

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 Chapters 3 & 4. Characteristics of Achievement Database

Table A3.1 presents basic demographic information for the 104 school districts in our analytic sample. It can be seen from the basic demographic comparison that new style mayor-led districts are larger, and serving student populations with greater percentages of minorities and students eligible for free/reduced priced lunch.

Table A3.2 presents the states that are included, and notes the number of districts from each state that are in the sample. There are only ten states not represented in the sample, and those states combined account for only 3.75% of total enrollment in U.S. public schools.¹ To see how representative the sample was to student enrollment patterns across the country, we compared two figures: (1) the percentage of schools in our sample from each state, and (2) the percentage of U.S. students enrolled in each state. Pearson's correlation coefficient between these two measures is 0.8794, with significance of $p < .0000$. This confirms that the sample is nationally representative.

Table A3.3 presents, for each state, the measure(s) of achievement we use for reading and math. Although some states had additional performance data (e.g., History, Science), in this

¹ The ten states not represented in this sample are: Delaware, Hawaii, Maine, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Vermont, West Virginia, and Wyoming. Calculations were made using 2002-03 enrollment data provided in the State Nonfiscal Public Elementary/Secondary Education Survey Data. Accessed on-line: <http://nces.ed.gov/ccd/stnfis.asp>.

study we focus on the core subjects of reading and math.² Looking at table A3.3, two additional data notes needs to be made. First, data in the NLSLSASD is *school-level* data. This is valuable, as it will allow us to look at variation within districts. But it also means that some suppression rules are introduced. States, in order to protect the identities of individual students, will generally not report school/grade scores when the group is composed of a small number of students (e.g., <10). For our study, this means that school-grades with small numbers of students are excluded from the sample.

Second, over the time period 1999-2003, states were introducing new tests, phasing out old ones, and recalibrating existing metrics. The notes to table A3.3 discuss the years in which, for particular states, we use a test result that is different from the one listed on the table. As discussed in the next section, we are careful only to compare standardized measures or measures on the same test. In a few instances, a state administered more than one test in a given year. This was the case when a state was transitioning to a new accountability system, and there was a year of overlap. In these rare cases, we chose the measurement which was available in the most years in our sample, e.g., if Measure 1 was available 1999-2002, and Measure 2 only in 2002 and 2003, we went with Measure 1.

States test their students in different grades, and therefore we do not have uniform grades tested across all states. Further, in some states, the NLSLSASD collected only a subset of the available grades of data. In appendix A, we present, for each year and state, the precise grades for which we have achievement data. It is the achievement of these grades that serves as our measure of student achievement. For the most part, within a state, the grades tested are consistent over time. In some states, however, there are slight variations over time in the data that is

² Michigan was the only state where we had to build our own databases from scratch. In Michigan, we obtained archived “Michigan School Report Card” (MSR) data from Paul Bielawski of the Office of Educational Assessment and Accountability, Michigan Department of Education.

included in the NLSLSASD. To take just one example, in Georgia in 1999, we have data from grades 3, 5, and 8. For the rest of time period, 2000-2003, we have data from grades 4, 6, and 8.

In table A3.4, we list the legal statutes which authorize mayoral control of schools. We draw on these statutes to code our measures of formal mayoral power. One important aspect of the table to note is that there are often sunset provisions written into the law. In New York, for instance, the mayor's appointive power is set to expire in 2009. Inserting sunset provisions allows the state legislature to hold the mayor accountable for progress in the school district.

Table A3.5 presents, by state, the grade levels of the achievement data used in this study. As discussed in chapter 3, states test different grades in different subject areas. The many different grades listed in table A3.5 are an additional reason why using standardized z-scores is essential to our analysis. In order to make comparisons between different states testing different grades, we have to use the standardized achievement approach.

Table A3.6 (reading) and table A3.7 (math) present what the raw data looks like before standardization. One can see how the different state achievement tests produce very different percentages across districts. This is because "proficiency" means different things in different states – to be proficient on the Michigan state exam doesn't mean the same thing as being proficient on the Maryland state exam. This is why we can't simply compare districts using the achievement data as presented in tables A3.6 and A3.7.

Table A3.1. Selected Characteristics of School Districts in Sample, 2002-03

District	City	State	Enroll	% Special Ed.	% African-American	% Hispanic	% Kids in Private Schools	% Kids in Poverty
Districts w/ New Style Leadership			207,017	14.4	59.3	15.6	15.3	32.1
Districts w/ Traditional Governance			53,056	13.8	36.8	13.5	11.8	23.4
Baltimore City	Baltimore	MD	96,230	14.8	88.3	1.7	15.3	31
Boston	Boston	MA	61,552	19.2	47.2	14.5	18.4	25.9
City Of Chicago	Chicago	IL	436,048	12.7	50.7	26	16.7	28.5
Cleveland Municipal	Cleveland	OH	71,616	17.4	70.5	7.2	16	38
Detroit City	Detroit	MI	173,742	11.6	90.6	5	9.1	34.8
District Of Columbia	Washington	DC	67,522	16.8	84	7.9	15.1	31.7
New Haven	New Haven	CT	20,329	11.1	55.8	21.4	9.7	32.6
New York City Public Schools	Brooklyn	NY	1,077,381	13.4	34	27	18.8	30.3
Oakland Unif.	Oakland	CA	52,501	10.8	43.3	21.9	13.9	28.2
Philadelphia City	Philadelphia	PA	192,683	12.2	65.3	8.5	23	31.6
Providence	Providence	RI	27,580	18.7	22.4	30	11.8	40.5
Birmingham City	Birmingham	AL	36,133	14	96.4	1.5	9.4	35.6
Huntsville City	Huntsville	AL	22,643	12.5	43	2.1	12.8	18.9
Montgomery County	Montgomery	AL	32,912	12.1	74.5	1.2	17.9	26
Anchorage	Anchorage	AK	50,055	14.4	8.9	5.7	8	9.3
Mesa Unif.	Mesa	AZ	75,269	8.6	3.7	19.8	4.4	11.2
Little Rock	Little Rock	AR	25,526	10.5	68.9	2.7	22.2	21.5
Fremont Unif.	Fremont	CA	31,452	8.8	5.5	13.5	13.3	6.2
Fresno Unif.	Fresno	CA	81,222	10.4	11.6	39.9	3.7	36.8
Long Beach Unif.	Long Beach	CA	97,212	7.9	18.8	35.7	6.6	33
Los Angeles Unif.	Los Angeles	CA	746,852	11.5	12.1	46.5	12.6	30.7
Pomona Unif.	Pomona	CA	35,427	9.9	8.5	64.5	5.3	28
San Bernardino City Unif.	San Bernardino	CA	56,096	11.6	20.3	47.3	6	36.4
San Diego Unif.	San Diego	CA	140,753	12.1	15	25.4	8.4	20.3
San Francisco Unif.	San Francisco	CA	58,216	11.6	14.7	14.1	23.8	14.2
Santa Ana Unif.	Santa Ana	CA	63,610	9	0.8	76.1	4.1	24.6
Denver County 1	Denver	CO	71,972	10.9	19.1	31.7	11.8	20.8
Poudre R-1	Fort Collins	CO	24,538	8.2	2	8.7	7.3	8.9
Pueblo City 60	Pueblo	CO	17,875	10.9	2.4	44.2	5.6	25.1
Duval County	Jacksonville	FL	128,126	15.8	43.7	4.1	14.3	17

Table A3.1. Selected Characteristics of School Districts in Sample, 2002-03

District	City	State	Enroll	% Special Ed.	% African-American	% Hispanic	% Kids in Private Schools	% Kids in Poverty
Leon County	Tallahassee	FL	31,857	20.3	40.4	4	13.7	22.2
Atlanta City	Atlanta	GA	54,946	7.8	88.6	4.5	10.1	39.3
Bibb County	Macon	GA	24,938	10.5	71.6	0.9	7.8	37.9
Chatham County	Savannah	GA	34,554	11.6	66	2.1	10	31.6
Muscogee County	Columbus	GA	32,944	12.2	60.7	4.5	9	22.3
Richmond County	Augusta	GA	34,691	10.4	70.5	2.9	8.3	27.7
Boise Independent	Boise	ID	26,266	11.5	1.7	4.5	8.8	10
Peoria 150	Peoria	IL	15,736	22.4	58	2.5	18.2	29
Rockford School Dist 205	Rockford	IL	28,361	14.9	31.7	10.2	19.5	20.1
Evansville-Vanderburgh Sch Corp	Evansville	IN	22,825	19.8	15.4	1.2	14.4	19.2
Fort Wayne Community Schools	Fort Wayne	IN	32,114	17.5	26.4	5.7	19.6	18
Des Moines Independent Comm	Des Moines	IA	31,553	17.8	15.3	6.5	9.2	15.7
Kansas City	City	KS	20,810	13.2	49.7	16.7	11	24.1
Wichita	Wichita	KS	48,913	14.3	23.6	9.6	14.6	14.9
Fayette County	Lexington	KY	34,296	10.4	23.2	3.3	14.4	14.7
Caddo Parish	Shreveport	LA	44,556	13.9	62.9	1.3	8.2	33.7
East Baton Rouge Parish	Baton Rouge	LA	52,434	10	72.7	1.9	21.1	31.7
Orleans Parish	Orleans	LA	70,246	10.8	93.4	3.1	18.1	40.5
Springfield	Springfield	MA	26,594	19.9	28.5	27.2	11	34.3
Worcester	Worcester	MA	25,680	17.3	11.8	15.3	12.8	25.1
Flint City	Flint	MI	21,443	12.5	77.2	3	6	37.7
Grand Rapids Public Schools	Grand Rapids	MI	23,418	25.5	42.9	13	20.9	20.2
Lansing Public	Lansing	MI	17,616	18.5	40.3	9.9	9.5	23.6
Minneapolis	Minneapolis	MN	46,037	14	42.9	7.6	12.7	25.1
Rochester	Rochester	MN	16,400	11.2	9.2	2.6	13.4	9.3
St. Paul	St. Paul	MN	43,923	15.8	26.6	7.9	15.4	23.6
Jackson Public School Dist	Jackson	MS	31,529	9.9	95.8	0.7	12.4	34
Springfield R-Xii	Springfield	MO	24,626	13	6.1	2.2	8	19.6
St. Louis City	St Louis	MO	45,480	16.1	81.7	1.9	19.3	36.9
Lincoln Public Schools	Lincoln	NE	31,867	16.7	7	3.7	16.5	11.3
Newark City	Newark	NJ	42,395	15.6	59.1	29.4	14.1	36.9
Albuquerque Public Schools	Albuquerque	NM	88,120	20.4	3.8	39.9	12	17.9

Table A3.1. Selected Characteristics of School Districts in Sample, 2002-03

District	City	State	Enroll	% Special Ed.	% African-American	% Hispanic	% Kids in Private Schools	% Kids in Poverty
Buffalo City	Buffalo	NY	43,474	21.7	58.3	7.4	14.8	38.7
Rochester City	Rochester	NY	35,659	19	63.9	12.7	11.9	37.9
Syracuse City	Syracuse	NY	22,455	20.4	46.7	5.1	11.4	35.4
Cumberland County Schools	Fayetteville	NC	52,094	13	49.6	5.7	8.3	21.7
Durham Public Schools	Durham	NC	30,794	12.8	59.3	8.5	11.6	19.7
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools	Charlotte	NC	109,767	12	44	7.4	13.9	14.1
Akron City	Akron	OH	29,532	15.6	47.9	1.1	12.8	26
Cincinnati City	Cincinnati	OH	42,715	18.3	71.1	1.2	20.2	32.5
Columbus City	Columbus	OH	64,175	13.7	61.6	2.4	11.7	19
Dayton City	Dayton	OH	19,813	21.1	69.2	1.3	17.1	32.3
Toledo City	Toledo	OH	35,742	16.3	46.7	5.5	20.2	26.1
Tulsa	Tulsa	OK	43,029	17.5	35.7	7.1	14.4	20.9
Eugene 04j	Eugene	OR	18,735	12.9	2.8	5	9.8	15.5
Portland 1j	Portland	OR	51,654	12.6	16.7	6.8	11.8	16.6
Salem/Keizer 24j	Salem	OR	37,137	11.9	1.4	14.7	9.3	21
Pittsburgh	Pittsburgh	PA	35,146	17.3	58.2	1.4	21	27.8
Richland County 01	Columbia	SC	27,393	14.5	78.4	2.9	12.5	30.2
Sioux Falls 49-5	Sioux Falls	SD	20,072	13.5	5	2.3	12.4	10.7
Memphis City	Memphis	TN	118,039	12.3	84.7	2.9	10	30.4
Nashville-Davidson County	Nashville	TN	67,954	15.7	46.7	4.6	16.2	19.8
Abilene Isd	Abilene	TX	17,466	17.9	12.5	19.5	6.9	19.3
Amarillo Isd	Amarillo	TX	29,244	12.6	10.6	21.9	7.5	20.1
Arlington Isd	Arlington	TX	61,928	9.8	22.2	18.3	9.8	12.7
Austin Isd	Austin	TX	78,608	12.1	14.4	30.6	7.6	17
Brownsville Isd	Brownsville	TX	44,340	12.1	0.1	91.5	5.5	45.3
Dallas Isd	Dallas	TX	163,347	7.9	32.9	35.6	10.3	25.5
Ector County Isd	Odessa	TX	26,594	11.2	5.4	41.5	3.8	24.4
Fort Bend Isd	Sugar Land	TX	59,489	10	29.3	8.3	12.8	3.5
Fort Worth Isd	Fort Worth	TX	81,081	9.8	29	29.7	8.8	21.8
Killeen Isd	Killeen	TX	31,258	13.3	40.9	17.8	3.8	18.9
Lubbock Isd	Lubbock	TX	29,472	16.1	14.9	27.5	6.3	22.2
Plano Isd	Plano	TX	51,039	11.3	8.2	10.1	9.9	4.9
Salt Lake City	Salt Lake City	UT	24,850	12.7	4	18.8	8.9	19
Newport News City Public Schools	Newport News	VA	32,887	13	56.1	4.1	8.4	20.8
Norfolk City Public Schools	Norfolk	VA	36,745	13.6	67.8	3.7	9.8	28.3
Richmond City Public Schools	Richmond	VA	26,136	16.1	90.3	2.6	12.5	33.4

Table A3.1. Selected Characteristics of School Districts in Sample, 2002-03

District	City	State	Enroll	% Special Ed.	% African-American	% Hispanic	% Kids in Private Schools	% Kids in Poverty
Virginia Beach City Public Schools	Virginia Beach	VA	75,902	13.7	28.6	4.2	8.8	9
Seattle School Dist 1	Seattle	WA	47,853	12.5	23	5.3	21.1	14.5
Spokane 81	Spokane	WA	31,362	12.7	4.8	2.9	9.6	20.2
Tacoma 10 Madison	Tacoma	WA	33,955	12.9	21.5	6.8	10	21.1
Metropolitan Milwaukee	Madison	WI	24,966	18	19.1	4.2	10.5	11.7
	Milwaukee	WI	97,293	16.5	59.7	11.9	17.8	32

NOTES: Data source is the Common Core of Data (CCD), maintained by the National Center on Education Statistics (NCES). Data and documentation is available on-line at: <http://nces.ed.gov/ccd/>.

Table A3.2. Distribution of Sample Districts, by State

State	No. of schools from state in sample	% of Sample Schools from this State	% of Total U.S. enrollment in this state
Alabama	3	2.88%	1.53%
Alaska	1	0.96%	0.28%
Arizona	1	0.96%	1.95%
Arkansas	1	0.96%	0.94%
California	10	9.62%	13.19%
Colorado	3	2.88%	1.56%
Connecticut	1	0.96%	1.18%
District Of Columbia	1	0.96%	0.16%
Florida	2	1.92%	5.27%
Georgia	5	4.81%	3.10%
Idaho	1	0.96%	0.52%
Illinois	3	2.88%	4.33%
Indiana	2	1.92%	2.08%
Iowa	1	0.96%	1.00%
Kansas	2	1.92%	0.98%
Kentucky	1	0.96%	1.37%
Louisiana	3	2.88%	1.52%
Maryland	1	0.96%	1.80%
Massachusetts	3	2.88%	2.04%
Michigan	4	3.85%	3.70%
Minnesota	3	2.88%	1.76%
Mississippi	1	0.96%	1.02%
Missouri	2	1.92%	1.88%
Nebraska	1	0.96%	0.59%
New Jersey	1	0.96%	2.84%
New Mexico	1	0.96%	0.66%
New York	4	3.85%	5.99%
North Carolina	3	2.88%	2.77%
Ohio	6	5.77%	3.82%
Oklahoma	1	0.96%	1.30%
Oregon	3	2.88%	1.15%
Pennsylvania	2	1.92%	3.77%
Rhode Island	1	0.96%	0.33%
South Carolina	1	0.96%	1.44%
South Dakota	1	0.96%	0.27%
Tennessee	2	1.92%	1.93%
Texas	12	11.54%	8.84%
Utah	1	0.96%	1.02%
Virginia	4	3.85%	2.44%
Washington	3	2.88%	2.11%
Wisconsin	2	1.92%	1.83%

Table A3.3. Achievement Measures for Sample Districts

State	Districts included in Sample	Exam(s)	Grades of reading student achievement tests used in analysis	Grades of math student achievement tests used in analysis	Measure	Suppression Rules
Alabama	Birmingham, Huntsville, Montgomery	SAT-9	3-8	3-8	Percentile	<10
Alaska	Anchorage	Alaska Benchmark Exam	4,8	4,8	% Proficient & Above	<5
Arizona	Mesa	SAT-9	2-8,9	2-8,9	Percentile	<10
Arkansas	Little Rock	Arkansas Comprehensive Testing, Assessment, and Accountability Program (ACTAAP)	4,8	4,8	% Proficient & Above	<10
California	Fremont, Fresno, Long Beach, Los Angeles, Oakland, Pomona, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Francisco, Santa Ana	California Standards Test	2-8,10,11	2-8,10,11	% At or Above PR50	<10
Colorado	Denver, Fort Collins, Pueblo	Colorado Student Assessment Program (CSAP)	3,4,6,7,8,9,10	5,6,7,8,9,10	% Proficient & Above	<16
Connecticut	New Haven	Connecticut Mastery Test	4,6,8	4,6,8	% Proficient & Above	<10
District Of Columbia	D.C.	SAT-9	2-8,9,10,11	2-8,9,10,11	Normal Curve Equiv.	.
Florida	Jacksonville, Tallahassee	Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)	3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10	3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10	% Proficient & Above	<10
Georgia	Atlanta, Augusta, Columbus, Macon, Savannah	Criterion-Referenced Competency Tests (CRCT)	4,6,8	4,6,8	% Meeting Std. & Above	<5
Idaho	Boise	Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS)	4,8,10	4,8,10	Percentile	<10
Illinois	Chicago, Peoria, Rockford	Illinois Standards Achievement Test (ISAT)	3,5,8,11	3,5,8,11	% Meeting Std. & Above	<15
Indiana	Evansville, Fort Wayne	Indiana Statewide Testing for Educational Progress (ISTEP)	3,6,8	3,6,8	% Meeting Std. & Above	<10
Iowa	Des Moines	NA
Kansas	Kansas City, Wichita	Kansas State Assessment	5,8,11	4,7,10	% Proficient & Above	<8
Kentucky	Lexington	Kentucky Core Content Test (KCCT)	4,7,10	5,8,11	% Proficient & Above	<10
Louisiana	Baton Rouge, New Orleans, Shreveport	Louisiana Educational Assessment Program (LEAP)	4,8	4,8	% Proficient & Above	<10

Table A3.3. Achievement Measures for Sample Districts

State	Districts included in Sample	Exam(s)	Grades of reading student achievement tests used in analysis	Grades of math student achievement tests used in analysis	Measure	Suppression Rules
Maryland	Baltimore	Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP)	3,5,8	3,5,8	% Proficient & Above	<5
Massachusetts	Boston, Springfield, Worcester	Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS)	3,4,7,10	4,6,8,10	% Proficient & Above	<10
Michigan	Detroit, Flint, Grand Rapids, Lansing	Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP)	4,7,11	4,8,11	% Meeting Std. & Above	<9
Minnesota	Minneapolis, Rochester, St. Paul	Minnesota Comprehensive Assessments (MCA)	3	3,5	% At & Above Level 2b	.
Mississippi	Jackson	Mississippi Grade Level Testing Program (MGLTP)	2-8	2-8	% Proficient & Above	<9
Missouri	Springfield, St. Louis	Missouri Assessment Program (MAP)	3,7,11	4,8,10	% Proficient & Above	.
Nebraska	Lincoln	School-Based Teacher-Led Assessment and Reporting System (STARS)
New Jersey	Newark	Elementary School Proficiency Assessment	4,8	4,8	% Proficient & Above	.
New Mexico	Albuquerque	TerraNova	3-8,9	3-8,9	Scale Score	<5
New York	New York City, Buffalo, Rochester, Syracuse	Regents Examinations in Comprehensive English and in Mathematics	4,8	4,8	% At & Above Level 3	<4
North Carolina	Charlotte, Durham, Fayetteville	NC End-of-Grade (EOG) Tests	3-8	3-8	% At & Above Level 3	<5
Ohio	Akron, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Columbus, Dayton, Toledo	Ohio Proficiency Tests	4,6,9,10	4,6,9,10	% Passing	<10
Oklahoma	Tulsa	Oklahoma Core Curriculum Tests (OCCT)	5,8	5,8	% Proficient & Above	<5
Oregon	Eugene, Portland, Salem	Oregon Statewide Assessment	3,5,8	3,5,8,10	% Meeting Std. & Above	<5
Pennsylvania	Philadelphia, Pittsburgh	Pennsylvania System of School Assessment	5,8,11	5,8,11	% Proficient & Above	<10
Rhode Island	Providence	RI Proficiency Assessments	4,8,10	4,8,10	% Proficient & Above	<5
South Carolina	Columbia	Palmetto Achievement Challenge Tests (PACT)	3-8	3-8	% Proficient & Above	.

Table A3.3. Achievement Measures for Sample Districts

State	Districts included in Sample	Exam(s)	Grades of reading student achievement tests used in analysis	Grades of math student achievement tests used in analysis	Measure	Suppression Rules
South Dakota	Sioux Falls	SAT-9	4,8	4,8	Percentile	<6
Tennessee	Memphis, Nashville	Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program (TCAP)	3-8	3-8	Percentile	.
Texas	Abilene, Amarillo, Arlington, Austin, Brownsville, Dallas, Fort Worth, Killeen, Lubbock, Odessa, Plano, Sugar Land	Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS)	3-8,9	3-8,9,10	% Passing	<5
Utah	Salt Lake City	SAT-9	3,5,8,11	3,5,8,11	Percentile	<10
Virginia	Newport News, Norfolk, Richmond, Virginia Beach	Virginia State Assessment Program (VSAP)	3,5,8,11	3,5,8,11	% Proficient & Above	.
Washington	Seattle, Spokane, Tacoma	Washington Assessment of Student Learning (WASL)	4,7,10	4,7,10	% Proficient & Above	<10
Wisconsin	Madison, Milwaukee	Wisconsin Knowledge and Concepts Examinations (WKCE)	4,8,10	4,8,10	% Proficient & Above	<5

NOTES: The NLSLSASD provides comprehensive, state-by-state notes on their achievement data online at: <http://208.253.216.16/assessment/profiles.asp>. In California, we use the measure “at or above the 50th national percentile” which is also referred to as the “the percentage of students scoring at or above grade level.” This captures the percentage of students in the district who scored at or above grade level in the grades for which we have data. See: http://star.cde.ca.gov/star2005/help_scoreexplanations.asp. In Tennessee, we use the “median percentile rank for all students.” In Florida, we use the percentage of students at level 3 on the criterion-referenced State Sunshine Exam. The NLSLSASD only had 2003 data for Iowa, so Iowa districts are excluded from this achievement analysis. They are included in non-achievement analyses in the other chapters. Over this period, Colorado adjusted their performance level cutpoints. In 2001, Mississippi adopted a new testing regime. Achievement data from Nebraska is not included because their teacher-administered, school-based, assessments are not designed for cross-district comparison, even within the state. For an explanation, see: <http://www.nde.state.ne.us/stars/index.html>. In New Mexico, data constraints forced us to use composite (reading and math combined) district scores from 1999-2001. In Connecticut, a new generation of the Connecticut Mastery Test was adopted after 1999.

Table A3.4. Legal Statutes Authorizing Mayoral Appointed School Boards							
State	Code	Start Date / Trigger	End Date / Repeal	Target	Size of Board	Methods	Legislative Guidance
Virginia	§ 22.1-50. (2005)	1901	Requires constitutional amendment	All districts	3	Appointed by governing body of city or town	-
Mississippi	§ 37-7-701 ; § 37-7-717 (2005)	Optional, after “organization, reorganization or reconstitution”	At discretion of local government	“Special municipal separate school districts,” e.g., Jackson	5 ^	Optional; local government can decide to appoint 5 member school board	Appointees to be “bona fide residents of and qualified electors” § 37-7-717 (a)
Illinois	§ 105 ILCS 5/34-3 (2005)	1995	Requires new legislation	Cities having a population exceeding 500,000	5	Mayor is given direct statutory authority to appoint the board	Full section on intent of legislation and outcomes that will be used for evaluation (§ 105 ILCS 5/34-1.01)
Massachusetts	Acts 1991, ch. 108, § § 1—10 (2005) *	1991	Referendum passed in 1996; Now requires new legislation **	Boston directly	7	Mayor is given direct statutory authority to appoint the board from list of candidates provided by nominating committee	“The mayor shall strive to appoint individuals who reflect the ethnic, racial and socioeconomic diversity of the city of Boston and its public school population.” (Acts 1991, ch. 108, § 2)
Maryland	§ 4-303 (2005) § 3-108.1 (2005)	1997	Requires new legislation	Baltimore City directly	9	Jointly appointed by the Mayor of Baltimore City and MD Governor from list of qualified individuals submitted by the State Board	Reflect the demographic composition of Baltimore City; at least 4 with Business administration expertise; at least 3 with Education expertise; at least 1 each: parent, knowledge of

Table A3.4. Legal Statutes Authorizing Mayoral Appointed School Boards							
State	Code	Start Date / Trigger	End Date / Repeal	Target	Size of Board	Methods	Legislative Guidance
							disability education
Ohio	3311.71 (2005)	“Whenever any municipal school district is released by a federal court from an order requiring supervision and operational, fiscal, and personnel management of the district by the state superintendent”	Referendum to be held 4 years later; if No, then back to elected board; if Yes, then need new legislation to end appointed board	Municipal school district = “is or has ever been under a federal court order requiring supervision and operational, fiscal, and personnel management of the district by the state superintendent of public instruction	9	Slate of at least eighteen candidates nominated by a municipal school district nominating panel is given to Mayor; Mayor then appoints 9 school board members	Municipal school district nominating panel, which gathers initial slate of candidates, is designed to be representative; 3 nominees must reside outside City of Cleveland (since school district serves several outlying cities as well)
Michigan	§ 380.372 § 380.410 (2005)	“Not later than 30 days after the date the qualifying school district becomes a school district of the first class” (§ 380.372 (1)	Referendum to be held 5 years later; if No, then back to elected board; if Yes, then need new legislation to end appointed board (§ 380.410)	School districts with 100,000 + students (§ 380.371)	7	Mayor appoints 6, and for first 5 years, 7 th spot filled by Michigan Superintendent of Public Instruction	“School district accountability board” created to monitor and report on the new governance arrangement
New York	NY CLS Educ § 2590-b (2005)	2002	2009	New York City directly	13	Mayor appoints 7; 5 Borough presidents each select 1; Plus Chancellor	Mayoral appointments must be residents of New York City
Oakland	City Charter, 404(a), 404(b)	2000	Requires charter amendment	Oakland only	10	Mayor appoints 3, 7 others are elected	-
Providence	City Charter, Art. VII, § 701	Longstanding	Requires charter amendment	Providence only	9	Mayor appoints all, staggered year-to-year	Providence School Board Nominating Commission presents candidates for mayor

Table A3.4. Legal Statutes Authorizing Mayoral Appointed School Boards							
State	Code	Start Date / Trigger	End Date / Repeal	Target	Size of Board	Methods	Legislative Guidance
							to choose from
Pennsylvania	§ 17-1714.1-B (2005)	14 days after certification as fourteen (14) days of the certification of school district as education empowerment district	Later of: 5 years or “When a school district certified as an education empowerment district under this section no longer has a history of low test performance and has reached the goals set forth in the school district improvement plan” (§ 17-1710-B) ^^^	Districts on the “Educational Empowerment” List ^^ More specifically, “mayor-council form of government and which has a population in excess of forty-five thousand (45,000)” and “a history of extraordinarily low test performance”	5	Mayor is given direct statutory authority to appoint the board	-
D. C. [2005 on]	D.C. Code § 1-204.95 1-1001.08 (2005)	2004 (July 8)	Requires new legislation	Washington D.C. directly	—	Election by ward	-
D.C. [up to 2004]	D.C. Code § 1-204.95 (2004)	2000	2004 (July 7)	Washington D.C. directly	9	Mayor appoints 4, must be approved by Council; 5 others are elected	-
Hartford	City Charter, Art.	2002	Requires charter amendment	Hartford only	9	Mayor appoints 5, 4 others are elected	Appointees should be experienced in relevant areas and be reflective of the city’s population
New Haven	City Charter, Art. XXIX	Longstanding	Requires charter amendment	New Haven only	7	Mayor appoints board	-
NOTES: ^ There are two exceptions. First, “the school board of a school division composed of any city or town having only one district shall consist of five members” § 22.1-50. Second, “Notwithstanding the provisions of the charter of the City of Norfolk, the school board of the City of Norfolk shall consist of							

Table A3.4. Legal Statutes Authorizing Mayoral Appointed School Boards							
State	Code	Start Date / Trigger	End Date / Repeal	Target	Size of Board	Methods	Legislative Guidance
							seven members to be appointed by the city council from the city at large.” (§ 22.1-51) ^^ ““Education empowerment list.” A list prepared annually by the Department of Education containing school districts that fall below certain academic assessments as provided in section 1703-B.” (§ 17-1702-B.) ^^^ Legislation runs until 2010 * Full title: “An act reorganizing the school committee of the city of Boston” which was approved July 5, 1991. ** Section 8 of the Act provided for a referendum on the Act in 1996. Since the referendum passed, the Act became permanent law and altering it now required a Constitutional amendment.

Table A3.5. Data used to compute average reading and math scores, by year and grade

State	1999				2000				2001			
	Elem Read	Elem Math	HS Read	HS Math	Elem Read	Elem Math	HS Read	HS Math	Elem Read	Elem Math	HS Read	HS Math
Arizona	2-7	2-7	.	.	2-8	2-8	9, 10, 11	9, 10, 11	2-8	2-8	.	.
Alabama	3-8	3-8	9,10,11	9,10,11	3-8	3-8	9,10,11	9,10,11	3-8	3-8	9, 10, 11	9, 10, 11
Alaska	3,6,8	3,6,8	.	.	3,6,8	3,6,8	.	.
Arkansas	4	4	.	.	4,8	4,8	.	.	4,8	4,8	.	.
California	2-8	2-8	10,11	10,11	2-8	2-8	10,11	10,11	2-8	2-8	10,11	10,11
Colorado	3,4,7	5	.	.	3,4,7	8	.	.	3,4,6,7,8	5,8	9,10	10
Connecticut	4,6,8	4,6,8	.	.	4,6,8	4,6,8	.	.	4,6,8	4,6,8	.	.
Florida	4,8	5,8	10	10	4,8	5,8	10	10	4,8	5,8	10	10
Georgia	3,5,8	3,5,8	.	.	4,6,8	4,6,8	.	.	4,6,8	4,6,8	.	.
Idaho	3-8	3-8	9,10,11	9,10,11	3-8	3-8	9,10,11	9,10,11
Illinois	3,5,8	3,5,8	10	10	3,5,8	3,5,8	10	10	3,5,8	3,5,8	11	11
Indiana	3,6,8	3,6,8	10	10	3,6,8	3,6,8	10	10	3,6,8	3,6,8	10	10
Iowa												
Kansas	3,7	4,7	10	10	5,8	4,7	11	10	5,8	4,7	11	10
Kentucky	4,7	5,8	10	11	4,7	5,8	10	11	4,7	5,8	10	11
Louisiana	4,8	4,8	.	.	4,8	4,8	.	.
Maryland	3,5,8	3,5,8	.	.	3,5,8	3,5,8	.	.	3,5,8	3,5,8	.	.
Massachusetts	4,8	4,8	10	10	4,8	4,8	10	10	3,4,7,8	4,6,8	10	10
Michigan	4,7	4,7	11	11	4,7	4,7	11	11	4,7	4	11	11
Minnesota	3,5	3,5	.	.	3,5	3,5	.	.	3,5	3,5	.	.
Mississippi	4,5,6,7,8	4,5,6,7,8	.	.	4,5,6,7,8	4,5,6,7,8	.	.	2-8	2-8	.	.
Missouri	3,7	4,8	11	10	3,7	4,8	11	10	3,7	4,8	11	10
Nebraska												
New Jersey	4,8	4,8	11	11	4,8	4,8	11	11	4,8	4,8	11	11
New Mexico	4,6,8	4,6,8	.	.	3-8	3-8	9	9	3-8	3-8	9	9
New York	4,8	4,8	.	.	4,8	4,8	.	.	4,8	4,8	.	.
North Carolina	3-8	3-8	.	.	3-8	3-8	.	.	3-8	3-8	.	.
Ohio	4,6	4,6	.	.	4,6	4,6	9,10	9,10	4,6	4,6	9,10	9,10
Oklahoma	5,8	5,8	.	.	5,8	5,8	.	.	5,8	5,8	.	.
Oregon	3,5,8	3,5,8	.	10	3,5,8	3,5,8	.	10	3,5,8	3,5,8	.	10
Pennsylvania	5,8	5,8	11	11	5,8	5,8	11	11	5,8	5,8	11	11

Table A3.5. Data used to compute average reading and math scores, by year and grade

State	1999				2000				2001			
	Elem Read	Elem Math	HS Read	HS Math	Elem Read	Elem Math	HS Read	HS Math	Elem Read	Elem Math	HS Read	HS Math
Rhode Island	4,8	4,8	.	10	4,8	4,8	10	10	4,8	4,8	10	10
South Carolina	3-8	3-8	.	.	3-8	3-8	.	.	3-8	3-8	.	.
South Dakota	4,8	4,8	11	11	4,8	4,8	11	11	4,8	4,8	11	11
Tennessee	3-8	3-8	.	.	3-8	3-8	.	.	3-8	3-8	.	.
Texas	3-8	3-8	10	10	3-8	3-8	10	10	3-8	3-8	10	10
Utah	5,8	5,8	11	11	3,5,8	3,5,8	11	11
Virginia	3,5,8	3,5,8	AvgHS	AvgHS	3,5,8	3,5,8	AvgHS	AvgHS	3,5,8	3,5,8	.	.
Washington	4,7	4,7	10	10	4,7	4,7	10	10	4,7	4,7	10	10
Wisconsin	4,8	4,8	10	10	4,8	4,8	10	10	4,8	4,8	10	10

Table A3.5. Data used to compute average reading and math scores, by year and grade, continued

State	2002				2003			
	Elem Read	Elem Math	HS Read	HS Math	Elem Read	Elem Math	HS Read	HS Math
Arizona	2-8	2-8	9	9	2-8	2-8	9	9
Alabama	3,4,6,8	3,4,6,8	.	.	3-8	3-8	.	.
Alaska	3,6,8	3,6,8	.	.	4,8	4,8	.	.
Arkansas	4,8	4,8	.	.	4,8	4,8	.	.
California	2-8	2-8	10,11	10,11	2-8	2-8	10,11	10,11
Colorado	3,4,6,7,8	5,6,7,8	9,10	9,10	3,4,6,7,8	5,6,7,8	9,10	9,10
Connecticut	4,6,8	4,6,8	.	.	4,6,8	4,6,8	.	.
Florida	3,4,5,6,7,8	3,4,5,6,7,8	9,10	9,10	3,4,5,6,7,8	3,4,5,6,7,8	9,10	9,10
Georgia	4,6,8	4,6,8	.	.	4,6,8	4,6,8	.	.
Idaho	3-8	3-8	9,10,11	9,10,11	4,8	4,8	10	10
Illinois	3,5,8	3,5,8	11	11	3,5,8	3,5,8	11	11
Indiana	3,6,8	3,6,8	10	10	3,6,8	3,6,8	.	.
Iowa								
Kansas	5,8	4,7	11	10	5,8	4,7	11	10
Kentucky	4,7	5,8	10	11	4,7	5,8	10	11
Louisiana	4,8	4,8	.	.	4,8	4,8	.	.
Maryland	3,5,8	3,5,8	.	.	3,5,8	3,5,8	.	.
Massachusetts	3,4,7	4,6,8	10	10	3,4,7	4,6,8	10	10
Michigan	4,7	4,8	11	11	4,7	4,8	11	11
Minnesota	3,5	3,5	.	.	3	3,5	.	.
Mississippi	2-8	2-8	.	.	2-8	2-8	.	.
Missouri	3,7	4,8	11	10	3,7	4,8	11	10
Nebraska								
New Jersey	4,8	4,8	.	11	4,8	4,8	.	.
New Mexico	3-8	3-8	9	9
New York	4,8	4,8	.	.	4,8	4,8	.	.
North Carolina	3-8	3-8	.	.	3-8	3-8	.	.
Ohio	4,6	4,6	9,10	9,10	4,6	4,6	9,10	9,10
Oklahoma	5,8	5,8	.	.
Oregon	3,5,8	3,5,8	.	10	3,5,8	3,5,8	.	10
Pennsylvania	5,8	5,8	11	11	5,8	5,8	11	11
Rhode Island	4,8	4,8	10	10	4,8	4,8	10	10

Table A3.5. Data used to compute average reading and math scores, by year and grade, continued

State	2002				2003			
	Elem Read	Elem Math	HS Read	HS Math	Elem Read	Elem Math	HS Read	HS Math
South Carolina	3-8	3-8	.	.	3-8	3-8	.	.
South Dakota	4,8	4,8	11	11	4,8	4,8	.	.
Tennessee	3-8	3-8	.	.	3-8	3-8	.	.
Texas	3-8	3-8	10	10	3-8	3-8	9	9,10
Utah	3,5,8	3,5,8	11	11	3,5,8	3,5,8	11	11
Virginia	3,5,8	3,5,8	.	.	3,5,8	3,5,8	11	11
Washington	4,7	4,7	10	10	4,7	4,7	10	10
Wisconsin	4,8	4,8	10	10	4,8	4,8	10	10

NOTES: The achievement data used in this analysis is the data collected and coded by the National Longitudinal School-Level State Assessment Score Database (NLSLSASD). As part of the study, the NLSLSASD researchers selected certain grades in states to include in the database. The omission of a grade in a particular state on this table does not necessarily mean that the state didn't test in that grade. It could be that a state tested in a particular grade, but that grade was not included in the NLSLSASD.

Table A3.6. Summary of Elementary Reading Achievement in Sample Districts, 1999-2003

District	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
New Style Leadership Districts					
Baltimore City Pub Sch System	13.06	15.89	16.13	14.08	39.28
Boston	18.48	19.79	28.3	32.97	34.55
City Of Chicago School Dist 299	42.98	42.2	43.42	46.11	46.22
Cleveland Municipal Sd	27.49	25.85	27.38	31.05	54.46
Detroit	40.81	44.03	35.76	27.95	43.33
New Haven School District	22.83	24.78	23.47	22.67	26.49
New York City Public Schools	33.82	38.28	38.66	39.48	43.47
Oakland Unified	27.53	26.23	27.84	30.62	25.22
Philadelphia City Sd	16.15	1126.8	20.51	22.18	26.06
Providence Sch Dist	29.66	26.77	28.63	29.14	28.49
Traditional Governance Districts					
Birmingham City Sch Dist	41.15	41.38	41.34	38.74	34.4
Huntsville City Sch Dist	60.07	58.68	58.72	57.26	55.79
Montgomery County Sch Dist	41.94	42.29	42.22	41.45	41.97
Anchorage School District	.	80.23	79.98	79.59	72.98
Mesa Unified District	60.74	58.52	57.31	60.19	61.89
Little Rock School District	30.96	26.77	30.01	36.27	46.6
Fremont Unified	68.1	69.89	72.17	73.02	62.76
Fresno Unified	27.04	28.25	28.63	29.99	26.38
Long Beach Unified	33.64	36.18	40.79	44.22	35.79
Los Angeles Unified	23.91	26.79	30.41	33.6	26.06
Pomona Unified	30.22	31.58	30.84	32.52	26.57
San Bernardino City Unified	25.49	26.74	28.84	28.56	25.26
San Diego Unified	44.78	49.08	49.16	51.68	42.75
San Francisco Unified	45.77	48.72	48.05	50	40.81
Santa Ana Unified	18.17	21.27	23.04	26.18	22.71
Denver County 1	34.91	38.61	38.7	38.88	41.73
Poudre R-1	72.48	74.92	75.89	77.46	79.01
Pueblo City 60	56.45	60.16	58.91	60.67	64.72
Duval County School District	15.13	15.31	18.98	21.35	22.48
Leon County School District	24.6	26.56	29.59	32.97	35.3
Atlanta City	44.57	51.62	69.06	67.98	71.16
Bibb County	49.25	70.64	74.29	78.17	77.23
Chatham County	43.74	62.25	74.57	76.89	71.53
Muscogee County	45.01	67.82	73.81	78.7	77.85
Richmond County	41.42	61.98	72.61	70.15	71.02
Boise Independent District	.	63.13	63.48	64.22	79.87
Peoria School District 150	56.83	54.03	57.49	57.48	58.85
Rockford School Dist 205	55.11	53.15	52.95	52.19	50.62
Evansville-Vanderburgh Sch Corp	63.89	62.99	60.05	60.22	65.52
Fort Wayne Community Schools	55.64	53.5	51.6	54.44	60.37
Kansas City	52.08	15.36	12.05	15.19	26.35
Wichita	58.96	27.05	25.71	29.6	32.45
Fayette County	61.47	63.76	63.47	64.33	67.65
Caddo Parish School Board	.	15.3	14.36	16.61	15.22

Table A3.6. Summary of Elementary Reading Achievement in Sample Districts, 1999-2003

District	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
East Baton Rouge Parish School Board	.	15.87	.	16.71	11.94
Orleans Parish School Board	.	7.79	5.87	5.5	4.65
Springfield	14.4	17.19	31.13	35.65	33.56
Worcester	22.17	23.79	38.1	42.15	44.05
Flint	32.13	27.71	39.12	25.57	38.53
Grand Rapids	35.5	37.63	39.15	29.1	40.48
Lansing	39.28	43.62	48.96	37.63	54.89
Minneapolis	31.06	35.71	42.11	42.7	50.24
Rochester	57.95	67.57	75.31	76.34	78
St. Paul	33.83	37.49	45.04	45.27	55.62
Jackson Public School Dist	42.36	46.47	63.21	64.99	67.66
Springfield R-Xii	35.52	36.21	37.37	42.18	40.82
St. Louis City	11.71	13.5	15.26	17.72	16.97
Newark City	41.98	39.14	50.79	57.25	60.08
Albuquerque Public Schools	55.1	55.01	57.44	.	646.38
Buffalo City Sd	29.61	27.46	30.07	26.88	28.64
Rochester City Sd	22.89	33.45	34.67	34.5	31.16
Syracuse City Sd	30.04	29.83	30.82	27.87	37.28
Cumberland County Schools	75.03	74.82	76.24	78.37	82.46
Durham Public Schools	69.69	70.04	71.23	72.86	77.19
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools	70.51	73.9	73.68	76.19	79.49
Akron City Sd	38.7	35.93	36.53	42.19	46.24
Cincinnati City Sd	32.83	27.91	27.69	34.45	41.93
Columbus City Sd	31.21	31.4	32.07	38.17	42.69
Dayton City Sd	26.42	22.64	23.43	20.77	34.02
Toledo City Sd	36.27	34.51	32.06	37.07	42.06
Tulsa	75.22	70.79	71.86	.	65.46
Eugene Sch Dist 04j	80.23	83.15	82.87	85.25	82.43
Portland Sch Dist 1j	67.6	71.46	73.06	75.31	74.48
Salem/Keizer Sch Dist 24j	60.71	65.58	67.44	68.64	66.08
Pittsburgh Sd	32.19	1237.56	41.15	37.19	43.74
Richland County School District 01	23.42	26.34	27.14	25.16	22.34
Sioux Falls School District 49-5	65.71	66.12	67.18	64.52	81.78
Memphis City School District	37.18	35.59	36.12	37.05	36.69
Nashville-Davidson County Sd	46.48	45.33	45.73	46.9	46.8
Abilene Isd	89.7	91.31	94.49	94.95	92.42
Amarillo Isd	87.43	87.42	88.38	90.47	85.84
Arlington Isd	87.18	86.68	88.89	91.58	86.55
Austin Isd	78.47	80.87	83.63	86.26	82.3
Brownsville Isd	77.58	78.09	80.86	85.21	80.63
Dallas Isd	74.1	71.48	75.2	81.61	74.07
Ector County Isd	81.34	83.48	86.1	89.7	84.39
Fort Bend Isd	90.31	90.68	92.57	94.51	90.69
Fort Worth Isd	78.07	79.88	82.91	86.47	79.43
Killeen Isd	87.43	87.94	89.14	90.05	87.13
Lubbock Isd	87.13	89.18	89.7	91.49	86.57
Plano Isd	95.56	95.87	96.59	96.98	96.14
Salt Lake City School District	44.23	49.18	.	40.38	40.55

Table A3.6. Summary of Elementary Reading Achievement in Sample Districts, 1999-2003

District	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
Newport News City Public Schools	60.99	59.64	62.45	65.47	65.83
Norfolk City Public Schools	53.05	54.01	57.85	62.12	69.92
Richmond City Public Schools	39.07	40.83	46.46	53.19	64.84
Virginia Beach City Public Schools	68.74	67.94	76.62	77.67	81.57
Seattle School Dist 1	48.69	52.9	52.49	55.28	56.77
Spokane Sch Dist 81	49.89	54.06	53.8	53.93	58.85
Tacoma Sch Dist 10	40.58	45.52	43.83	47.31	49.37
Madison Metropolitan	74.58	74.98	78.73	80.67	82.63
Milwaukee	48.18	49.76	50.32	52.89	60.69

NOTES: The achievement data used in this analysis is the data collected and coded by the National Longitudinal School-Level State Assessment Score Database (NLSLSASD).

Table A3.7. Summary of Elementary Math Achievement in Sample Districts, 1999-2003

District	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
New Style Leadership Districts					
Baltimore City Pub Sch System	13.47	16.6	19.35	15.3	28.97
Boston	15.04	15	17.68	16.68	19.08
City Of Chicago School Dist 299	32.3	31.78	39.69	42.96	47.25
Cleveland Municipal Sd	25.3	25.36	30.51	34.41	42.51
Detroit	49.05	50.87	50.61	34.78	33.81
New Haven School District	20.63	22.79	22.85	23.8	30.06
New York City Public Schools	37.08	36.02	38.75	42.75	52.21
Oakland Unified	31.54	33.11	34.44	36.95	33.87
Philadelphia City Sd	13.65	14.15	16.48	18.15	20.89
Providence Sch Dist	6.76	6.56	12.61	14.67	15.04
Traditional Governance Districts					
Birmingham City Sch Dist	45.58	46.63	46.61	41.97	33.82
Huntsville City Sch Dist	61.63	60.88	60.88	58.63	53.53
Montgomery County Sch Dist	43.4	45.59	45.55	43.75	40.25
Anchorage School District	.	80.23	79.98	79.59	72.98
Mesa Unified District	65.78	65.77	62.42	68.11	71.29
Little Rock School District	21.48	19.32	22.13	23.9	29.67
Fremont Unified	67.99	73.4	75.41	78.74	73.13
Fresno Unified	32.43	35.58	36.54	39.14	34.25
Long Beach Unified	40.77	46.47	51.42	56.78	47.73
Los Angeles Unified	29.96	33.68	37.33	42.44	36.58
Pomona Unified	34.89	38.12	41.82	45.86	40.27
San Bernardino City Unified	30.95	34.51	39.1	41.88	35.05
San Diego Unified	48.31	54.06	52.81	55.78	49.69
San Francisco Unified	53.99	58.52	58.44	61	55.21
Santa Ana Unified	30.24	35.99	39.91	44.02	36.09
Denver County 1	19.18	11.68	20.86	20.67	22.09
Poudre R-1	63.99	47.51	55.02	59.24	59.02
Pueblo City 60	47.89	18.17	40.22	42.21	43
Duval County School District	11.87	17.25	19.67	16.17	16.97
Leon County School District	23.26	31.13	37.09	31.3	33.15
Atlanta City	48.25	40.97	49.84	50.77	54.03
Bibb County	58.76	59.29	57.77	59.61	61.72
Chatham County	49.61	53.82	56.9	59.14	56.28
Muscogee County	50.71	57.72	57.67	62.46	64.34
Richmond County	47.07	48.81	53.09	51.81	55.08
Boise Independent District	.	57.9	59.69	60.55	71.75
Peoria School District 150	44.35	45.64	57.47	60.76	67.42
Rockford School Dist 205	47.61	46.58	56.93	53.43	55.89
Evansville-Vanderburgh Sch Corp	63.89	62.99	60.05	60.22	65.52
Fort Wayne Community Schools	55.64	53.5	51.6	54.44	60.37
Kansas City	41.02	8.73	8.39	11.95	17.36
Wichita	49.56	23.32	24.91	26.02	28.76
Fayette County	38.06	44.02	48.07	44.97	44.85

Table A3.7. Summary of Elementary Math Achievement in Sample Districts, 1999-2003

District	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
Caddo Parish School Board	.	9.88	9.22	8.04	11.96
East Baton Rouge Parish School Board	.	9.17	.	7.69	8.99
Orleans Parish School Board	.	4.27	3.03	2.45	3.58
Springfield	11.34	13.89	11.05	12.44	13.07
Worcester	21.65	24.96	19	23.92	24.6
Flint	39.7	39.2	57.8	33.16	29.81
Grand Rapids	44.1	50.31	57.07	34.65	29.35
Lansing	47.21	53.5	66.85	41.15	39.61
Minneapolis	30.49	37.29	39.89	43.84	52.45
Rochester	51.06	59.77	66.94	70.72	79.2
St. Paul	29.47	38.54	44.07	46.07	57.04
Jackson Public School Dist	43.68	41.74	49.06	55.48	61.04
Springfield R-Xii	27.51	29.95	30.75	33.07	34.7
St. Louis City	11.62	12.07	14.5	13.96	15.35
Newark City	27.9	29.16	31.08	36.58	42.48
Albuquerque Public Schools	55.1	55.01	57.44	.	636.23
Buffalo City Sd	38.49	31.81	35.38	35.88	44.77
Rochester City Sd	26.69	26.82	32.98	31	36.04
Syracuse City Sd	34.41	32.3	33.8	33.69	49.18
Cumberland County Schools	76.93	77.43	79.95	81.05	85.39
Durham Public Schools	71.64	72.44	75.95	77.36	81
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools	73.38	74.39	77.96	82.23	85.23
Akron City Sd	31.36	27.88	39.42	40.32	34.1
Cincinnati City Sd	22.68	22.69	26.43	32.22	27.85
Columbus City Sd	24.28	26.86	36.56	40.23	35.34
Dayton City Sd	19.82	16.29	20.87	21.8	22.22
Toledo City Sd	29.16	28.25	33.21	35.82	28.44
Tulsa	67.81	68.36	60.74	.	58.44
Eugene Sch Dist 04j	77.7	79.14	79.45	79.36	80.32
Portland Sch Dist 1j	62.95	68.54	71.25	70.85	71.84
Salem/Keizer Sch Dist 24j	52.26	55.57	58.82	59.16	61.95
Pittsburgh Sd	31.4	1220.29	32.52	31.68	37.52
Richland County School District 01	14.02	16.82	20.84	20.34	20.81
Sioux Falls School District 49-5	65.71	66.12	68.27	64.79	55.68
Memphis City School District	39.82	38.65	38.54	42.31	39.17
Nashville-Davidson County Sd	47.03	46.84	45.43	50.43	50.37
Abilene Isd	89.81	91.73	95.89	96.49	88.02
Amarillo Isd	88.24	87.71	90.04	92.56	81.15
Arlington Isd	86.52	86.74	89.49	92.91	82.43
Austin Isd	75.3	79.18	83.62	87.74	76.43
Brownsville Isd	82.83	82.46	86.17	89.49	74.93
Dallas Isd	72.37	71	77.58	84.54	70.3
Ector County Isd	80.98	82.34	86.32	91.87	77.08
Fort Bend Isd	88.71	89.82	92.46	94.57	84.37
Fort Worth Isd	76.79	80.49	84.75	87.93	75.42
Killeen Isd	86.75	87.43	89.66	90.79	81.99
Lubbock Isd	86.96	90.25	92.05	94.07	82.12
Plano Isd	93.56	94.84	96.02	97.19	94.77

Table A3.7. Summary of Elementary Math Achievement in Sample Districts, 1999-2003

District	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
Salt Lake City School District	47.5	50.02	.	40.99	42.56
Newport News City Public Schools	55.76	58.86	63.21	67.24	69.82
Norfolk City Public Schools	44.62	55.95	60.44	63.92	71.47
Richmond City Public Schools	30.71	37.7	42.5	51.71	69.28
Virginia Beach City Public Schools	67.15	68.86	78.9	80.39	84.99
Seattle School Dist 1	31.82	38.33	37.37	41.32	44.34
Spokane Sch Dist 81	32.05	36.84	37.62	43.67	52.11
Tacoma Sch Dist 10	20.17	25.88	24.26	30.54	37.73
Madison Metropolitan	61.28	61.47	58.79	61.39	74.63
Milwaukee	30.94	32.52	25.05	29.78	41.64

NOTES: The achievement data used in this analysis is the data collected and coded by the National Longitudinal School-Level State Assessment Score Database (NLSLSASD).