Ensuring that *all* students in Indiana learn
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### Two to Three

For every two students with free or reduced meals who are proficient on math and ELA, there are **three who are not**.

For every two minority students who are proficient on math and ELA, there are **three who are not**.

### 134,329

134,329 or 13% of students in IN attend a D or F school.

### 181

Black students in 2016 scored 181 points less on the SAT than white students.

### Two

If you are an ELL student, you are **two times** more likely to go to a D or F school than a NonELL student.

### 38% fewer

38% fewer SpEd students are proficient on math and ELA than are GenEd students, according to 2016 ISTEP data.

### 5% higher

The dropout rate for black students is **5% higher** than the dropout rate for white students.

### 10% fewer

10% fewer minority students pass the IREAD exam than white students.

### 15%

The gap between ELL and NonELL students on ELA proficiency closed by 15 percentage points from 2011 to 2016.

### Three

Hispanic and multiracial students are **three times more likely** to go to a D or F school than a white student.

### 21% fewer

21% fewer students with free or reduced meals participated in the SAT when compared to students with paid meals.
Executive Summary

Achievement gaps exist when one group of students significantly outperforms another group, and they impact minority students, low-income students, English language learners, and special education students. These gaps are the product of past policies that have left some groups historically disadvantaged and with a lesser opportunity to change their situation. The disparities among these groups affect society in numerous ways such as lost tax revenue, higher crime, and greater health costs. To assist with the Board’s responsibility to establish the educational goals of the state, this report provides information on gaps in Indiana public schools as they relate to access, achievement, and opportunity for upward mobility. When reviewing the data, it is important to consider how the Board can act to stop the cycle of achievement gaps and improve the lives of students from these subgroups across the state. **Goals set forth by the Board can help to show that Indiana is not only a state that works, but a state that works for everyone.**

**Access**
- Of 1,825 public schools, 271 are rated D or F
- 134,329 students attend D or F schools
- Students in D and F schools are disproportionately minority and/or low-income

**Achievement**
- These subgroups of students fall far behind the state average on statewide standardized assessments
- On IREAD, students with free/reduced meals pass 15.8% less often than students with paid meals
- Minority students passed ISTEP at a rate of 20% lower than the passing rate of white students

**Opportunity**
- Early disparities in achievement place students on a track that lacks in college and career readiness
- Minority students and students with free/reduced meals graduate at lower rates and drop out at higher rates than white students and students with paid meals
- These students are also significantly less likely to participate and succeed on Advanced Placement (AP) exams and the SAT

**Cycle Continues**
- Students who do not pursue college or a technical career earn significantly less income and are less likely to move to a more affluent community
- The children of these students grow up with lesser access to quality schools, achieve at lower rates on assessments, and do not participate in or perform as highly on assessments used by college admissions
- The cycle continues and achievement gaps perpetuate
Introduction

Purpose

IC 20-19-2-14 gives the IN State Board of Education the authority to (1) establish the educational goals of the state, developing standards and objectives for local school corporations, and (2) assess the attainment of the established goals. As part of these responsibilities, the issue of achievement gaps must be addressed when formulating Indiana education policy. The data shows that while Indiana ranks highly in quality of education, there is still a lot of work to do to ensure equity of this quality. The purpose of this report is to assist the Board by providing information on gaps in Indiana public schools relating to access, achievement, and opportunity for upward mobility.

What is an achievement gap?

According to the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), an achievement gap is “when one group of students outperforms another group and the difference in average scores for the two groups is statistically significant.” While achievement gaps are commonly associated with racial disparities, they can also affect groups such as low-income students, English language learners, and special education students. Achievement gaps can be seen not only on test scores, but in many aspects of the education system, such as gaps in access to high quality facilities, teachers, resources, and opportunities.

Why should we care?

Achievement gaps impact our society in a number of ways. First, there is a significant link between level of education and median annual earnings. A study by the U.S. Census Bureau shows that there is a $5,000 difference between high school graduates and dropouts, and a $20,000 difference between a high school graduate and an individual with a Bachelor’s degree. This income difference translates into lost income tax revenue for the state; Data from 2002 and adjusted for present values shows that, due to dropouts, Indiana lost:

- $4,221,265,000 in income
- $890,098,000 in federal income taxes
- $143,523,000 in state income taxes

Second, closing the achievement gap would help reduce crime and eliminate the school-to-prison pipeline. Only around two-thirds of African American and Latino students graduate from high school on time, compared to approximately 80 percent of their white peers. Consequently, African American and Latino males make up over 60 percent of the nation’s male inmates, even though they comprise only one third of the population. This pipeline is also costly to the taxpayer—the nation spends an average of $23,643 per year to educate a student, and states’ average annual cost per inmate is $28,323. The benefits of a better education system are undeniable, as only a 5 percent increase in the male graduation rate is expected to produce $360,000,000 in annual crime-related savings and $26,000,000 in annual additional earnings in Indiana.
Third, higher quality education is also better for individual health. **U.S. adults without a high school diploma at age 25 have a lower life expectancy than college graduates by 9 years.*** Studies have also shown that “the children of less educated parents suffer higher obesity rates, have more social and emotional problems, and are more likely to report poor or fair health.”

**Things to Consider**

As Indiana improves education attainment, are all students demonstrating the same levels of growth and achievement?

How do gaps that affect students in K-12 continue to impact them as they enter college and the work force?

How can educational goals set forth by the Board contribute to the resolution of achievement gaps, and what could the implications of these goals be on individual students' lives?
About the Data

- In 2014, there was a shift to more rigorous standards, which in turn led to more rigorous assessments. This resulted in drops in scores on assessments statewide in 2015 and 2016.
- IN’s accountability model shifted in 2015 to focus equally on both proficiency and growth. Consequently, there is an overall decrease in scores and letter grades across the board in 2016 compared to previous years. However, this dip has affected all subgroups and should not have an impact on the changes in gap sizes.
- This report is meant to provide information on gaps in various aspects of the education system. The data has in no way been manipulated or altered to fit a certain agenda. As such, the information should not be misconstrued as a poor reflection on individual subgroups or educators.
- This report focuses only on achievement gaps in public schools. The years in consideration were determined by accessibility to information and statewide reporting laws.

Terms

- IREAD: Indiana Reading Evaluation and Determination
  - Administered to students in third grade to assess reading skills
- ISTEP: Indiana Statewide Testing for Educational Progress-Plus
  - Administered to students in grades 3-8 to assess achievement in mathematics, English/Language Arts (ELA), Science and Social Studies
- AP: Advanced Placement
  - Courses offered by certain schools and administered by the College Board for the purpose of granting college credit to students while still in high school
- F/R: Free and Reduced Price Meals
  - Available to students from low-income families as part of the IDOE’s Child Nutrition Programs
- ELL: English Language Learner
  - Students are classified as English Language Learners based on their level of English proficiency as determined by a placement test administered upon their arrival in the U.S.
- SpEd: Special Education
  - Students with an Individualized Education Program (IEP) are classified as special education for reporting purposes, separate from general education (GenEd)
Gaps in Access

Disparities in Fillers of A/B/C Seats

The IN Student-Centered A-F Accountability Model consists of a series of metrics that take into account student growth and performance. This section focuses on subgroups of students that are disproportionately concentrated in D and F schools.

To preface the data, it is important to consider overall enrollment and the student population disaggregated. As shown in Figure 1, the IN student population has stayed fairly consistent over the last seven years, and is predominantly white with minority students making up 25.2% of the population in 2010, and 31.0% in 2017. Of the student population, 45.7% receive free or reduced meals; of those receiving free or reduced meals, the majority are white (Figure 2).

While minority students make up a disproportionate amount of students on free/reduced lunch in Indiana, the majority are white.
Students during the 2015-2016 school year were spread across **approximately 1,825 public schools**. From 2011 to 2014, the state demonstrated progress towards decreasing the number of students in a D or F school. Shifts in Indiana’s academic standards and the state’s accountability model went into effect in 2015 which makes the data less comparable, and should serve as a new baseline.

- 2011 – 2014: Consistent standards, assessments, and accountability model
- 2015: Shift to new, more rigorous standards and assessments; accountability held harmless
- 2016: Shift to new accountability model; first year under new standards *and* accountability

*Figure 3: Number of Students by School Grade, 2011-2016*
The demographic breakdown of students in the different grade schools is shown in Figure 4. Various subgroups can be compared to the “All Students” column for comparison. Data across the subgroups has been calculated separately and controls for duplication.

Two of the biggest predictors of a student’s access to a high quality seat are ethnicity and geographic location.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage of Total Enrollment</th>
<th>Percentage in D/F Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Black students also have the highest likelihood of attending a D or F school when compared to other ethnicities.
Gaps in Achievement

K-8: Does every student succeed?

Achievement gaps are traditionally associated with the performance of certain demographic groups on standardized tests. This section will consider the performance of various subgroups on two tests administered to students in grades K-8: IREAD and ISTEP.

Indiana Reading Evaluation and Determination (IREAD)

Gaps among students begin to show as early as 3rd grade when it comes to reading abilities. Research suggests students who are not at or above grade level reading proficiency in 3rd grade are four times as likely to drop out of high school or not graduate on time.1 IREAD is thus indicative of whether a student is on a college and career readiness track. Figure 5 shows the IREAD passing rates for the various ethnic subgroups.1 Black students fall the farthest behind with an average gap of 11 percentage points below the state average passing rate, and 14 percentage points below white students’ passing rate.

![IREAD Passing Percentages Disaggregated](image)

**Figure 5: IREAD Passing Percentages Disaggregated, 2012-2017; 2017 Data Incomplete**

1 As of July 2017, IREAD data for 2017 is not yet complete. The large decrease in passing rates overall is due to the exclusion of re-testers (students who are not taking the test for the first time) and thus the data appears skewed. This report will be updated as soon as complete 2017 IREAD data becomes available.
Since 2012, the minority-white gap has remained constant.

Over the past 5 years, the gap between free/reduced meals and paid meals has been inconsistent but remained relatively flat.

ELL students have one of the largest gaps in the state, but it has decreased over the last 5 years.

Students with special needs have the largest 3rd grade literacy gap.
Indiana Statewide Testing for Educational Progress-Plus (ISTEP)

The following figures look at three metrics related to the ISTEP assessment—the percentage of students passing math, the percentage of students passing ELA, and the percentage of students passing both sections. While changes to standards and assessment following 2015 should be considered when reviewing this data, we present the gaps between particular subgroups to allow for more accurate comparison.

Black students and SpEd students demonstrate the largest gaps in proficiency on ISTEP. These gaps appear to have been made worse by the shifts to more rigorous standards.

ISTEP: Math and ELA

- For every ONE low-income student who is proficient on math & ELA, there are TWO who are not
- For every ONE black student who is proficient on math and ELA, there are THREE who are not
- For every ONE SpEd student who is proficient on math and ELA, there are FOUR who are not

Figure 10: 2016 Passing Rates for Both the Math and ELA Sections of ISTEP
• Students with free or reduced meals passed the ELA section at a rate **26 percentage points lower** than that of students with paid meals

• Black students still have the **largest gap** of the ethnic subgroups

• Black students are **half as likely** to pass the math section of ISTEP when compared to white students

• The gap between ELL and NonELL students is **at its smallest** on the math portion of the test
Figure 13: Minority ISTEP Gaps, 2012-2016; White Students represented as 0.0% baseline

Figure 14: Free/Reduced Meals ISTEP Gaps, 2012-2016; Paid Meals represented as 0.0% baseline
Figure 15: English Language Learner ISTEP Gaps, 2011-2016; Non-English Language Learners represented as 0.0% baseline.

Figure 16: Special Education ISTEP Gaps, 2011-2016; General Education represented as 0.0% baseline.
Gaps in Opportunity for Upward Mobility

Indicators of College and Career Readiness

Upward mobility is generally defined as the ability for a child to move between socioeconomic levels during their lifetime.

As discussed earlier in this report, an individual’s level of education has a significant impact on their future income earnings, and thus on their potential for upward mobility. This section will first consider graduation rates by subgroup, the most basic indicator of educational attainment. It will then explore additional indicators of educational attainment such as Advanced Placement assessments and SAT scores.

Graduation and Dropout Rates

In 2016, the state average graduation and dropout rates were 89% and 4%, respectively. The rates of minority students were 84% and 6%. The rates of black students were 79% and 8%. Although the dropout rate for black students has decreased, it is still double that of the state average.

![Graduation Rate Disaggregated by Ethnicity](image_url)

*Figure 17: Graduation Rates Disaggregated, 2011-2016; Scale begins at 70.0%*
Figure 18: Dropout Rates Disaggregated, 2011-2016

Figure 19: Minority Graduation and Dropout Gaps, 2011-2016; White students represented as 0.0% baseline
Figure 20: Free/Reduced Graduation and Dropout Gaps, 2011-2016; Paid Meals represented as 0.0% baseline

Figure 21: English Language Learner Graduation and Dropout Gaps, 2011-2016; Non-English Language Learners represented as 0.0% baseline
Advanced Placement (AP)

Figures 23 and 24 show the participation and passing rates for AP exams among high school graduates, as an indicator of readiness for college coursework. When looking at the data, it is also important to note that Indiana has allocated funds that would cover exam fees for low income students so as not to discourage these students from participating.10

Black students participate less and pass at a lower rate than the other ethnic subgroups, with a passing rate of only 4% in 2015. Contrarily, Asian students are outperforming all other subgroups with a passing rate of 42% in 2015. Fortunately, rates across the board are gradually rising. From Figures 25 and 26, one can see that students with free/reduced meals are experiencing gaps that are nearly double those of minority students and are widening. This could suggest that covering exam fees for these students is not an adequate solution.
Figure 23: AP Participation Rates Disaggregated by Ethnicity, 2010-2015

Figure 24: AP Passing Rates Disaggregated by Ethnicity, 2010-2015
Minority-White AP Exam Gaps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Participation/Passing Rate Gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>-7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>-9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>-9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>-8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>-9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>-7.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 25: Minority AP Exam Participation and Passing Rate Gaps, 2010-2015; White Students represented as 0.0% baseline

F/R-Paid Meals AP Exam Gaps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Participation/Passing Rate Gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>-14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>-18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>-19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>-19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>-20.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>-20.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 26: Free/Reduced Meals AP Exam Participation and Passing Rate Gaps, 2010-2015; Paid Meals represented as 0.0% baseline
SAT Participation and Scores

The SAT is a standardized test administered by College Board and used by college admissions officers to assess a student’s preparedness for college coursework. Through a partnership with College Board, IDOE has been able to access Indiana students’ scores and participation on the SAT for analysis. Currently, Indiana reports an SAT composite score out of 1600. College Board has determined a benchmark, college-ready composite score of 1010.12

Overall participation rates have risen since 2010, though gaps are still prevalent. Composite scores have remained fairly consistent over the years, with black students scoring 160 points below the state average, followed by Hispanic students scoring 90 points below the state average. Students with free/reduced meals experience a gap that is doubled that which is experienced by minority students.

Figure 27: SAT Participation Disaggregated by Ethnicity, 2010-2015; Scale begins at 30.0%
Overall participation rates have risen, though composite scores and gaps have remained fairly consistent since 2010.
Over the past 5 years, the participation gap between minority and white students has stayed consistent.

The score gap between minority and white students has fluctuated, but shows a widening trend since 2010.

The participation gap between free/reduced meals and paid meals has gotten 5 percentage points wider since 2010.

The score gap between students in poverty and their more affluent peers has widened each year over the last five years.
Looking Forward

Indiana has taken great strides when it comes to education. Almost two-thirds of students attend an A or B school and the number of A/B schools has generally been increasing. Indiana also consistently scores above the national average on NAEP comparative assessments. The data has shown that the gap is closing on some metrics:

- The graduation rate gap has been closing across most subgroups
- SAT Composite Score gaps for students with free/reduced meals has greatly decreased
- Gaps between ELL and NonELL students have significantly closed across the board

While we seem to be heading in the right direction, there is still work to be done. We must consider how to create and implement effective policies that will address these gaps and ensure that all students in Indiana achieve to their greatest potential. **Equality begins with education, and everyone is a stakeholder in the future of our children.**

Additional Resources

If you would like to learn more, please visit any of the following:

- "Indiana Report Card" – National Assessment for Educational Progress (NAEP)
- “Students Affected by Achievement Gaps” – National Education Association (NEA)
- “2016 Indiana Career Readiness Report” – IN Department of Education
- “2017 Indiana College Readiness Report” – IN Commission for Higher Education
- “2017 Dual Credit Performance Report” – IN Commission for Higher Education
- “Mobility Report Cards” – The Equality of Opportunity Project
Notes

1 http://iga.in.gov/legislative/laws/2016/ic/titles/020/articles/019/chapters/002/#section-14
2 https://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/studies/gaps/
9 http://www.aecf.org/m/resourcedoc/AECF-DoubleJeopardy-2012-Full.pdf
11 https://collegereadiness.collegeboard.org/about
12 https://collegereadiness.collegeboard.org/about/scores/benchmarks
Appendix A: Black-White Gaps

For every one black student proficient on math and ELA, there are three who are not.

In 2015, one in five black students took an AP exam, and only one in twenty passed.
In 2015, Hispanic students scored a 908 on the SAT, 102 points below the College Board benchmark.

One in seven Hispanic students did not graduate on time in 2016.
Appendix C: Multiracial-White Gaps

In 2015, one in three multiracial students took an AP exam, and only one in seven passed.

One in three multiracial students are not proficient at math and ELA.
Appendix D: Asian-White Gaps

In 2015, three in four Asian students took the SAT, compared to the state average of three in five students.

In 2015, three in five Asian students took an AP exam, and two in five passed.
Appendix E: F/R-Paid Meals Gaps

In 2015, one in five students with F/R meals took an AP exam, and only one in fourteen passed.

For every one student with F/R meals who is proficient on math and ELA, there are two who are not.
Appendix F: ELL-NonELL Gaps

The ISTEP gaps between ELL and NonELL students have been cut in half since 2011.

One in four ELL students did not graduate on time in 2016.
Appendix G: SpEd-GenEd Gaps

For every one SpEd student who is proficient on math and ELA, there are four who are not.

One in four SpEd students did not graduate on time in 2016, yet only one in 33 dropped out.
## Indicators of Student Achievement

### Graduation Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>Gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black – White</td>
<td>-10.7%</td>
<td>-11.3%</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic – White</td>
<td>-7.1%</td>
<td>-4.6%</td>
<td>+2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial – White</td>
<td>-6.2%</td>
<td>-4.2%</td>
<td>+2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority – White</td>
<td>-8.4%</td>
<td>-7.0%</td>
<td>+1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F/R – Paid Meals</td>
<td>-11.5%</td>
<td>-8.7%</td>
<td>+2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL – NonELL</td>
<td>-14.2%</td>
<td>-16.4%</td>
<td>-2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SpEd - GenEd</td>
<td>-23.4%</td>
<td>-20.4%</td>
<td>+3.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Dropout Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>Gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black – White</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>+1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic – White</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial – White</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority – White</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>+0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F/R – Paid Meals</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>-2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL – NonELL</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>-0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SpEd - GenEd</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>-2.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Indicators of Student Achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>Gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AP Participation Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black – White</td>
<td>-13.0%</td>
<td>-14.9%</td>
<td>-1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic – White</td>
<td>-8.8%</td>
<td>-8.0%</td>
<td>+0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial – White</td>
<td>-4.9%</td>
<td>-5.1%</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority – White</td>
<td>-7.8%</td>
<td>-7.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F/R – Paid Meals</td>
<td>-14.6%</td>
<td>-20.4%</td>
<td>-5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL – NonELL</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SpEd - GenEd</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>Gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AP Passing Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black – White</td>
<td>-10.1%</td>
<td>-14.8%</td>
<td>-4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic – White</td>
<td>-5.0%</td>
<td>-6.9%</td>
<td>-1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial – White</td>
<td>-3.5%</td>
<td>-4.7%</td>
<td>-1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority – White</td>
<td>-5.3%</td>
<td>-7.3%</td>
<td>-2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F/R – Paid Meals</td>
<td>-9.5%</td>
<td>-15.5%</td>
<td>-6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL – NonELL</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SpEd - GenEd</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Indicators of Student Achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IREAD Passing Rate</th>
<th>ISTEP 3-8 Math Passing Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black – White</td>
<td>-17.6%</td>
<td>-12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic – White</td>
<td>-11.2%</td>
<td>-10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial – White</td>
<td>-4.9%</td>
<td>-3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority – White</td>
<td>-12.6%</td>
<td>-9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F/R – Paid Meals</td>
<td>-11.7%</td>
<td>-10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL – NonELL</td>
<td>-21.7%</td>
<td>-16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SpEd - GenEd</td>
<td>-28.8%</td>
<td>-28.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                      | 2011               | 2016                        | Gap          |
| Black – White        | -27.3%             | -32.1%                      | -4.8%        |
| Hispanic – White     | -13.8%             | -18.5%                      | -4.7%        |
| Multiracial – White  | -9.0%              | -12.0%                      | -3.0%        |
| Minority – White     | -17.7%             | -20.6%                      | -2.9%        |
| F/R – Paid Meals     | -19.4%             | -27.5%                      | -8.1%        |
| ELL – NonELL         | -20.5%             | -9.8%                       | +10.7%       |
| SpEd - GenEd         | -26.4%             | -35.1%                      | -8.7%        |
# Indicators of Student Achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>Gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicators of Student Achievement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ISTEP 3-8 ELA Passing Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black – White</td>
<td>-23.7%</td>
<td>-27.7%</td>
<td>-4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic – White</td>
<td>-14.6%</td>
<td>-17.4%</td>
<td>-2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial – White</td>
<td>-7.2%</td>
<td>-8.7%</td>
<td>-1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority – White</td>
<td>-16.3%</td>
<td>-18.3%</td>
<td>-2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F/R – Paid Meals</td>
<td>-20.1%</td>
<td>-25.7%</td>
<td>-5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL – NonELL</td>
<td>-27.1%</td>
<td>-12.6%</td>
<td>+14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SpEd - GenEd</td>
<td>-35.8%</td>
<td>-44.6%</td>
<td>-8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SAT Composite Score</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black – White</td>
<td>-176</td>
<td>-181</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic – White</td>
<td>-94</td>
<td>-110</td>
<td>-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial – White</td>
<td>-44</td>
<td>-51</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority – White</td>
<td>-54</td>
<td>-68</td>
<td>-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F/R – Paid Meals</td>
<td>-93</td>
<td>-111</td>
<td>-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL – NonELL</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SpEd - GenEd</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>