#### Highlights of Performance Comparison Between MPS and Other Urban School Districts

#### 10<sup>th</sup> Grade Knowledge and Concepts Tests: Reading and Math

#### **Beloit**

- Beloit's Hispanic students performed at lower levels in reading than their counterparts in MPS.
- When the percentages of students not tested and testing at minimal performance are combined, the performance of both Beloit's White and Black is similar to\* the performance of their counterparts in MPS in both reading and math.
- At the combined higher levels of performance (proficient and advanced performance) in both reading and math, Beloit's White students had lower scores than Whites in MPS.

#### **Green Bay**

- 58% of Green Bay's Hispanic students were not tested in reading and 52% were not tested in math.
- When the percentages of students not tested and students testing at minimal performance are combined, all of Green Bay's minority groups scored lower in reading than MPS minority groups, with the exception of Black students. (31% of Green Bay's Black students were not tested in reading and 38% were not tested in math.)
- In math, Green Bay's Hispanic students' performance was similar to\* or lower than MPS' Hispanic students.

#### (continued on following page)

This information is based on the tables that follow. This summary and the tables that follow were produced by the Center for Education Research, Analysis, and Innovation (CERAI) at the University of Wisconsin--Milwaukee.

\* The phrase "similar to" means that the district's performance in this category was within 3% of MPS' performance. E.g., if 30% of MPS' Black students scored in the proficient or advanced levels on reading, and 32% of Kenosha's Black students did, MPS and Kenosha's performance could be said to be "similar to" each other.

#### 10<sup>th</sup> Grade Knowledge and Concepts Tests: Reading and Math

#### (continued from previous page)

#### Kenosha

- Kenosha failed to test approximately 1/3 of all their Black and Hispanic students. In reading, 31% of Black students and 36% of Hispanic students were not tested. In math, 32% of Black students and 39% of Hispanic students were not tested.
- In math, Kenosha's economically disadvantaged students' performance was similar to\* that of their MPS counterparts.
- Kenosha's Black students' math performance was lower than that of Black students in MPS.
- Kenosha's Hispanic students' math scores were similar to\* or lower than those of MPS' Hispanic students.
- In reading, Kenosha's Hispanic students' scores were lower than those of MPS' Hispanic students.

#### Racine

• Racine's economically disadvantaged students' performance was lower in math than that of their MPS counterparts.

This information is based on the tables that follow. This summary and the tables that follow were produced by the Center for Education Research, Analysis, and Innovation (CERAI) at the University of Wisconsin--Milwaukee.

\* The phrase "similar to" means that the district's performance in this category was within 3% of MPS' performance. E.g., if 30% of MPS' Black students scored in the proficient or advanced levels on reading, and 32% of Kenosha's Black students did, MPS and Kenosha's performance could be said to be "similar to" each other.

## 10th Grade Results for Beloit

### Reading, By Income Level

#### Math, By Income Level

							Disadvantaged
16	2	14	23	61	50	11	Not Econom.
							Disadvantaged
7	1	6	10	83	57	26	Economically
Advanced				% Min. Perf.			
Proficient and				Not Tested and	Performance		
Combined %	% Advanced	% Proficient	% Basic	Combined %	% Minimal	Income Level % Not Tested	Income Level

This information is compiled from the Wisconsin Dept. of Public Instruction's web site's Office of Educational Accountability page (http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/dpi/oca), cited on 27 August 1998 and 8 September 1998.

## 10th Grade Results for Beloit

## Reading, By Race/Ethnicity

*** 48	17	31	26	*** 26	15	11	White, Not Hisp.
16	8	8	29	55	38	17	Hispanic
25	4	21	23	*** 52	31	21	Black, Not Hisp.
•		1	ŧ	-	E	1	Asian/Pacific Islnd
							Alaskan
1	•	•	-	•	•	ı	Am. Indian/Native
				Perf.			
Advanced				% Min.			
and				Tested and			
Proficient		Proficient		% Not	Performance	Tested	
Combined %	% Advanced	%	% Basic	Combined	% Minimal	% Not	Race/Ethnicity

### Math, By Race/Ethnicity

16	2	14	27	*** 56	44	12	White, Not Hisp.
17	0	17	4	80	63	17	Hispanic
*** 4	0	4	7	06 ***	71	19	Black, Not Hisp.
	1	•	•	1	-	•	Asian/Pacific Islnd
							Alaskan
-	t	-	-	-	1	1	Am. Indian/Native
				Perf.			
Advanced				% Min.			
and				Tested and			
Proficient		Proficient		% Not	Performance	Tested	
Combined %	% Advanced	%	% Basic	ned	% Minimal	% Not	Race/Ethnicity

# 10th Grade Results for Green Bay

## Reading, By Income Level

% Min. Perf.
Not Tested and
Combined %

#### Math, By Income Level

40	10	30	27	33	22		Not Econom.  Disadvantaged
18	5		23	60	37	23	Economically Disadvantaged
Proficient and Advanced				Not Tested and % Min. Perf.	Performance		
Combined %	% Advanced	% Proficient	% Basic	Combined %	% Minimal	Income Level % Not Tested	Income Level

# 10th Grade Results for Green Bay

## Reading, By Race/Ethnicity

		90					
99	28	38	20	14	6	<b>∞</b>	White, Not Hisp.
01	0	10	23	68	10	58	Hispanic
46	23	23	8	46	15	31	Black, Not Hisp.
*** 38	4	34	27	35	12	23	Asian/Pacific Islnd
46	16	30	19	*** 36	14	22	Am. Indian/Native Alaskan
Advanced				% Min. Perf.			
and				Tested and			
Proficient		Proficient		%Not	Performance	Tested	
Combined %	% Advanced	%	% Basic	Combined	% Minimal	% Not	Race/Ethnicity

### Math, By Race/Ethnicity

				'			
43	11	32	27	30	21	9	White, Not Hisp.
9 ***	0	6	6	*** 87	35	52	Hispanic
23	8	15	15	61	23	38	Black, Not Hisp.
19	5	14	26	55	32	23	Asian/Pacific Islnd
**************************************	3	5	30	63	41	22	Am. Indian/Native Alaskan
Combined % Proficient and Advanced	% Advanced	% Proficient	% Basic	Combined %Not Tested and %Min. Perf.	% Minimal Performance	% Not Tested	Race/Ethnicity

This information is compiled from the Wisconsin Dept. of Public Instruction's web site's Office of Educational Accountability page (http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/dpi/oea), cited on 27 August 1998 and 8 September 1998.

## 10th Grade Results for Kenosha

### Reading, By Income Level

							Disadvantaged
59	21	38	20	21	7	14	Not Econom.
							Disadvantaged
28	5	23	30	43	13	0.6	Economically
Advanced				% Min. Perf.			
Proficient and				Not Tested and	Performance		
Combined %	% Advanced	% Proficient	% Basic	Combined % % Basic	% Minimal	% Not Tested	Income Level

#### Math, By Income Level

20	2	18	26	54	40	14	Not Econom.  Disadvantaged
4**4	<u> </u>	3	11	*** 85	53	32	Economically Disadvantaged
Combined % Proficient and Advanced	% Advanced	% Proficient	% Basic	Combined % Not Tested and %Min. Perf.	% Minimal Performance		Income Level % Not Tested

This information is compiled from the Wisconsin Dept. of Public Instruction's web site's Office of Educational Accountability page (http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/dpi/oea), cited on 27 August 1998 and 8 September 1998.

## 10th Grade Results for Kenosha

## Reading, By Race/Ethnicity

62	22	40	19	19	7	12	White, Not Hisp.
*** 25	5	20	27	48	12	36	Hispanic
22	3	19	32	46	15	31	Black, Not Hisp.
58	21	37	16	*** 27	16	11	Asian/Pacific Islnd
							Alaskan
	1	1	-	-	-	-	Am. Indian/Native
				Perf.			
Advanced				% Min.			
and				Tested and			
Proficient		Proficient		% Not	Performance	Tested	
Combined %	% Advanced   Combined %	%	% Basic	Combined	% Minimal	% Not	Race/Ethnicity

### Math, By Race/Ethnicity

*** 20	2	18	27	53	40	13	White, Not Hisp.
*** 3	0	3	13	*** 85	46	39	Hispanic
***	0	1	7	*** 92	60	32	Black, Not Hisp.
37	0	37	21	43	32	11	Asian/Pacific Islnd
							Alaskan
1	-	•	1	-	-	ı	Am. Indian/Native
				Perf.			
Advanced				% Min.			
and				Tested and			
Proficient		Proficient		%Not	Performance	Tested	
Combined %	% Advanced	%	% Basic		% Minimal Combined	% Not	Race/Ethnicity

This information is compiled from the Wisconsin Dept. of Public Instruction's web site's Office of Educational Accountability page (http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/dpi/oea), cited on 27 August 1998 and 8 September 1998.

## 10th Grade Results for Madison

### Reading, By Income Level

							Disadvantaged
71	39	32	13	16	5	111	Not Econom.
							Disadvantaged
27	3	24	28	*** 46	16	30	Economically
Advanced				% Min. Perf.			
Proficient and				Not Tested and	Performance		
Combined %	% Advanced	% Proficient	% Basic	Combined % Basic	% Minimal	Income Level   % Not Tested   % Minimal	Income Level

#### Math, By Income Level

				•			
							Disadvantaged
54	21	33	19	28	17	11	Not Econom.
							Disadvantaged
12	3	9	20	68	38	30	Economically
Advanced				% Min. Perf.			
Proficient and				Not Tested and	Performance		
Combined %	% Advanced	% Proficient	% Basic	Combined % % Basic	% Minimal	Income Level   % Not Tested   % Minimal	Income Level

This information is compiled from the Wisconsin Dept. of Public Instruction's web site's Office of Educational Accountability page (http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/dpi/oea), cited on 27 August 1998 and 8 September 1998.

## 10th Grade Results for Madison

## Reading, By Race/Ethnicity

75	41	34	12	13	4	9	White, Not Hisp.
35	14	21	28	*** 38	7	31	Hispanic
25	6	19	22	*** 52	20	32	Black, Not Hisp.
51	20	31	25	24	8	16	Asian/Pacific Islnd
							Alaskan
	ı	ı	1	ı	•	•	Am. Indian/Native
Combined % Proficient and Advanced	% Advanced Combined % Proficient and Advanced	% Proficient	% Basic	Combined %Not Tested and %Min. Perf.	% Minimal Performance	% Not Tested	Race/Ethnicity

### Math, By Race/Ethnicity

White, Not Hisp.	Hispanic	Black, Not Hisp.	Asian/Pacific Islnd	Alaskan	Am. Indian/Native	Race/Ethnicity
9	31	31	17		•	% Not Tested
15	34	44	20		•	% Minimal Performance
24	65	75	37		1	Combined % Not Tested and % Min. Perf.
19	10	12	25			% Basic
34	21	11	23		•	% Proficient
22	3		15		Ī	% Advanced
56	24	12	38		•	Combined % Proficient and Advanced

This information is compiled from the Wisconsin Dept. of Public Instruction's web site's Office of Educational Accountability page (http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/dpi/oea), cited on 27 August 1998 and 8 September 1998.

# 10th Grade Results for Milwaukee

## Reading, By Income Level

				***			
							Disadvantaged
35		24	25	40	24	16	Not Econom.
							Disadvantaged
21	3	18	30	49	28	21	Economically
Advanced				% Min. Perf.			
Proficient and				Not Tested and	Performance		
Combined %	% Advanced	% Proficient	% Basic	Combined % % Basic	% Minimal	% Not Tested	Income Level

#### Math, By Income Level

							Disadvantaged
12	2	10	15	73	55	18	Not Econom.
							Disadvantaged
3	0	3	10	87	66	21	Economically
Advanced				% Min. Perf.			
Proficient and				Not Tested and	Performance		
Combined %	% Advanced	% Proficient	% Basic	Combined % % Basic	% Minimal		Income Level % Not Tested

# 10th Grade Results for Milwaukee

## Reading, By Race/Ethnicity

51	18	33	23	26	15	11	White, Not Hisp.
28	4	24	31	41	26	15	Hispanic
17	2	15	30	54	33	21	Black, Not Hisp.
38	5	33	32	29	16	13	Asian/Pacific Islnd
							Alaskan
34	17	17	33	33	21	12	Am. Indian/Native
				Perf.			-
Advanced				% Min.			
and				Tested and			
Proficient		Proficient		% Not	Performance	Tested	
Combined %	% Advanced   Combined %	%	% Basic	Combined	% Minimal	% Not	Race/Ethnicity

### Math, By Race/Ethnicity

White, Not Hisp.	Hispanic	Black, Not Hisp.	Asian/Pacific Islnd	Alaskan	Am. Indian/Native	Race/Ethnicity
13	17	22	13		9	% Not Tested
45	67	69	52		62	% Minimal Combing Performance % Not Tested % Min.  Perf.
58	84	91	65		71	Combined % Not Tested and % Min. Perf.
21	13	7	21		20	% Basic
17	3	2	13		9	% Proficient
4	0	0	2		0	% Advanced
21	3	2	15		9	ed Combined % Proficient and Advanced

This information is compiled from the Wisconsin Dept. of Public Instruction's web site's Office of Educational Accountability page (http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/dpi/oea), cited on 27 August 1998 and 8 September 1998.

## 10th Grade Results for Racine

## Reading, By Income Level

							Disadvantaged
56	21	35	19	25	9	16	Not Econom.
							Disadvantaged
16	2	14	28	56	21	35	Economically
Advanced				% Min. Perf.			
Proficient and				Not Tested and	Performance		
Combined %	% Advanced	% Proficient	% Basic	Combined %	% Minimal		Income Level   % Not Tested

#### Math, By Income Level

				•			
							Disadvantaged
30	7	23	22	48	32	16	Not Econom.
							Disadvantaged
***2	0	2	10	*** 88	56	32	Economically
Advanced				% Min. Perf.			
Proficient and				Not Tested and	Performance		
Combined %	% Advanced	% Proficient	% Basic	Combined %	% Minimal		Income Level % Not Tested

August 1998 and 8 September 1998. This information is compiled from the Wisconsin Dept. of Public Instruction's web site's Office of Educational Accountability page (http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/dpi/oea), cited on 27

## 10th Grade Results for Racine

## Reading, By Race/Ethnicity

White, Not Hisp. 12	Hispanic 23	Black, Not Hisp. 31	Asian/Pacific Islnd 0	Alaskan	Am. Indian/Native -				l ested   Perform	
'n	18	19	0		ı				Performance	
17	*** 41	50	0			Perf.	% Min.	Tested and	% Not	
17	26	27	13		1					
39	28	18	53		•				Proficient	
28	5	4	33		•					
							Advanced	and	Proficient	

### Math, By Race/Ethnicity

38	9	29	25	37	25	12	White, Not Hisp.
12	2	10	20	69	47	22	Hispanic
5 ***	0	5	11	84	55	29	Black, Not Hisp.
53	20	33	33	13	13	0	Asian/Pacific Islnd
							Alaskan
•	-	1	•	•	•	•	Am. Indian/Native
				Perf.			
Advanced				% Min.			
and				Tested and			
Proficient		Proficient		% Not	Performance	Tested	
Combined %	% Advanced	%	% Basic	Combined	% Minimal	% Not	Race/Ethnicity