Highlights of Performance Comparison Between MPS and Other Urban School Districts

8th Grade Knowledge and Concepts Tests: Reading and Math

Beloit

- Beloit failed to test 26% of its economically disadvantaged students in reading and 23% in math. 25% of Black students were not tested in reading and 26% were not tested in math.
- In Beloit, White students' performance for reading and math was similar to* or lower than that of MPS' White students.
- Beloit's Hispanic students' math performance was lower than MPS'.

Green Bay

- Green Bay's Hispanic students performed at levels similar to* or lower than MPS' Hispanic students in both reading and math.
- Green Bay and MPS had similar* percentages of Native American, Black, and Hispanic students performing at the higher levels (proficient and advanced performance) in math.

Kenosha

- 21% of Kenosha's Hispanic students did not take the tests.
- Kenosha's Hispanic students had lower performance than their MPS counterparts in both reading and math.
- Black students' performance in Kenosha was, on the whole, similar to* their performance in MPS.

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.

8th Grade Results for Beloit

Reading, By Income Level

							Post Committee
							Disadvantaged
53	14	39	16	31	20	pared pared	Not Econom.
							Disadvantaged
*** 22	4	18	18	*** 60	34	26	Economically
Advanced				% Min. Perf.			
Proficient and				Not Tested and	Performance		
Combined %	% Advanced	% Proficient	% Basic	Combined % % Basic	% Minimal		Income Level % Not Tested

Math, By Income Level

							Disanvalliaged
26	6	20	33	41	31	10	Not Econom.
							Disadvantaged
9 ***	2	4	33	61	38	23	Economically
Advanced				% Min. Perf.			
Proficient and				Not Tested and	Performance		
Combined %	% Advanced	% Proficient	% Basic	Combined %	% Minimal		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.

8th Grade Results for Beloit

Reading, By Race/Ethnicity

*** 52	14	38	16	*** 31	20	11	White, Not Hisp.
18	0	18	9	72	36	36	Hispanic
25	5	20	16	*** 59	34	25	Black, Not Hisp.
	1	ı		-	-	-	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

Math, By Race/Ethnicity

*** 26	6	20	37	*** 37	28	9	White, Not Hisp.
0	0	0	27	73	55	18	Hispanic
8	2	6	20	*** 71	45	26	Black, Not Hisp.
•	ı	•		1	1	_	Asian/Pacific Islnd
							Alaskan
-	ı	-	1		•	-	Am. Indian/Native
				Perf.			
Advanced				% Min.			
and				Tested and			
Proficient		Proficient		%Not	Performance % Not	Tested	
Combined %	% Advanced	%	% Basic	Combined	% 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.

8th Grade Results for Green Bay

Reading, By Income Level

ò	Į	,					Disadvantaged
70	20	50	11	18	14	4	Not Econom.
ţ	•						Disadvantaged
77	4	23	17	55	39	16	Economically
Advanced				% Min. Perf.			
Proficient and				Not Lested and	renormance		
Comoinea %	/0 VOAUICEO	/0 T TOTTCICIT) o Longito	W-1 Track 1			
Cant: 30/	ı	% Proficient	% Racio	Combined % % Racic	% Minimal		Income Level % Not Tested

Math, By Income Level

40	13	27	38	22	18	4	Not Econom. Disadvantaged
***	₽ A	7	32	60	44	16	Economically Disadvantaged
Combined % Proficient and Advanced	% Advanced	% Proficient	% Basic	Combined % Not Tested and % Min. Perf.	% Minimal Performance	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.

8th Grade Results for Green Bay

Reading, By Race/Ethnicity

70	20	50	11	19	15	4	White, Not Hisp.
15	3	12	15	69	42	27	Hispanic
26	5	21	21	53	32	21	Black, Not Hisp.
*** 24	4	20	20	46	39	7	Asian/Pacific Islnd
50	3	47	8	41	33	8	Am. Indian/Native Alaskan
ланитеи				Perf.			
and				Tested and			
Proficient		Proficient		%Not	Performance	Tested	
Combined %	% Advanced	%	% Basic	Combined	% Minimal	% Not	Race/Ethnicity

Math, By Race/Ethnicity

00							
38	12	26	39	24	20	4	White, Not Hisp.
0 ***	0	9	18	n	45	27	Hispanic
2 ***	5	0	32	63	37	26	Black, Not Hisp.
14	3	11	32	*** 54	37	17	Asian/Pacific Islnd
*** 14	3	11	36	50	44	6	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/oca), cited on 27 August 1998 and 8 September 1998.

Asterisks indicate district performance within 3% of Milwaukee's. Shaded cells indicate district performance lower than Milwaukee's.

8th Grade Results for Kenosha

Reading, By Income Level

					·	,	Disadvantaged
	14	47	15	24	16	8	Not Econom.
-							Disadvantaged
	5	31	14	51	36	15	Economically
Advancea				% Min. Perf.			
Proficient and				Not Tested and	Performance		
Combined %	% Advanced	% Proficient	% Basic	Combined % % Basic	% Minimal	Income Level % Not Tested	Income Level

Math, By Income Level

23	5	18	43	34	25	9	Not Econom. Disadvantaged
6 ***	1	5	31	63	48	15	Economically Disadvantaged
Combined % Proficient and Advanced	% Advanced	% Proficient	% Basic	Combined % % Basic Not Tested and % Min. Perf.	% Minimal Performance	% Not Tested	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/oca), cited on 27 August 1998 and 8 September 1998.

8th Grade Results for Kenosha

Reading, By Race/Ethnicity

Am. Indian/Native Alaskan Asian/Pacific IsInd 0 Black, Not Hisp. 16 Hispanic 21 White, Not Hisp. 4
Tested ve ve
Tested Performance ve nd 0 17 16 44
Tested Performance ian/Native icific Islnd 0 17
Tested Performance ian/Native
Tested Performance
Performance
Performance
Performance
Performance
Race/Ethnicity % Not % Minimal Combined

Math, By Race/Ethnicity

	<u>л</u>		46	31	26	S	White, Not Hisp.
	0	4	33	*** 63	42	21	Hispanic
**	1	4	22	*** 73	60	13	Black, Not Hisp.
3	0	33	33	33	33	0	Asian/Pacific Islnd
							Alaskan
	•	-		•	-	•	Am. Indian/Native
				Perf.			
Advanced				% Min.			
and				Tested and			
Proficient		Proficient		%Not	Performance	Tested	
Combined %	% Advanced	%	% Basic	Combined	% Minimal	% Not	Race/Ethnicity
Combined 9 Proficient	% Advanced	% Proficient	% Basic		nal ance	% Minir Perform	

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.

8th Grade Results for Madison

Reading, By Income Level

78	26	52	9	13	&	5	Not Econom. Disadvantaged
26	4	22	17	*** 57	35	22	Economically Disadvantaged
Combined % Proficient and Advanced	% Advanced	% Proficient	% Basic	Combined % Not Tested and % Min. Perf.	% Minimal Performance	Income Level % Not Tested	Income Level

Math, By Income Level

							Disadvantaged
51	21	30	32	18	13	5	Not Econom.
							Disadvantaged
9	2	7	28	63	41	22	Economically
Advanced		E E		% 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/oea), cited on 27 August 1998 and 8 September 1998.

8th Grade Results for Madison

Reading, By Race/Ethnicity

82	28	54	9	10	7	3	White, Not Hisp.
41	5	36	20	39	15	24	Hispanic
28	6	22	14	*** 59	39	20	Black, Not Hisp.
35	10	25	17	48	29	19	Asian/Pacific Islnd
							Alaskan
•	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

54	22	32	32	15	11	4	White, Not Hisp.
19	5	14	30	51	30	21	Hispanic
8	2	6	26	66	46	20	Black, Not Hisp.
25	10	15	27	48	28	20	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

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.

Asterisks indicate district performance within 3% of Milwaukee's. Shaded cells indicate district performance lower than Milwaukee's.

8th Grade Results for Milwaukee

Reading, By Income Level

							Disadvantaged
		33	14	43	32		Not Econom.
							Disadvantaged
		20	18	60	49	11	Economically
				% Min. Perf.			
				Not Tested and	Performance		
vanc	% Advanced	% Proficient	% Basic	Combined % % Basic	% Minimal	Income Level % Not Tested	Income Level

Math, By Income Level

19	0	13	30	32	40	12	Disadvantaged
		3	3	5	10	13	Disadvantaged
5		4	25	70	58	12	Economically
Advanced				% Min. Perf.			
Proficient and				Not Tested and	Performance		
Combined %	% Advanced	% Proficient	% Basic	Combined % % Basic	% 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/oea), cited on 27 August 1998 and 8 September 1998.

Asterisks indicate district performance within 3% of Milwaukee's. Shaded cells indicate district performance lower than Milwaukee's.

8th Grade Results for Milwaukee

Reading, By Race/Ethnicity

White, Not Hisp.	Hispanic	Black, Not Hisp.	Asian/Pacific Islnd	Alaskan	Am. Indian/Native	Race/Ethnicity
7	14	11	12		15	% Not Tested
25	43	51	44		29	% Minimal Performance
32	57	62	56		44	Combined %Not Tested and %Min. Perf.
15	17	18	22		21	% Basic
40	25	18	19		29	% Proficient
13	3	2	3		6	% Advanced
53	28	20	22		35	% Advanced Combined % Proficient and Advanced

Math, By Race/Ethnicity

•						
7	17	36	39	31	8	White, Not Hisp.
8	8	29	61	48	13	Hispanic
3		22	74	62	12	Black, Not Hisp.
8	3	40	52	43	9	Asian/Pacific Islnd
						Alaskan
3	13	32	55	42	13	Am. Indian/Native
			Perf.			
			% Min.		,,,	
			Tested and			
	Proficient		% Not	Performance	Tested	
% Advance	%	% Basic	Combined	% Minimal	% 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.

8th Grade Results for Racine

Reading, By Race/Ethnicity

•							
67	18	49	15	18	14	4	White, Not Hisp.
37	6	31	24	39	28	11	Hispanic
28	2	26	20	52	39	13	Black, Not Hisp.
89	33	56	0	11	11	0	Asian/Pacific Islnd
							Alaskan
-	•	•	•	-	-	-	Am. Indian/Native
Combined % Proficient and Advanced	% Advanced	% Proficient	% Basic	Combined % Not Tested and % Min. Perf.	% Minimal Performance	% Not Tested	Race/Ethnicity

Math, By Race/Ethnicity

34	12	22	41	24	20	4	White, Not Hisp.
14	4	10	34	52	41	11	Hispanic
4**	0	4	32	64	50	14	Black, Not Hisp.
44	11	33	44	11	11	0	Asian/Pacific Islnd
							Alaskan
-	-	•	1	1		•	Am. Indian/Native
				Perf.			
Advanced				% Min.			
and			•	Tested and			
Proficient		Proficient		%Not	Performance	Tested	
Combined %	% Advanced	%	% Basic	Combined	% Minimal	% Not	Race/Ethnicity

August 1998 and 8 September 1998.

Asterisks indicate district performance within 3% of Milwaukee's. Shaded cells indicate district performance lower than Milwaukee's. 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

8th Grade Results for Racine

Reading, By Income Level

Disadvantaged 17	Disadvantaged 37			Performance Not	Minimal Com
21	53		% Min Perf	Not Tested and	Combined % % Basic
16	22				% Basic
47	22				% Proficient
16	3			Vo v ran alloca	% Advanced
63	*** 25	Advanced	Proficient and	Comoinea %	Cantingo

Math, By Income Level

Disadvantaged	Not Fromom	Disadvantaged	Economically			Income Level % Not Tested
1		i	16			
24		+	77		Performance	% Minimal
28		0.5		% Min. Perf.	Not Tested and	Combined %
42		29				% Basic
20		8				% Proficient
11		1			, 9 1 1 to 1 all 1 con	% Advanced
31		9	Advanced	r rojicient ana	Ducking 70	Combinator

Asterisks indicate district performance within 3% of Milwaukee's. Shaded cells indicate district performance lower than Milwaukee's. 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.