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Overview

- One in a series of papers to inform future education policies for high schools in New York City
- Sets the stage with descriptive information about system configuration and trends over a 12-year period (1999-2011)
- Papers in this series include:
  - On-track indicators (version published in JESPAR, Feb. 2013)
  - Impact of school closures (“phase outs”)
  - Characteristics of schools that “beat the odds”
  - College enrollment and validation of college readiness indicators
Sample

- Nearly 900,000 students who enrolled in 469 different NYC public high schools between September 1999 and September 2010.
- Students who enrolled as 1st time 9th graders (not students who transferred to NYC after 9th grade).
- Does not include students who enrolled initially in self-contained special education, alternative, or Charter high schools.
- Follow these students through their expected 4-year graduation (eg., September of 2011 for students entering in September 2007).
An Evolving System of High Schools

- In 1999, 212 schools enrolling 72,928 1st time 9th graders:
  - 5 Specialized HS
  - 186 General and Vocational HS
  - 21 Junior HS (grade 7-9)

- In 2010, 409 schools enrolling 72,588 1st time 9th graders:
  - 9 Specialized HS
  - 148 Gen. and Voc. HS operated continuously since 1999
  - 251 New HS (73% enrolling 110 or fewer 1st time 9th graders)
  - 1 Junior HS

- Over 12 years, 60 schools phased out or no longer serving 9th graders:
  - 38 original HS phased out
  - 20 original JHS no longer serve 9th graders
  - 2 schools opened and phased out
The Shifting HS Landscape
More Schools/Smaller Size
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New 9th Graders per school

Number of School/Student per School

First Year of High School (as of September)
Steady Progress/Persistent Aspirations Gap

• Steady improvement at key stages of development:
  ○ Getting on track in Grade 9 (28 percent growth from 2001 to 2007 cohorts, 50 percent through 2011 cohort)
  ○ Staying on track and earning a Regents diploma (64 percent growth from 2001 to 2007 cohorts)
  ○ Graduating with “college ready” credentials (61 percent growth from 2001 to 2007 cohorts)

• Aspirations gap:
  ○ 56-64 percent of Regents diploma recipients do not meet “aspirational performance” standard based on Math and English Regents exams
Progress on 9th Grade on Track, Graduation, and College Readiness

First Year of HS (as of September)

Percent of 1st Time 9th Graders

- Local Diploma
- Regents Diploma
- Advanced Regents Diploma
- On-Track grade 9
- College Ready

2001: 15.9
2002: 19.1
2003: 20.4
2004: 40.7
2005: 53.3
2006: 62.2
Decline in Dropout and Discharge Rates

2001: 18.2%
2002: 22.4%
2003: 18.2%
2004: 11.7%
2005: 17.3%
2006: 11.7%
2007: 17.3%

First Year of HS (as of September)

Discharged
Dropout
Better Preparation in Early Grades and More Effective High Schools

- Better preparation at entry to high school:
  - Improving 8th grade achievement in Math and ELA
  - Improving attendance

- Improving on-track, graduation, and college ready outcomes across the spectrum of prior preparation
  - Strongest gains made by students in the bottom and middle of the distribution of 8th grade attendance and achievement.
Better Prepared 1st Time 9th Graders: ELA and Math Proficiency in Grade 8

First Year of High School (as of September)

Percent Proficient (Level 3-4)

1999 2000 2001 2002 2003 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008 2009 2010

ELA Level 3-4
Math Level 3-4
Graduating with a Regents Diploma
By Grade 8 Attendance and Test Score Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade 8 Attendance Groups</th>
<th>Grade 8 ELA/Math Test Score Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;= 85%</td>
<td>Bottom 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle 60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Top 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>63.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent Earning Regents Diploma

Year: 2001, 2007

- <= 85%
- 86%-94%
- >= 95%
- Bottom 20%
- Middle 60%
- Top 20%
College Readiness
By Grade 8 Attendance and Test Score Groups

Percent College Ready

Grade 8 Attendance Groups
- <= 85%
- 86%-94%
- >= 95%

Grade 8 ELA/Math Test Score Groups
- Bottom 20%
- Middle 60%
- Top 20%

2001
- 2.5
- 9.4
- 0.1
- 0.1
2007
- 3.4
- 15.7
- 22.6
- 3.7

Legend:
- Yellow: 2001
- Blue: 2007
Progress on Closing Gaps, But Significant Differences Remain

- Strongest gains among black, Latino, low-income, ELL and special education students:
  - Regents diploma receipt more than doubled among black, Latino, ELL, and special education students (related services).
  - Growth on college readiness fastest for these groups, but less dramatic than growth on Regents diploma receipt.

- Significant gaps remain:
  - Asian and white students nearly 1.5 times more likely than black and Latino students to earn a Regents diploma and 4 times more likely to be college ready.
  - Approximately 10 percent of entering black and Latino young men graduate college ready.
Graduating with a Regents Diploma By Race and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Young Women</th>
<th>Young Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>84.9</td>
<td>73.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>55.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>76.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regents Diploma Rate

Year: 2001 and 2007
College Readiness
By Race and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian Young Women</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>57.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Young Women</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Young Women</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Young Women</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>44.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Young Men</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Young Men</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Young Men</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Young Men</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graduating with a Regents Diploma By Demographic Groups

At Age Overage Higher SES Lower SES English Not English Non-ELL ELL Not Special Ed Special Ed

2001 2007

- At Age: 68.7% (2001) vs. 43.5% (2007)
- Overage: 34.4% (2001) vs. 14.0% (2007)
- Higher SES: 65.5% (2001) vs. 32.3% (2007)
- Lower SES: 57.3% (2001) vs. 35.0% (2007)
- English: 61.9% (2001) vs. 57.8% (2007)
- Not English: 61.2% (2001) vs. 44.1% (2007)
- Non-ELL: 38.0% (2001) vs. 44.1% (2007)
- ELL: 21.6% (2001) vs. 9.5% (2007)
- Not Special Ed: 62.7% (2001) vs. 27.8% (2007)
- Special Ed: 38.4% (2001) vs. 9.5% (2007)
College Readiness
By Demographic Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At Age</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overage</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher SES</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower SES</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not English</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-ELL</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Special Ed</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Ed</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Looking Forward

- Strong evidence from other studies that new, non-selective small schools produce substantial improvement in student outcomes.
- Three-pronged approach to advance high school reform agenda:
  - Identify and support students who struggle to reach the minimum requirements for a Regents diploma.
  - Align performance standards, curricula, and instruction with the skills that students need to succeed in college.
  - Multiple, high-quality pathways that combine academic and career development and reach students who do not opt for four-year college.
Open Questions

1. Get beyond the averages: What are the characteristics of schools that raise achievement and close gaps?
2. Examine impact of policy elements: What is the impact of phasing out low-performing high schools:
   - On students who are enrolled in the schools as they are phase out?
   - On students who would have enrolled had they remained open?
   - On teachers who work in those schools?
   - On communities?
3. Closer look at system changes: What is the impact of universal and mandatory high school choice:
   - On the distribution and performance of high performing students and students with special needs?
   - On the performance of students who are assigned to preferred schools vs. less preferred schools?
Questions?
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