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>−3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>−1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Best Quartile for Overall Performance (2019-20)
- Boston
- Broward County
- Chicago
- District of Columbia
- Los Angeles
- Miami
- New York
- Newark
- Pinellas
- San Francisco

Best Quartile for Change in Performance (2016-17 to 2019-20)
- Austin
- Clark County
- Cleveland
- Jefferson
- Long Beach
- Seattle
- Toledo
- Minneapolis − 2.8
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APPENDIX A. DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS
The Council of The Great City Schools

Academic KPIs Survey

Thank you for participating in this survey of Academic Key Performance Indicators (KPIs). The Council of the Great City Schools and its members have developed this collection of academic progress and achievement KPIs to help your district make better informed decisions about curriculum and instruction, and compare yourself against other major city school systems.

Survey Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Refers To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survey School Year</td>
<td>The 2017-18 academic school year, including the summer immediately following the academic year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next School Year</td>
<td>The school year after the Survey School Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous School Year</td>
<td>The school year preceding the Survey School Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Fiscal Year</td>
<td>The 2017-18 fiscal year, as defined by the district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next Fiscal Year</td>
<td>The fiscal year after the Survey Fiscal Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Fiscal Year</td>
<td>The fiscal year preceding the Survey Fiscal Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>Full-Time Equivalent staff. In this survey, FTE generally refers to district staff, but may also include independent contractors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEP</td>
<td>Individualized Educational Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWD</td>
<td>Students with disabilities* (SWDs) refers to students who have a disability under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and who are eligible for a free appropriate public education under federal and state law. This is limited to students aged 6-21 unless otherwise specified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL</td>
<td>English language learners, or students who are identified as having limited English proficiency (LEP).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former ELLE</td>
<td>A student who was identified as EL (thus having limited English proficiency) in the past but who no longer meets the state’s definition of EL (or the term used for a student with limited English proficiency). This includes students who were identified as an English learner at any point.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.1. Achievement in Algebra I/Integrated Math I (or equivalent) by Grade Nine, by Subgroup (Official Fall Count)

We are looking for the student count as of the official fall count. “Completing” a course successfully refers to earning whatever is considered a passing grade by the school. If a student completes Algebra I/Integrated Math I (or the equivalent) in summer school, count this towards the Survey School Year (i.e., the summer after the eighth grade counts towards the student’s eighth-grade year). The three right-hand columns are all subsets of the left-hand column.

Table 1.1 Algebra I/Integrated Math I Completion Rate for Credit by Grade Nine, by Subgroup

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total number of first-time ninth-grade students in Survey School Year</th>
<th>Number of first-time ninth-grade students who successfully completed Algebra I / Integrated Math I (or equivalent) in grade seven</th>
<th>Number of first-time ninth-grade students who successfully completed Algebra I / Integrated Math I (or equivalent) in grade eight</th>
<th>Number of first-time ninth-grade students who successfully completed Algebra I / Integrated Math I (or equivalent) in grade nine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native, female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native, male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Hawaiian Native/Pacific Islander, female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Hawaiian Native/Pacific Islander, male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American, female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American, male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic, female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic, male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races, female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races, male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students With Disabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former ELLS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible for Free/Reduced-Price Lunch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1.2. AP Exam Scores (Official Fall Count)
We are looking for the student count as of the official fall count. For this section, consider each AP exam score, not each student. For a student who took four AP courses and took the exam for each course, this would count as four AP exam scores. All exam scores are for exams taken within the Survey School Year or in the summer immediately following the Survey School Year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number of AP exam scores</th>
<th>Number of AP exam scores that were three or higher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native, female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native, male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Hawaiian Native/Pacific Islander, female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Hawaiian Native/Pacific Islander, male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American, female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American, male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic, female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic, male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Racer, male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Racer, female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with Disabilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former ELLs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible for Free/Reduced-Price Lunch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.3. Ninth-Grade Course Failures and GPAs, by Subgroup (Official Fall Count)
Number of ninth-grade students who failed one or more core courses in the ninth grade: Core subjects are defined as Math, English, Science, and Social Studies. These include all ninth-grade students, including students who repeated the ninth grade.

Number of ninth-grade students with a B average or better (Survey School Year): This is a count of the number of students whose ninth-grade GPA was the equivalent of a "B average" as defined by the district. For example, some districts might define a "B" as a 3.0 GPA. This includes both first time ninth grade students as well as students repeating the ninth grade. If students are repeating the ninth grade, only include their most recent ninth-grade GPA (i.e., their GPA for the survey school year).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of ninth-grade students who failed one core course or more</th>
<th>Number of ninth-grade students with B average GPA or better in all grade nine courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native, female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native, male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Hawaiian Native/Pacific Islander, female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Hawaiian Native/Pacific Islander, male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American, female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American, male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic, female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic, male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Racer, female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Racer, male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with Disabilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former ELLs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible for Free/Reduced-Price Lunch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1.4. Advanced Placement, AP-Equivalent, and Early College Participation (Official Fall Count)

**AP-Equivalent Courses** (third column from the left) should not include AP courses. It should only include non-AP courses that are equivalent in rigor and requirements (for example, International Baccalaureate (IB) and Advanced International Certificate of Education (AICE)). Such courses must generally include an external student assessment and certificate of achievement. Do NOT include “honors-level” courses or courses for students identified for gifted and talented Education (GATE), unless they meet similar requirements as outlined above.

*Early college is a general description for dual enrollment, early college, or any other program (other than AP or IB) in which a student can earn college credit. All student counts should be as of the official count in the fall of the survey school year.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1.4. Advanced Placement, AP-Equivalent, and Early College Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of students in grades nine through 12 who took one AP course or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native, female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native, male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Hawaiian Native/Pacific Islander, female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Hawaiian Native/Pacific Islander, male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American, female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American, male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic, female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic, male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races, female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races, male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with Disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former ELL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible for Free/Reduced-Price Lunch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.5. Four- and Five-Year Graduation Rates

For the table below, enter the student graduation rate for each student subgroup as specified by the requirements of your state’s four-year cohort and five-year cohort graduation rates [e.g., the National Governor’s Association (NGA) Compact Rate]. These figures should be expressed as a percentage rounded to the nearest tenth, and should NOT include the percent symbol (%). For example, a rate of 75.4% should be entered as “75.4.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1.5. Four- and Five-Year Graduation Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of students who graduated in Survey School Year after being in grades nine through 12 for four years, using the methodology required for your state reporting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native, female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native, male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Hawaiian Native/Pacific Islander, female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Hawaiian Native/Pacific Islander, male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American, female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American, male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic, female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic, male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races, female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races, male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with Disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former ELL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible for Free/Reduced-Price Lunch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.1. Student Absences - Grade Three (Rolling Count)
For the table below, enter the rolling student count for the number of third-grade students who were absent for the number of days specified (e.g., Absent 5-9 days) by student subgroup, as specified. The spans of absenteeism can be non-consecutive days of absences (i.e., the total number of days absent) throughout the Survey School Year for each individual student. Only include absences from the regular school year; do not include summer school absences. Include excused as well as unexcused absences. Do not count field trips as absences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of third-grade students absent 5-9 days</th>
<th>Number of third-grade students absent 10-19 days</th>
<th>Number of third-grade students absent 20+ days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native, female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native, male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Hawaiian Native/Pacific Islander, female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Hawaiian Native/Pacific Islander, male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American, female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American, male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic, female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic, male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races, female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races, male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with Disabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former ELLs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible for Free/Reduced-Price Lunch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please briefly describe your district’s definition of an “absence” for this grade level:

Table 2.2 Student Absences - Grade Six (Rolling Count)
For the table below, enter the rolling student count for the number of sixth-grade students who were absent for the number of days specified (e.g., Absent 5-9 days) by student subgroup, as specified. The spans of absenteeism can be non-consecutive days of absences (i.e., the total number of days absent) throughout the Survey School Year for each individual student. Only include absences from the regular school year; do not include summer school absences. Include excused as well as unexcused absences. Do not count field trips as absences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of sixth-grade students absent 5-3 days</th>
<th>Number of sixth-grade students absent 10-13 days</th>
<th>Number of sixth-grade students absent 20+ days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native, female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native, male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Hawaiian Native/Pacific Islander, female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Hawaiian Native/Pacific Islander, male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American, female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American, male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic, female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic, male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races, female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races, male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with Disabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former ELLs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible for Free/Reduced-Price Lunch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please briefly describe your district’s definition of an “absence” for this grade level:
Table 2.3. Student Absences - Grade Eight (Rolling Count)
For the table below, enter the rolling student count for the number of eighth-grade students who were absent for the number of days specified (e.g., Absent 5-9 days) by student subgroup, as specified. The spans of absenteeism can be non-consecutive days of absences (i.e., the total number of days absent) throughout the Survey School Year for each individual student. Only include absences from the regular school year; do not include summer school absences. Include excused as well as unexcused absences. Do not count field trips as absences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of eighth-grade students absent 5-9 days</th>
<th>Number of eighth-grade students absent 10-19</th>
<th>Number of eighth-grade students absent 20+ days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native, female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native, male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Hawaiian Native/Pacific Islander, female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Hawaiian Native/Pacific Islander, male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/ African American, female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/ African American, male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic, female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic, male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races, female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races, male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with Disabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former ELLs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible for Free/Reduced-Price Lunch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please briefly describe your district's definition of an "absence" for this grade level:

Table 2.4. Student Absences - Grade Nine (Rolling Count)
For the table below, enter the rolling student count for the number of ninth-grade students who were absent for the number of days specified (e.g., Absent 5-9 days) by student subgroup, as specified. The spans of absenteeism can be non-consecutive days of absences (i.e., the total number of days absent) throughout the Survey School Year for each individual student. Only include absences from the regular school year; do not include summer school absences. Include excused as well as unexcused absences. Do not count field trips as absences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of ninth-grade students</th>
<th>Number of ninth-grade students absent 10-19</th>
<th>Number of ninth-grade students absent 20+ days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native, female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native, male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Hawaiian Native/Pacific Islander, female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Hawaiian Native/Pacific Islander, male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/ African American, female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/ African American, male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic, female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic, male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races, female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races, male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with Disabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former ELLs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible for Free/Reduced-Price Lunch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please briefly describe your district's definition of an "absence" for this grade level:
Table 3.1. Student Suspensions (Rolling Count)
Recall, outcomes number 10 of school suspension days for the Survey School Year; this is for all students in all grades, including pre-K. For each subgroup as specified, enter the total number of students who were suspended for the specified number of suspension days for the Survey School Year. Because this is a count of suspension days for the school year, a student can be included only once for each span. For example, a student who was suspended twice in the year, once for three days and once for nine days, would be counted under “11-19 suspension days,” because the student had a total of twelve suspension days. This student would not be included in the count for “1-5 suspension days” or in the count for “6-10 suspension days,” because each of these are too low for this student’s suspension day count.

The “total number of instructional days missed due to suspension” refers to the aggregate sum of suspension days for all students in all grades. For example, if 2,500 students were suspended for six days each, this would be counted as 2,500 x 6 = 15,000 suspension days.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number of students suspended</th>
<th>Number of students with 1-5 out-of-school suspension days for the Survey School Year</th>
<th>Number of students with 6-10 out-of-school suspension days for the Survey School Year</th>
<th>Number of students with 11-19 out-of-school suspension days for the Survey School Year</th>
<th>Number of students with 20+ out-of-school suspension days for the Survey School Year</th>
<th>Total number of instructional days missed due to out-of-school suspension for the Survey School Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native, female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native, male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander, female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander, male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American, female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American, male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic, female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic, male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races, female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races, male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with Disabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former ELLs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible for Free/Reduced-Price Lunch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.1. Total Enrollment (Rolling Count)
Recall, outcomes number 10 of school suspension days for the Survey School Year; this is for all students in all grades, including pre-K. For each subgroup as specified, enter the total number of students enrolled in the district for the 2017-18 school year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number of students enrolled in the 2017-18 school year (Rolling Count)</th>
<th>Total number of students enrolled in kindergarten in the 2017-18 school year (Rolling Count)</th>
<th>Total number of students enrolled in grades eight in the 2017-18 school year (Rolling Count)</th>
<th>Total number of students enrolled in grades nine in the 2017-18 school year (Rolling Count)</th>
<th>Total number of students enrolled in grades ten in the 2017-18 school year (Rolling Count)</th>
<th>Total number of students enrolled in grades eleven in the 2017-18 school year (Rolling Count)</th>
<th>Total number of students enrolled in grades twelve in the 2017-18 school year (Rolling Count)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native, female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native, male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander, female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander, male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American, female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American, male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic, female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic, male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races, female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races, male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with Disabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former ELLs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible for Free/Reduced-Price Lunch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6.1: Total Enrollment (Official Fall Count)

*Include students enrolled during the official fall enrollment period in the district for each grade level.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Total Number of Students Enrolled in the 2017-18 School Year (Official Fall Count)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Grade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Grade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Grade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Grade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Grade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Grade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Grade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Grade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th Grade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th Grade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th Grade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th Grade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6.2: Student Enrollment (Official Fall Count)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Total Number of Students Enrolled in the 2017-18 School Year (Official Fall Count)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Grade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Grade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Grade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Grade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Grade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Grade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Grade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Grade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th Grade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th Grade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th Grade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th Grade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Additional columns for different criteria such as race, gender, etc.*
APPENDIX B. COUNCIL OF THE GREAT CITY SCHOOLS
Council of the Great City Schools

The Council of the Great City Schools is a coalition of 76 of the nation’s largest urban public 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 regular oversight of the 501(c) (3) organization. The mission of the Council is to advocate for urban public education and assist its members in the improvement of leadership and instruction. 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; conducts research and studies on urban school conditions and trends; and operates ongoing networks of senior school district managers with responsibilities in areas such as federal programs, operations, finance, personnel, communications, research, and technology. The Council was founded in 1956 and incorporated in 1961 and has its headquarters in Washington, DC.

Chair of the Board
Barbara Jenkins
Superintendent, Orange County Public Schools

Chair-elect
Kelly Gonez
School Board, Los Angeles Unified School District

Secretary/Treasurer
William Hite
Superintendent, The School District of Philadelphia

Immediate Past Chair
Michael O’Neill
School Committee, Boston Public Schools

Executive Director
Raymond Hart
Council of the Great City Schools