

NOTE: This .pdf document is part of the online supplement for *The Education Mayor* by Kenneth K. Wong, Francis X. Shen, Dorothea Anagnostopoulos, and Stacey Rutledge (2007, Washington, D.C.: Georgetown Press). The supplement is designed to provide interested readers with additional background information that was not included in the manuscript due to space limitations. Please see the appropriate chapters in the book for the context in which the supplementary materials are presented. This online supplement was last updated in September 2007. Questions about the online materials can be sent to Francis: fxshen@post.harvard.edu

Supplemental Tables for Chapter 5. Supplemental Achievement Inequality Data

In this document we present supplemental data related to achievement inequality discussed in chapter 5. Table A5.1 reports the demographics of the schools in the bottom 10th and 25th percentiles. Not surprisingly, these low-performing schools have high percentages of students eligible for free or reduced price lunch. Touching on concerns about racial and ethnic disparities, the data in this table also show that the low-performing schools have student bodies with large percentage of minorities.

In tables A5.2 and A5.3 we present middle school achievement data for the lowest 10th and 25th percentile schools. Middle school inequality patterns roughly mirror those seen in elementary schools. The exceptionally low performance levels in the bottom 10% and bottom 25% schools in these districts serve as a reminder that whatever gains mayoral control may be able to bring about, there remain a group of schools severely underperforming in their cities. The inequality ratios (table A5.4) confirm that severe disparities exist at the middle school level, just as they did at the elementary level. In interpreting these middle school ratios, it is important to note that there are usually a smaller number of middle schools than elementary schools in a given school district. This may make the ratios more susceptible to outliers. Nevertheless, the ratios are large enough to merit concern that achievement equity is not being achieved in the middle grades.

Table A5.1. Student demographics of Bottom 10th and 25th percentile schools in Mayoral Control Districts

Grade	# Schools	% Afr- American	% Hispanic	% Free Lunch	Enroll
New Haven					
<i>District Average</i>		56.0	31.2	64.2	442
<i>Bottom 10th Percentile Schools</i>					
4	4	66.1	32.3	73.2	444
6	2	68.5	28.7	69.1	631
8	2	68.5	28.7	69.1	631
<i>Bottom 25th Percentile Schools</i>					
4	7	62.5	35.2	71.6	397
6	3	56.5	40.0	68.8	706
8	3	56.5	40.0	68.8	706
Washington, D.C.					
<i>District Average</i>		84.2	9.3	68.0	407
<i>Bottom 10th Percentile Schools</i>					
3	12	96.7	3.0	80.8	409
4	14	99.1	0.6	84.2	395
6	12	95.1	4.5	78.4	464
<i>Bottom 25th Percentile Schools</i>					
3	26	95.8	3.6	80.6	411
4	29	98.2	1.4	80.9	423
6	25	93.6	5.7	79.4	454
Chicago					
<i>District Average</i>		51.2	36.0	83.1	699
<i>Bottom 10th Percentile Schools</i>					
3	52	85.9	13.3	92.0	588
5	47	79.8	19.9	91.1	604
8	44	75.4	23.8	89.3	654
<i>Bottom 25th Percentile Schools</i>					
3	113	81.8	17.3	90.9	614
5	112	75.1	23.7	91.9	636
8	103	73.1	25.6	90.1	684

Table A5.1. Student demographics of Bottom 10th and 25th percentile schools in Mayoral Control Districts

Grade	# Schools	% Afr-American	% Hispanic	% Free Lunch	Enroll
Oakland					
<i>District Average</i>		44.1	31.3	55.0	491
<i>Bottom 10th Percentile Schools</i>					
3	9	42.9	47.1	70.4	519
4	6	26.9	56.1	69.3	814
8	3	56.0	36.3	53.2	779
<i>Bottom 25th Percentile Schools</i>					
3	17	44.7	38.1	66.0	540
4	15	47.4	39.2	64.7	625
8	5	49.6	43.8	63.0	612
Boston					
<i>District Average</i>		45.2	28.4	73.7	445
<i>Bottom 10th Percentile Schools</i>					
4	20	44.4	35.8	83.7	314
8	3	47.8	48.0	78.2	539
<i>Bottom 25th Percentile Schools</i>					
4	20	44.4	35.8	83.7	314
8	7	63.6	31.5	73.8	539
Baltimore					
<i>District Average</i>		87.0	1.0	77.2	506
<i>Bottom 10th Percentile Schools</i>					
3	12	97.7	0.3	88.4	469
5	12	86.5	4.8	84.5	466
8	5	83.0	0.5	68.2	589
<i>Bottom 25th Percentile Schools</i>					
3	29	95.2	0.8	84.4	487
5	29	92.6	2.4	84.0	459
8	11	83.3	0.5	73.0	681
Cleveland					
<i>District Average</i>		70.2	9.1	85.2	514
<i>Bottom 10th Percentile Schools</i>					
4	9	97.8	0.6	92.9	467
6	3	97.5	0.7	58.7	657

Table A5.1. Student demographics of Bottom 10th and 25th percentile schools in Mayoral Control Districts

Grade	# Schools	% Afr- American	% Hispanic	% Free Lunch	Enroll
<i>Bottom 25th Percentile Schools</i>					
4	21	87.8	6.1	93.2	505
6	6	97.8	0.5	71.0	623
Philadelphia					
<i>District Average</i>		65.2	13.2	73.9	623
<i>Bottom 10th Percentile Schools</i>					
5	19	78.5	20.2	89.4	622
8	9	80.2	18.8	82.6	611
<i>Bottom 25th Percentile Schools</i>					
5	48	81.5	13.6	88.9	627
8	24	85.3	11.4	80.9	712
Providence					
<i>District Average</i>		21.9	53.1	87.1	564
<i>Bottom 10th Percentile Schools</i>					
4	3	18.7	55.9	91.3	532
8	1	23.7	59.2	83.5	830
<i>Bottom 25th Percentile Schools</i>					
4	7	19.4	57.8	92.3	495
8	2	19.7	63.5	90.4	836
New York					
<i>District Average</i>		34.5	37.7	80.0	834
<i>Bottom 10th Percentile Schools</i>					
4	34	51.8	44.9	89.1	657
8	13	49.5	47.1	93.3	822
<i>Bottom 25th Percentile Schools</i>					
4	84	48.5	47.5	88.9	695
8	31	44.1	50.5	93.7	846

Table A5.2. Tracking the lowest 10th Percentile of Middle Schools, Selected Districts, 1999-2003

City	Grade	No. Schools	<i>Reading</i>					<i>Math</i>				
			1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
Baltimore	8	3	0.2	11.8	8.8	12.8	49.0	2.2	20.5	15.9	18.2	13.4
Boston	8	3	9.3	21.7	32.7	-	-	0.0	2.3	8.3	6.0	13.0
Chicago	8	44	28.7	42.2	29.8	40.5	34.7	0.8	7.2	9.0	13.0	13.5
Cleveland	6	3	5.9	5.9	8.1	9.7	-	1.9	4.4	9.1	14.4	-
Detroit	7	8	-	-	12.9	15.4	21.3	-	-	-	2.1	11.7
New Haven	6	2	13.5	13.0	9.1	10.0	12.5	6.0	9.0	13.6	14.0	11.0
New Haven	8	2	15.0	15.0	17.6	15.8	19.5	4.0	10.0	2.0	1.8	10.0
New York	8	13	9.7	14.2	15.3	13.0	17.4	3.0	7.8	6.9	17.5	25.9
Oakland	8	3	13.7	12.0	17.3	18.0	17.3	3.0	9.0	7.0	16.0	11.0
Philadelphia	8	9	2.8	8.6	11.4	13.3	-	1.2	4.1	6.6	7.2	-
Washington, D.C.	6	11	36.6	42.3	41.4	40.5	-	38.7	45.4	45.1	44.8	-

NOTES: Achievement can be compared year-to-year within a given district, but without proper statistical controls, ratios cannot be directly compared to each other because different tests are being used in each district. When within-district comparisons are not appropriate (e.g., change of test from one year to next), we report a missing value. See discussion in chapter for methods used to identify lowest 10th percentile. All achievement measures are % Proficient, with two exceptions. Achievement measure in Detroit is % Satisfactory + Above, and measure in Washington, D.C. is Normal Curve Equivalent.

Table A5.3. Tracking the lowest 25th Percentile of Middle Schools, Selected Districts, 1999-2003

MIDDLE SCHOOLS												
City	Grade	No. Schools	<i>Reading</i>					<i>Math</i>				
			1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
Boston	8	9	1.0	2.2	5.1	4.7	8.6	11.1	18.6	27.1	-	-
Chicago	8	111	2.6	6.9	10.4	14.8	15.1	35.1	44.7	32.1	42.7	38.2
Cleveland	6	6	3.0	4.3	12.4	15.0	-	6.8	7.7	9.3	8.3	-
Detroit	7	17	-	-	15.2	15.1	20.6	-	-	-	4.8	9.9
New York	8	31	5.3	8.8	7.2	18.4	24.1	14.5	16.9	16.7	14.8	19.3
Oakland	6	5	11.0	13.3	16.8	23.3	14.3	9.5	11.4	13.3	15.7	15.8
Oakland	8	5	4.2	8.8	12.0	19.5	14.8	14.2	11.5	16.0	16.6	16.0
Philadelphia	8	25	2.4	5.6	8.0	7.3	-	5.0	9.7	11.3	14.6	-
Washington, D.C.	6	24	41.4	48.4	47.3	47.4	-	38.9	43.1	41.9	42.8	-

NOTES: Achievement can be compared year-to-year within a given district, but without proper statistical controls, cannot be directly compared to each other because different tests are being used in each district. When within-district comparisons are not appropriate (e.g., change of test from one year to next), we report a missing value. Scores for all districts and all grades are reported in appendix tables. See discussion in chapter for methods used to identify lowest 10th percentile. All achievement measures are % Proficient, with two exceptions. Achievement measure in Detroit is % Satisfactory + Above, and measure in Washington, D.C. is Normal Curve Equivalent.

Table A5.4. Inequality Ratios of Mayoral Control Districts (75th Pctile / 25th Pctile), Selected Middle Grades, 1999-2003

City	Grade	<i>Reading</i>					<i>Math</i>				
		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
Boston	8	2.267	2.444	1.519	-	-	5.5	5.5	3	2.4	3.5
Chicago	8	1.558	1.523	1.629	1.473	-	3.429	3.375	3.364	2.877	2.795
Cleveland	6	2.07	2	3.092	3.056	-	2.755	3.145	2.658	3.252	-
Detroit	7	1.425	1.61	1.385	1.665	1.429	1.904	1.602	-	1.702	1.56
New Haven	6	1.933	2.25	2.427	2.703	2.533	2	2.667	2.142	2.418	2.563
New Haven	8	2.133	2.5	1.888	2.298	2.158	3.556	4.286	2.238	2.469	3.1
New York	8	2.044	2.216	2.3	2.389	2.224	2.841	2.87	3.531	2.815	2.319
Oakland	7	2.615	2.727	2.231	2.5	2.385	3.333	2.533	2.647	2.933	2.923
Oakland	8	2.333	2.917	2.214	2	2.357	2.769	4.6	3.077	2.556	2.5
Philadelphia	8	3.4	2.825	3.038	2.528	-	7	4.636	4.569	3.357	-
Providence	8	1.25	3.25	1.403	1.463	1.307	1.833	7	1.852	1.722	1.437
Washington, D.C.	7	1.306	1.103	1.432	1.35	-	1.243	1.3	1.385	1.3	-
Washington, D.C.	8	1.244	1.39	1.2	1.279	1.191	1.175	1.275	1.25	1.35	1.302

NOTES: Ratios can be compared year-to-year within a given district, but without proper statistical controls, ratios cannot be directly compared to each other because different tests are being used in each district. When within-district comparisons are not appropriate (e.g., change of test from one year to next), we report a missing value. Ratios for all districts and all grades are reported in appendix tables. See discussion in chapter for methods used to calculate 75/25 Ratios. All achievement measures are % Proficient, with two exceptions. Achievement measure in Detroit is % Satisfactory + Above, and measure in Washington, D.C. is Normal Curve Equivalent.