In your work, you regularly have to organize data in a way that will help your audience understand something and, often, act on it.
Rather than create a fake teaching tool for you, decided to walk you through a real presentation I recently made—but stop, as I go, to explain a little bit about why.
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America: Two Powerful Stories
1. **Land of Opportunity**: Work hard, and you can become anything you want to be.
2. **Generational Advancement:**

Through hard work, each generation of parents can assure a better life — and better education — for their children.
These stories animated hopes and dreams of people here at home.

And drew countless immigrants to our shores.
Yes, America was often intolerant...

And they knew the “Dream” was a work in progress.
We were:

• The first to provide universal high school;
• The first to build public universities;
• The first to build community colleges;
• The first to broaden access to college, through GI Bill, Pell Grants, ...
Percent of U.S. adults with a high school diploma

- 1920: 21%
- 1940: 38%
- 1960: 61%
- 1980: 85%
- 2000: 88%
- 2012: 90%
Percent of U.S. adults with a B.A. or more

2012

33%
Progress was painfully slow, especially for people of color. But year by year, decade by decade...
Percent of U.S. adults with a high school diploma, by race 2012

- White: 95%
- Black: 89%
- Latino: 75%
Percent of U.S. adults with a B.A. or more, by race

2012

White: 40%
Black: 23%
Latino: 15%
Then, beginning in the eighties, inequality started growing again.
In the past four years alone, 95% of all income gains have gone to the top 1%.

In 2012:

- In 2012, the top 5% of Americans took home 22% of the nation’s income; the top .1% took home 11%.
- And the bottom 20% took home just 3%.

Instead of being the most equal, the U.S. has the third highest income inequality among OECD nations.

Note: Gini coefficient ranges from 0 to 1, where 0 indicates total income equality and 1 indicates total income inequality.

Median Wealth of White Families

20 X that of African Americans

18 X that of Latinos

Not just wages and wealth, but social mobility as well.
U.S. intergenerational mobility was increasing until 1980, but has sharply declined since.

The falling elasticity meant increased economic mobility until 1980. Since then, the elasticity has risen, and mobility has slowed.

The US now has one of lowest rates of intergenerational mobility

Cross-country examples of the link between father and son wages

At macro level, better and more equal education is not the only answer.

But at the individual level, it really is.
What schools and colleges do, in other words, is hugely important to our economy, our democracy, and our society.
There is one road up, and that road runs through us.
So, what did I just do:
• Established a reason for them to listen—both moral and economic;
• Demonstrated that we can accomplish a lot as a country when we try; and,
• Shared a little bit of who I am, which turns out to be important.
So, how are we doing?
First, some good news.

After more than a decade of fairly flat achievement and stagnant or growing gaps in K-12, we appear to be turning the corner with our elementary students.
Since 1999, large gains for all groups of students, especially students of color

9 Year Olds – NAEP Reading

*Denotes previous assessment format

Since 1999, performance rising for all groups of students

9 Year Olds – NAEP Math

*Denotes previous assessment format

Looked at differently (and on the “other” NAEP exam)
All groups have improved since 1990, but gaps between groups remain wide

National Public – Grade 4 NAEP Math

Average Scale Score


187 219 217 231 219 228 230 258 250 224

Source: NAEP Data Explorer, NCES (Proficient Scale Score = 249)

*Accommodations not permitted
1996 NAEP Grade 4 Math

By Race/Ethnicity – Nation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Proficient/Advanced</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Below Basic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: • NAEP Data Explorer, NCES
2013 NAEP Grade 4 Math

By Race/Ethnicity – National Public

Percentage of Students

African American
- Proficient/Advanced: 18%
- Basic: 48%
- Below Basic: 34%

Latino
- Proficient/Advanced: 26%
- Basic: 47%
- Below Basic: 27%

White
- Proficient/Advanced: 54%
- Basic: 37%
- Below Basic: 9%

Middle grades are up, too.
Record performance for students of color

13 Year Olds – NAEP Reading

*Denotes previous assessment format

Over the last decade, all groups have steadily improved and gaps have narrowed.

National Public – Grade 8 NAEP Math

*Accommodations not permitted
Source: NAEP Data Explorer, NCES (Proficient Scale Score = 299)
Bottom Line:

When we really focus on something, we make progress!
Clearly, much more remains to be done in elementary and middle school. Too many youngsters still enter high school way behind.
But at least we have some traction on elementary and middle school problems.

The same is NOT true of our high schools.
Achievement is flat in reading.

17-Year-Olds Overall - NAEP

Source: NAEP Long-Term Trends, NCES (2004)
Math achievement is flat over time.

17-Year-Olds Overall - NAEP

* Denotes previous assessment format

Source: National Center for Education Statistics, NAEP 2008 Trends in Academic Progress
And gaps between groups haven’t narrowed since the late 80s and early 90s.
Reading: Not much gap narrowing since 1988.

17 Year Olds – NAEP Reading

- African American
- Latino
- White

*Denotes previous assessment format

Math: Not much gap closing since 1990.

17 Year Olds – NAEP Math

*Denotes previous assessment format
Moreover, no matter how you cut the data, our students aren’t doing well compared with their peers in other countries.
Of 34 OECD Countries, U.S.A. Ranks 17th in Reading

2012 PISA - Reading

Of 34 OECD Countries, U.S.A. Ranks 20th in Science

2012 PISA - Science
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Of 34 OECD Countries, U.S.A. Ranks 27th in Math Literacy

2012 PISA - Math

Average Scale Score

Higher than U.S. average
Not measurably different from U.S. average
Lower than U.S. average

Only place we rank high?

Inequality.
Among OECD Countries, U.S.A. has the 4\textsuperscript{th} Largest Gap Between High-SES and Low-SES Students

Source: PISA 2006 Results, OECD, table 4.8b
Among OECD Countries, U.S.A. has the 5th Largest Gap Between High-SES and Low-SES Students

2009 PISA – Reading

Source: PISA 2009 Results, OECD, Table II.3.1
The U.S. Gap Between High-SES and Low-SES Students is Equivalent to Over Two Years of Schooling

Source: PISA 2012 Results, OECD, Annex B1, Chapter 2, Table II.2.4a
Gaps in achievement begin before children arrive at the schoolhouse door.

But, rather than organizing our educational system to ameliorate this problem, we organize it to exacerbate the problem.
How?

By giving students who arrive with less, less in school, too.
Some of these “lesses” are a result of choices that policymakers make.
Funding Gaps *Within States*: National inequities in state and local revenue per student

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High-Poverty versus Low-Poverty Districts</td>
<td>−$773 per student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Minority versus Low-Minority Districts</td>
<td>−$1,122 per student</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In truth, though, some of the most devastating “lesses” are a function of choices that educators (and school board members) make.
Choices we make about what to expect of whom.....
Students in poor schools receive As for work that would earn Cs in affluent schools.

Choices we make about what to teach whom...
Even African-American students with high math performance in fifth grade are unlikely to be placed in algebra in eighth grade.

Students of color are less likely to attend high schools that offer physics.

- High schools with the highest African-American and Latino enrollment: 40%
- High schools with the lowest African-American and Latino enrollment: 66%

Source: U.S. Department of Education Office of Civil Rights, Civil Rights Data Collection, March 2012
Students of color are less likely to attend high schools that offer calculus.

Source: U.S. Department of Education Office for Civil Rights, Civil Rights Data Collection
And choices we make about who teaches whom...
Students at high-minority schools more likely to be taught by novice* teachers.

Note: High minority school: 75% or more of the students are Black, Hispanic, American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian or Pacific Islander. Low-minority school: 10% or fewer of the students are non-White students. Novice teachers are those with three years or fewer experience.

Math classes at high-poverty, high-minority secondary schools are more likely to be taught by out-of-field* teachers.

Note: High-poverty school: 55 percent or more of the students are eligible for free/reduced-price lunch. Low-poverty school: 15 percent or fewer of the students are eligible for free/reduced-price lunch. High-minority school: 78 percent or more of the students are black, Hispanic, American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian or Pacific Islander. Low-minority school: 12 percent or fewer of the students are non-white students.

*Teachers with neither certification nor major. Data for secondary-level core academic classes (math, science, social studies, English) across the U.S. Source: Education Trust Analysis of 2007-08 Schools and Staffing Survey data.
Tennessee: High-poverty/high-minority schools have fewer of the “most effective” teachers and more “least effective” teachers.

Note: High poverty/high minority means at least 75 percent of students qualify for FRPL and at least 75 percent are minority.

Los Angeles: Black, Latino students have fewer highly effective teachers, more weak ones.

Latino and black students are:

3X as likely to get low-effectiveness teachers

1/2 as likely to get highly effective teachers

So, what did I just do?

- Reminded them that, while some contributors to achievement gaps are outside of their control, others are decidedly within it.
The results are devastating.

Kids who come in a little behind, leave a lot behind.
And these are the students who remain in school through 12th grade.
Students of color are less likely to graduate from high school on time.

Class of 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Averaged Freshman Graduation Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Add those numbers up and throw in college entry and graduation, and different groups of young Americans obtain degrees and very different rates...
Whites attain bachelor’s degrees at nearly twice the rate of blacks and almost three times the rate of Hispanics.

Bachelor’s Degree Attainment of Young Adults (25-29-year-olds), 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Bachelor's Degree Attainment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NCES, *Condition of Education* 2010 (Table A-22-1) and U.S. Census Bureau, Educational Attainment in the United States: 2012
Young people from high-income families earn bachelor’s degrees at seven times the rate of those from low-income families.

Source: Postsecondary Education Opportunity, “Bachelor’s Degree Attainment by Age 24 by Family Income Quartiles, 1970 to 2010.”
These rates threaten the health of our democracy.

But even for those who don’t care much about that, the rates are particularly worrisome, given which groups are growing — and which aren’t.
Changing demographics demand greater focus on underrepresented populations.

Population Increase, Ages 0–24, (in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>31,337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>4,431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>-5,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>-9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage Increase, Ages 0–24

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>137%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>-9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>-9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Closing racial gaps in degree attainment will create more than half the degrees necessary to raise America to first in the world in degree attainment.

Note: Projected Population Growth, Ages 0–24, 2010-2050
Given these patterns, it is not surprising that our international standing is slipping.
We’re relatively strong in educational attainment.

Percentage Of Residents Aged 25–64 With a Postsecondary Degree

Note: Adults with a postsecondary degree include those who have completed either a tertiary-type B program (programs that last for at least two years, are skill-based, and prepare students for direct entry into the labor market) or a tertiary-type A program (programs that last at least three, but usually four, years, are largely theory-based, and provide qualifications for entry into highly skilled professions or advanced research programs).
Our world standing drops to 15th for younger workers.

Percentage of Residents Aged 25–34 With a Postsecondary Degree

Note: Adults with a postsecondary degree include those who have completed either a tertiary-type B program (programs that last for at least two years, are skill-based, and prepare students for direct entry into the labor market) or a tertiary-type A program (programs that last at least three, but usually four, years, are largely theory-based, and provide qualifications for entry into highly-skilled professions or advanced research programs).
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We’re near the bottom in intergenerational progress.

Difference in Percentage of Residents Aged 45–54 and Those Aged 25-34 With a Postsecondary Degree

Note: Adults with a postsecondary degree include those who have completed either a tertiary-type B program (programs that last for at least two years, are skill-based, and prepare students for direct entry into the labor market) or a tertiary-type A program (programs that last at least three, but usually four, years, are largely theory-based, and provide qualifications for entry into highly-skilled professions or advanced research programs).

So, what did I just do?
• Showed both progress, to give hope, and the remaining challenge, to inspire action.
• Let them see how the pieces connect—the decisions we make in K-12 have lasting impact in college and beyond.
What Can We Do?

An awful lot of Americans have decided that we can’t do much.
What We Hear Many Educators Say:

- They’re poor
- Their parents don’t care
- They come to schools without breakfast
- Not enough books
- Not enough parents

Source: N/A
But if they are right, why are low-income students and students of color performing so much higher in some schools...
George Hall Elementary School  
Mobile, Alabama

• 549 students in grades PK-5  
  99% African American
• 99% Low Income

Note: Enrollment data are for 2009-10 school year
Source: Alabama Department of Education
Big Improvement at George Hall Elementary

Low-Income Students – Grade 4 Reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>George Hall</th>
<th>Alabama</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Alabama Department of Education
Exceeding Standards: George Hall students outperform white students in Alabama

Grade 5 Math (2011)

- **African-American Students - George Hall**
  - Exceeds Standards: 97%
  - Meets Standards: 7%
  - Partially Meets Standards: 24%
  - Does Not Meet Standards: 0%

- **White Students - Alabama**
  - Exceeds Standards: 69%
  - Meets Standards: 24%
  - Partially Meets Standards: 7%

Source: Alabama Department of Education
Halle Hewetson Elementary School
Las Vegas, NV

• 962 students in grades PK – 5
  – 85% Latino
  – 7% African American

• 100% Low Income

• 71% Limited English Proficient

Note: Data are for 2010-2011 school year
Source: Nevada Department of Education
Big Improvement at Halle Hewetson Elementary

Latino Students – Grade 3 Reading

Source: Nevada Department of Education
High Performance Across Groups at Halle Hewetson Elementary

Grade 3 Math (2011)

- All: 91% (Halle Hewetson) vs 69% (Nevada)
- Latino: 95% (Halle Hewetson) vs 63% (Nevada)
- Low Income: 91% (Halle Hewetson) vs 61% (Nevada)
- Limited English Proficient: 95% (Halle Hewetson) vs 61% (Nevada)

Source: Nevada Department of Education
Exceeding Standards at Halle Hewetson Elementary

Low-Income Students – Grade 3 Math (2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Students</th>
<th>Halle Hewetson</th>
<th>Nevada</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds Standards</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets Standards</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approaches Standards</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergent/Developing</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Nevada Department of Education
Calcedeaver Elementary School
Mount Vernon, AL

- 262 students in grades K – 6
  - 81% American Indian
  - 16% white
- 80% Low Income

Note: Data are for 2009-10 school year
Source: National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data
Outperforming the State at Calcedeaver Elementary

All Students – Grade 6 Reading (2011)

Percentage of Students

Source: Alabama State Department of Education
Elmont Memorial Junior-Senior High
Elmont, New York

• 1,895 students in grades 7-12
  – 77% African American
  – 13% Latino
• 25% Low-Income

Source: New York Department of Education
Outperforming the State at Elmont

Secondary-Level English (2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage Meeting Standards or Above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>95% (Elmont) 79% (New York)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American Students</td>
<td>96% (Elmont) 67% (New York)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Income Students</td>
<td>93% (Elmont) 73% (New York)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: New York State Department of Education
Improvement and High Performance at Elmont Memorial Junior-Senior High

African-American Students – Secondary-Level Math

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Elmont</th>
<th>New York</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: New York State Department of Education
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High Graduation Rates at Elmont Memorial High School

Class of 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Elmont</th>
<th>New York</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of 2006 Freshmen Graduating in Four Years

Source: New York State Department of Education
Available from Harvard Education Press and amazon.com
Very big differences at district level, too—even in the performance of the “same” group of students.
Average Scale Scores, by District
Low-Income African American Students
Grade 4 – NAEP Reading (2013)

Note: Basic Scale Score = 208; Proficient Scale Score = 238
Source: NAEP Data Explorer, NCES
Average Scale Scores, by District
Low-Income Latino Students
Grade 4 – NAEP Reading (2013)

Note: Basic Scale Score = 208; Proficient Scale Score = 238
Source: NAEP Data Explorer, NCES
Big differences in change over time, too.
Change in Average Scale Scores, by District Low-Income African American Students

Grade 4 – NAEP Reading (2003-2013)

Los Angeles 18
Atlanta 13
Charlotte 12
San Diego 9
Large city 9
National public 8
New York City 8
District of Columbia (DCPS) 6
Boston 4
Chicago 3
Houston 2
Cleveland -7

Change in Mean Scale Score, 2003-2013

Note: Chart includes only districts that participated, and had members of this specific subgroup, in both the 2003 and 2013 NAEP TUDA administrations.
Source: NCES, NAEP Data Explorer
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Change in Average Scale Scores, by District Low-Income Latino Students

Grade 4 – NAEP Reading (2003-2013)

- District of Columbia (DCPS)
  - Change in Mean Scale Score: 16
- Charlotte
  - Change in Mean Scale Score: 11
- Los Angeles
  - Change in Mean Scale Score: 9
- Boston
  - Change in Mean Scale Score: 9
- San Diego
  - Change in Mean Scale Score: 7
- Chicago
  - Change in Mean Scale Score: 7
- National public
  - Change in Mean Scale Score: 7
- Large city
  - Change in Mean Scale Score: 6
- New York City
  - Change in Mean Scale Score: 1
- Houston
  - Change in Mean Scale Score: 1
- Cleveland
  - Change in Mean Scale Score: -10

Note: Chart includes only districts that participated, and had members of this specific subgroup, in both the 2003 and 2013 NAEP TUDA administrations.

Source: NCES, NAEP Data Explorer
And not just in reading...
Average Scale Scores, by District Latino Students
Grade 8 – NAEP Math (2013)

Note: Basic Scale Score = 262; Proficient Scale Score = 299
NAEP Data Explorer, NCES
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Change in Average Scale Scores, by District Latino Students

Grade 8 – NAEP Math (2003-2013)

- Boston: 23
- Houston: 18
- Los Angeles: 18
- Charlotte: 17
- District of Columbia (DCPS): 16
- Large city: 14
- National public: 13
- Chicago: 12
- San Diego: 11
- New York City: 3
- Cleveland: 2

Change in Mean Scale Score, 2003-2013

Note: Chart includes only districts that participated, and had members of this specific subgroup, in both the 2003 and 2013 NAEP TUDA administrations.

Source: NCES, NAEP Data Explorer
So, what did I just do?
- Showed more progress;
- Helped take away the excuses;
- Prepared them to take on the excuse makers.
Now, I’m going to pivot and take it home to Oregon.
Even big differences in whole states. Oregon?
4th Grade Reading
Scale Scores by State – All Students

Grade 4 – NAEP Reading (2013)

Source: NAEP Data Explorer, NCES (Proficient Scale Score = 238; Basic Scale Score = 208)
Scale Scores by State – White Students

Grade 4 – NAEP Reading (2013)

Source: NAEP Data Explorer, NCES (Proficient Scale Score = 238; Basic Scale Score = 208)
Scale Scores by State – African-American Students
Grade 4 – NAEP Reading (2013)

- NAEP Data Explorer, NCES (Proficient Scale Score = 238; Basic Scale Score = 208)
Scale Scores by State – Latino Students

Grade 4 – NAEP Reading (2013)

- NAEP Data Explorer, NCES (Proficient Scale Score = 238; Basic Scale Score = 208)
8th Grade Math
Scale Scores by State – All Students

Grade 8 – NAEP Math (2013)

Source: NAEP Data Explorer, NCES (Proficient Scale Score = 299; Basic Scale Score = 262)
Scale Scores by State – White Students

Grade 8 – NAEP Math (2013)

Average Scale Score

Source: NAEP Data Explorer, NCES (Proficient Scale Score = 299; Basic Scale Score = 262)
Scale Scores by State – Latino Students

Grade 8 – NAEP Math (2011)

Source: NAEP Data Explorer, NCES (Proficient Scale Score = 299; Basic Scale Score = 262)
Improvement over time?

Much more progress for higher income students than for low-income students
Widening gap between low-income students and higher income students

Grade 4 Reading

Average Scale Score

2003 2005 2007 2009 2011 2013

Low Income
Higher Income

Note: Proficient Scale Score = 238; Basic Scale Score = 208
Source: NAEP Data Explorer, National Center for Education Statistics
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Flat performance for low-income students, rising achievement for higher income, leads to widening gaps

Grade 8 Math

Note: Proficient Scale Score = 299; Basic Scale Score = 262
Source: NAEP Data Explorer, National Center for Education Statistics
Slower-than-average improvement, especially for low-income students and students of color
Oregon’s 4th graders achieving, improving below the nation in reading

Below-average reading performance and improvement for Oregon’s African American students

Low performance, slow improvement in reading for Oregon’s Latino fourth-graders

Low performance, average improvement for white students in Oregon

Low-income students in Oregon improving slower in reading than students nationwide...

...While higher income students in Oregon improve faster than average.

Average performance, below-average improvement in math for Oregon’s students

Oregon’s Latino students below the national average in math performance and improvement

Oregon’s white students slightly below national averages in math

Average performance, but below-average improvement for Oregon’s low-income students

Oregon’s higher income students improving slightly faster than national average in math

Then and now

• In 1996, Latino 8th graders in Oregon #5 in the nation in math; today, #36;
• In 2003, Latino 4th graders in Oregon were 30th in the nation in reading; today, 3rd from bottom.
Wide gaps, low graduation rates
Oregon’s students of color less likely to graduate on time

Class of 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Percent of students graduating in four years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students Overall</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Data show the 4-year adjusted cohort graduation rate.
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Oregon’s low-income students less likely to graduate on time

Class of 2012

Low-Income Students: 61%
Higher Income Students: 76%

Note: Data show the 4-year adjusted cohort graduation rate.
It doesn’t have to be this way.
Menlo Park Elementary School
Portland, Oregon

514 Students in Grades K-5

- 44% White
- 25% Latino
- 10% African American
- 9% Asian
- 9% Multiracial
- 76% Low-Income
- 33% English Language Learners

Note: Data are from 2012-2013.
Source: Oregon Department of Education, www.ode.state.or.us.
Excellence in Reading Across Grade Levels at Menlo Park

Reading, Percent Proficient or Advanced (2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Menlo Park ES</th>
<th>Oregon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3rd Grade</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Grade</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Grade</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strong Math Results for All Students at Menlo Park

5th Grade Math, Percent Proficient or Advanced (2013)

- **White**: 79% Menlo Park ES, 64% Oregon
- **African American**: 71% Menlo Park ES, 38% Oregon
- **Hispanic**: 77% Menlo Park ES, 42% Oregon
- **Low-Income**: 77% Menlo Park ES, 46% Oregon
- **English Language Learners**: 71% Menlo Park ES, 21% Oregon

Bottom Line:
It’s not just the kids.
What we do MATTERS!
What’s Next?
Now, let’s give them something to do…that is, something that THEY can do.
#1. Learning from the high gainers.
Los Angeles, Atlanta, Charlotte Make Biggest Gains in Reading for Low-Income African American Students

Grade 4 – NAEP Reading (2003-2013)

Los Angeles: 18
Atlanta: 13
Charlotte: 12
San Diego: 9
Large city: 9
National public: 8
New York City: 8
District of Columbia (DCPS): 6
Boston: 4
Chicago: 3
Houston: 2
Cleveland: -7

Change in Mean Scale Score, 2003-2013

Note: Chart includes only districts that participated, and had members of this specific subgroup, in both the 2003 and 2013 NAEP TUDA administrations.

Source: NCES, NAEP Data Explorer
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DC, Charlotte Make Biggest Gains in Reading for Low-Income Latino Students

Grade 4 – NAEP Reading (2003-2013)

- District of Columbia (DCPS): 16
- Charlotte: 11
- Los Angeles: 9
- Boston: 9
- San Diego: 7
- Chicago: 7
- National public: 7
- Large city: 6
- New York City: 1
- Houston: 1
- Cleveland: -10

Change in Mean Scale Score, 2003-2013

Note: Chart includes only districts that participated, and had members of this specific subgroup, in both the 2003 and 2013 NAEP TUDA administrations. Source: NCES, NAEP Data Explorer
DC, Los Angeles Make Biggest Gains in Math for African American Students

Grade 4 – NAEP Math (2003-2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Change in Mean Scale Score, 2003-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia (DCPS)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large city</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National public</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York City</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change in Mean Scale Score, 2003-2013

Note: Chart includes only districts that participated, and had members of this specific subgroup, in both the 2003 and 2013 NAEP TUDA administrations.
Source: NCES, NAEP Data Explorer
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Boston, Houston Make Biggest Gains in Math for Latino Students

Grade 8 – NAEP Math (2003-2013)

Note: Chart includes only districts that participated, and had members of this specific subgroup, in both the 2003 and 2013 NAEP TUDA administrations.

Source: NCES, NAEP Data Explorer
There’s been some research on this—see various recent reports from Council of Great City Schools, for example.

But the bottom line is that if your district has not been making fast progress you should be spending some time learning from those that have.
Critical questions for School Board Members:

• Which districts and/or schools are making the fastest progress in math, reading?
• Which are making the fastest progress for the students who are lagging in our district?
• How can we learn from them?
#2. Attacking the issue of low expectations head on by leveraging Common Core.
We always talk about the issue of low expectations as if it were some abstract concept. But where those expectations find their most concrete form is in the daily assignments that children get from their teachers.
An awful lot of our teachers—even brand new ones—are left to figure out on their own what to teach and what constitutes “good enough” work.
What does this do?

Leaves teachers entirely on their own to figure out what to teach, what order to teach it in, HOW to teach it...and to what level.
‘A’ Work in Poor Schools Would Earn ‘Cs’ in Affluent Schools

Students can do no better than the assignments they are given...
A frequent theme in literature is the conflict between the individual and society. From literature you have read, select a character who struggled with society. In a well-developed essay, identify the character and explain why this character’s conflict with society is important.
Write a composition of at least 4 paragraphs on Martin Luther King’s most important contribution to this society. Illustrate your work with a neat cover page. Neatness counts.
Grade 7 Writing Assignment

Essay on Anne Frank

Your essay will consist of an opening paragraph which introduced the title, author and general background of the novel.

Your thesis will state specifically what Anne's overall personality is, and what general psychological and intellectual changes she exhibits over the course of the book.

You might organize your essay by grouping psychological and intellectual changes OR you might choose 3 or 4 characteristics (like friendliness, patience, optimism, self doubt) and show how she changes in this area.
Grade 7 Writing Assignment

The “ME” Page

- My Best Friend:
- A chore I hate:
- A car I want:
- My heartthrob:

Source: Unnamed school district in California, 2002-03 school year.
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The new standards represent an opportunity to change this, but that won’t happen automatically.

And teachers in schools where expectations have been lower will need more help.
Critical questions for board members:

- Who—district office versus schools—is responsible for what in the implementation effort? Who, in particular, is translating standards into curriculum?
- Are we getting regular reports from district staff on the status of implementation efforts?
- What other kind of evidence—surveys of teachers or students, or periodic audits of classroom assignments, for example—should we be collecting to understand where things are going well...and where not?
#3. Educator evaluation: how do we make certain this work reinforces the standards work, and doesn’t just exist in a separate silo?
In many states, districts, current timelines are a mess—with lots of conflicting signals that undermine both pieces of work.
What can you do?

Given federal requirements, boards have only limited ability to change timelines, but...
Critical questions for School Board Members:

- Are our HR and academic shops talking to each other and planning their work jointly?
- Do our observation rubrics reinforce practices associated with the new standards?
- Does our feedback process concentrate on standards implementation?
- During the transition to new assessments, are we weighing old assessments more than they should be?
#4. Communication with parents and community.
Even parents whose own education is limited can be serious partners with us in this work. But only if they get the information they need.
Parents need understandable information about the whats and whys of the new standards.
They will also need help knowing what to make of educator evaluation. Especially true in states—and those numbers will grow—with policies regarding parental notice.
Critical questions for School Board Members

• How are we communicating with parents about the whats and whys of the new standards?
• How are we communicating with them about educator evaluation?
• Often enough? Clear enough?
• Are we leaving some parents out?
• Do we have a way of knowing if concerns are building?
#5. Preparing your community for the drop in assessment results.
This is something we have lots of experience with as a country: when results drop, folks think schools are getting worse unless they know IN ADVANCE what to expect and why.
Every district will need to find multiple ways—notices home, community meetings, work with journalists (print, radio, tv), CBO’s—to help people know what to expect.
(And if YOU want to know what to expect, take a look at NAEP or SAT/ACT “college ready” numbers.)
Critical questions for School Board Members:

• What’s our best estimate of what the new numbers will look like?
• Have we prepared parents, media? Once or more than once?
• Who are our most effective messengers with different audiences? Are they deployed?
• Are we ready for the first data release?
• Are our teachers and principals prepared to respond to questions from frantic parents?
#6. Utilizing results from educator evaluation
If this just becomes an exercise in rating people, we won’t have accomplished much.
DIFFERENCES IN TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS ACCOUNT FOR LARGE DIFFERENCES IN STUDENT LEARNING

The distribution of value-added scores for ELA teachers in LAUSD
ACCESS TO MULTIPLE EFFECTIVE TEACHERS CAN DRAMATICALLY AFFECT STUDENT LEARNING

CST math proficiency trends for second-graders at ‘Below Basic’ or ‘Far Below Basic’ in 2007 who subsequently had three consecutive high or low value-added teachers
Critical questions for School Board Members:

• Are we sure our educators are getting clear, useful feedback and have strong supports for improvement? How?

• What kinds of changes in salary schedules, titles and roles would reinforce the move to put effectiveness at the center?

• How equitably are our most- and least-effective teachers distributed across different kinds of schools? Where is our plan to make patterns more fair?
#7. This is NOT mostly about teachers, by the way. First rate school leaders need to be at the heart of your strategy.
While much has been said about the importance of quality teachers, high quality principals are the most important of all.
Every district needs a strategy to secure high quality principals.

This is WAY TOO IMPORTANT to be left to higher education.

(See Charlotte for good example.)
Critical questions for School Board Members:

• Where do our principals come from?
• Are some sources better than others?
• Do we have an adequate supply of high quality principals?
• If not, where is our action plan?
#8. Minding gaps at the high end
Percentage Below Basic Over Time

Latino Students (National Public) – Grade 8 NAEP Math

| Year | Percentage
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990*</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992*</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Accommodations not permitted

Percentage Below Basic Over Time

African-American Students (National Public) – Grade 8 NAEP Math

*Accommodations not permitted
Yet while we’re making progress in getting White students to the Advanced level...
Percentage Advanced Over Time

White Students (National Public) – Grade 8 NAEP Math

*Accommodations not permitted
Percentage Advanced Over Time

African-American Students (National Public) – Grade 8 NAEP Math

*Accommodations not permitted
Percentage Advanced Over Time

Latino Students (National Public) – Grade 8 NAEP Math

*Accommodations not permitted
Percentage Advanced Over Time

Lower Income Students (National Public) – Grade 8 NAEP Math

Percentage of Students at Advanced

Important to make sure your district has a strategy to move kids to the highest levels.
Critical Questions for School Board Members:

• How much progress have we made in reducing the number of students performing at the low-end? Are there differences for different groups?

• How much progress have we made in increasing the number of students at the advanced level? Are there differences for different groups?

• Where is our plan for moving more low-income students and students of color to the high end of performance?
All in all, not a very long list.

But there are some hard things on it.
If not to do the hard, important things, though, why else did you run?
Download this presentation
www.edtrust.org