



DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Office of Data and Accountability

July 2013

DC CAS 2013 Results



We Have Set Incredibly Ambitious Goals . . .



GOAL

1

IMPROVE ACHIEVEMENT RATES

At least **70%** of our students will be **proficient in reading and math**, and we will **double the number of advanced students** in the district.



Proficiency rates

READING

SY 10-11 **43%** ➔ SY 15-17 **70%**

MATH

SY 10-11 **43%** ➔ SY 15-17 **70%**

Number of advanced students

READING

SY 10-11 **1,907** ➔ SY 15-17 **3,814**

MATH

SY 10-11 **2,382** ➔ SY 15-17 **4,764**

District of Columbia Public Schools



GOAL

2

INVEST IN STRUGGLING SCHOOLS

Our **40 lowest-performing schools** will **increase proficiency rates by 40 percentage points**.



Proficiency rates in the 40 lowest-performing schools*

READING



SY 10-11 **23%** ➔ SY 15-17 **63%**

MATH


SY 10-11 **22%** ➔ SY 15-17 **62%**

*Average of 40 lowest-performing schools


...that we knew would be challenging to achieve.





DCPS' 2013 CAS results demonstrate that we can achieve our goals





DCPS' 2013 CAS results show achievement gains in composition and science.



Advanced rates are up while below basic rates are down




Every subgroup increased proficiency in math, most increased proficiency in reading




Our lowest performing schools narrowed the gap with other schools

- 34 of our 40/40 schools (85%) showed gains in reading or math
- 22 of our lowest 40 schools saw growth in both reading and math
 - 26 grew in math
 - 30 grew in reading
- 13 of our 40/40 schools (33%) had double-digit gains
- As a group, students at 40/40 schools grew more than non-40/40 schools and more than the district as a whole in both reading and math.



PWP/Extended Day schools post large gains

- 7 of 8 PWP/Extended Day schools improved in both math and reading
 - 4 of 8 schools grew by double-digits
- As a group, students in PWP/Extended Day schools grew 10.6 percentage points in math and 7.2 percentage points in reading, compared to 3.3 and 3.7 percentage points, respectively, for students in non-PWP/Extended Day schools.




The Black/White achievement gap narrowed in reading and math

Math			
	White	Black	Gap
2012	89.1	37.2	51.9
2013	91.1	40.0	51.1



Reading			
	White	Black	Gap
2012	90.6	35.3	55.3
2013	92.1	38.6	53.5



Students in nearly every ward improved performance in reading and math over 2012 levels

Ward	2012	2013	Math Gains	2012	2013	Reading Gains
1	50.0%	53.2%	+3.2	42.2%	47.5%	+5.3
2	64.9%	70.0%	+5.1	63.7%	66.5%	+2.8
3	80.5%	82.2%	+1.7	80.5%	80.4%	-0.1
4	47.3 %	52.0%	+4.7	45.3%	50.9%	+5.6
5	39.1%	42.2%	+3.1	39.8%	40.1%	+0.3
6	46.4 %	49.0%	+3.4	42.7%	47.6%	+4.9
7	33.5 %	34.7%	+0.8	28.8%	31.2%	+2.4
8	24.0 %	27.2%	+3.2	21.5%	25.8%	+4.3

Students at every grade improved performance in reading and math over 2012 levels

Grade	2012	2013	Math Gains	2012	2013	Reading Gains
3	39.5%	43.0%	+3.5	40.9%	44.0%	+3.1
4	50.7%	55.8%	+5.1	47.8%	50.7%	+2.9
5	46.2%	48.9%	+2.7	45.7%	51.8%	+6.1
6	43.7%	47.1%	+3.4	38.2%	39.6%	+1.4
7	50.8%	52.7%	+1.9	43.2%	52.7%	+9.5
8	49.6%	57.1%	+7.5	43.4%	48.0%	+4.6
10	41.8%	44.0%	+2.2	43.6%	44.6%	+1.0

Most schools saw growth in reading, math or both

- **78% of schools (87 schools) posted gains in reading or math from 2012 to 2013**
 - As compared to 60% of schools (66 schools) gaining in reading or math from 2011 to 2012
- **49% of schools (54 schools) saw growth in both reading and math from 2012 to 2013**
 - As compared to 29% of schools (32 schools) gaining in reading and math from 2011 to 2012
- **12 schools attained the highest proficiency rates in both reading and math that they have had in the history of the DC CAS in 2013** (as compared to 7 in 2012):

Janney ES	Nalle ES
Johnson, John Hayden MS	Powell ES
Kelly Miller MS	Ross ES
MacFarland MS (Closing, July 2013)	Thomson ES
Malcolm X ES	Tubman ES
Maury ES	Wheatley EC
- **66 schools showed growth in math over 2012, 22 of those showed double digit growth over 2012**
 - As compared to 57 schools in math over 2011, 16 of those with double digit growth over 2011
- **75 schools showed growth in reading over 2012, 15 of those showed double digit growth over 2012**
 - As compared to 41 school in reading over 2011, 5 of those with double digit growth over 2011

Schools with greatest gains in proficiency

Reading Top 10 Gainers (% point change)

Maury ES	28.8
Malcolm X ES	20.2
MacFarland MS	19.7
Ross ES	18.4
Nalle ES	16.2
LaSalle-Backus EC	14.7
King, M.L. ES	14.0
Kelly Miller MS	13.4
C.W. Harris ES	13.1
Bruce-Monroe ES @ Park View	12.6

Math Top 10 Gainers (% point change)


Nalle ES	27.2
J.O. Wilson ES	24.6
Seaton ES	21.9
Leckie ES	21.4
MacFarland MS	20.2
Maury ES	19.2
Ellington School of the Arts	17.1
Bruce-Monroe ES @ Park View	15.9
Browne EC	15.7
Kelly Miller MS	14.4

2013 DC CAS Results – Five Things To Know

1. DCPS students improved their proficiency in reading and math and the gains were the biggest since 2009. Not only were more DCPS students proficient, more were also advanced and fewer were below basic.
2. Black, Hispanic, White, Asian, Special Education, and low-income students all improved performance significantly in reading and math.
3. While all groups improved, the Black/White achievement gap narrowed and our lowest performing schools narrowed the gap with our higher performing schools.
4. Students in every ward improved their performance over 2012.
5. Students in every grade improved their performance over 2012.




In 2013, DCPS students reached their highest proficiency rates ever in reading and math.




DCPS has the highest rates of advanced students ever.

Reading



Math



Composition

2013 (n=7,817)



DCPS has the lowest rates of below basic students ever in math

Reading



(n=24,639)

2007

(n=24,639)

(n=21,527)

2008

(n=21,527)

(n=19,524)

2009

(n=19,500)

(n=19,095)

2010

(n=19,096)

(n=19,370)

2011

(n=19,348)

(n=18,667)

2012


(n=18,635)

(n=18,668)

2013

(n=18,657)

Math



Composition

2013

(n=7,817)

20%

30%

29%

21%


Below Basic Basic Proficient Advanced

All subgroups have grown significantly in reading and math since 2007


Math				Reading			
	2007	2013	Change from 2007		2007	2013	Change from 2007
Black (n=13,280)	23.4%	40.0%	+16.6%	Black (n=13,295)	30.1%	38.6%	+8.5%
Hispanic (n=2,747)	36.2%	57.4%	+21.2%	Hispanic (n=2,745)	40.6%	51.2%	+10.6%
White (n=1,945)	81.9%	91.1%	+9.2%	White (n=1,945)	87.0%	92.1%	+5.1%
Asian (n=359)	70.2%	85.8%	+15.6%	Asian (n=358)	63.6%	73.2%	+9.6%
ELL (n=2,080)	33.6%	48.3%	+14.7%	ELL (n=2,075)	35.0%	36.9%	+1.9%
FARM (n=14,294)	22.3%	40.4%	+18.1%	FARM (n=14,306)	28.4%	37.6%	+9.2%
SPED (n=3,575)	8.3%	20.5%	+12.2%	SPED (n=3,583)	12.9%	18.1%	+5.2%

Student at every grade have shown growth since 2007

Math



Reading




Students in all 8 wards have improved proficiency rates in reading and math since 2007.

Math				Reading			
WARD	2007	2013	Change from 2007	WARD	2007	2013	Change from 2007
1	37.5	53.2	+15.7	1	39.3	47.5	+8.2
2	47.8	70.0	+22.2	2	57.1	66.5	+9.4
3	69.0	82.2	+13.2	3	73.9	80.4	+6.5
4	43.2	52.0	+8.8	4	48.6	50.9	+2.3
5	35.1	42.2	+7.1	5	37.5	40.1	+2.6
6	32.5	49.0	+16.5	6	40.3	47.6	+7.3
7	17.6	34.7	+17.1	7	25.7	31.2	+5.5
8	14.2	27.2	+13.0	8	21.0	25.8	+4.8


2013 DC CAS Results – Five More Things To Know

1. DCPS has the highest proficiency rates ever.
2. DCPS has the highest advanced rates ever in reading and math, and the lowest below basic rates ever in math.
3. Black, Hispanic, White, Asian, Special Education, and low-income students all improved performance significantly in reading and math since 2007.
4. Students in most grades have seen double digit gains in reading and math since 2007.
5. Students in every ward improved their performance since 2007.


Our Progress – In Math, we have gone from a daunting task in our lowest performing schools . . .




...to a challenging one.



Our Progress – In Reading, we have gone from a near impossible task in our lowest performing schools . . .



... To one I know that we can handle.



Progress toward *A Capital Commitment*



Goal 1: At Least **70%** of our students will be proficient in reading and math

Reading

Where we
started
(SY10-11)

43.5%

Where we
stand
(SY12-13)

47.4%

How much
we have to go
(SY16-17)

+22.6%

Math

43.9%

49.5%

+20.5%



Goal 1b: We will **double** the number of advanced students

Reading

1907

2127

+1687

Math

2382

3055

+1709



Goal 2: Our 40 lowest-performing schools will increase proficiency rates by **40 percentage points***

Reading

25.5%

28.0%

+37.5%

Math

24.5%

29.7%

+34.8%

*Goal targets revised upward based on new cohort of 40/40 schools

**“WHILE WE HAVE
ACCOMPLISHED A
LOT IN DCPS, AND
WE HAVE A LOT TO
BE PROUD OF, WE
STILL HAVE A LONG
WAY TO GO”**

Appendix

Results by school

School	Classification	Math			Reading		
		2012	2013	Change	2012	2013	Change
Aiton ES	Priority	20.6%	13.0%	-7.6%	17.5%	18.8%	1.3%
Amidon Bowen ES	Priority	16.8%	20.6%	3.8%	21.8%	30.9%	9.1%
Anacostia HS	Priority	12.0%	18.5%	6.5%	16.9%	19.6%	2.7%
Ballou HS	Priority	22.8%	18.7%	-4.1%	20.0%	13.4%	-6.6%
Browne EC	Priority	21.8%	37.6%	15.7%	19.5%	26.4%	6.9%
C W Harris ES	Priority	19.4%	31.3%	11.9%	15.3%	28.4%	13.1%
Cardozo HS At Meyer	Priority	31.6%	32.6%	1.0%	25.5%	19.7%	-5.8%
Drew ES	Priority	4.8%	12.0%	7.2%	21.0%	16.0%	-5.0%
Dunbar HS	Priority	19.7%	16.8%	-2.9%	27.7%	17.9%	-9.8%
Eastern HS	Priority		39.3%			45.1%	
Garfield ES	Priority	11.8%	25.0%	13.2%	9.4%	15.6%	6.2%
Hendley ES	Priority	24.1%	25.2%	1.0%	18.4%	17.1%	-1.2%
Houston ES	Priority	34.2%	19.3%	-14.9%	35.5%	22.9%	-12.6%
Johnson John Hayden MS	Priority	23.3%	29.2%	5.9%	18.0%	30.1%	12.1%
Kelly Miller MS	Priority	38.5%	52.9%	14.4%	24.0%	37.5%	13.4%
Kramer MS	Priority	25.4%	31.5%	6.1%	16.9%	23.1%	6.2%
Langdon EC	Priority	57.2%	42.9%	-14.3%	55.6%	53.4%	-2.2%
Lasalle Backus EC	Priority	17.6%	30.9%	13.2%	19.9%	34.6%	14.7%
Luke Moore Alternative HS	Priority	7.9%	7.5%	-0.4%	22.2%	11.3%	-11.0%
M C Terrell Mcgogney ES	Priority	19.4%	18.2%	-1.3%	22.2%	28.8%	6.6%
Malcolm X ES	Priority	18.5%	31.7%	13.1%	14.8%	35.0%	20.2%
Moten ES	Priority	20.9%	12.8%	-8.1%	19.1%	14.5%	-4.6%
Patterson ES	Priority	18.4%	24.0%	5.6%	28.2%	15.0%	-13.2%
Prospect LC	Priority	20.0%	16.2%	-3.8%	7.8%	10.8%	3.0%

Results by school (ctd.)

School	Classification	Math			Reading		
		2012	2013	Change	2012	2013	Change
Roosevelt HS	Priority	17.9%	19.7%	1.7%	15.4%	21.1%	5.7%
Savoy ES	Priority	16.0%	21.5%	5.5%	19.4%	26.6%	7.1%
Spingarn HS	Priority	12.8%	17.2%	4.4%	13.5%	22.7%	9.2%
Stanton ES	Priority	28.1%	42.4%	14.3%	18.8%	19.9%	1.1%
Washington Metropolitan HS	Priority	8.3%	5.2%	-3.2%	10.4%	20.0%	9.6%
Woodson H D HS	Priority	16.3%	18.0%	1.7%	21.9%	21.4%	-0.5%
Brightwood EC	Focus	34.8%	47.7%	13.0%	33.3%	42.4%	9.0%
Davis ES	Focus	25.4%	25.0%	-0.4%	34.3%	30.0%	-4.3%
Ferebee Hope ES	Focus	21.9%	17.1%	-4.8%	18.8%	27.6%	8.9%
Garrison ES	Focus	50.7%	32.8%	-18.0%	44.8%	31.0%	-13.7%
H D Cooke ES	Focus	29.1%	33.3%	4.2%	30.7%	40.8%	10.1%
Kenilworth ES	Focus	21.4%	27.6%	6.2%	23.2%	29.3%	6.1%
Kimball ES	Focus	29.5%	29.1%	-0.5%	27.3%	34.2%	6.9%
King, M L ES	Focus	31.1%	27.9%	-3.1%	26.5%	40.5%	14.0%
Miner ES	Focus	35.0%	23.3%	-11.8%	31.6%	25.8%	-5.8%
Nalle ES	Focus	29.2%	56.4%	27.2%	22.9%	39.1%	16.2%
Orr ES	Focus	20.4%	29.2%	8.8%	28.6%	32.3%	3.7%
Payne ES	Focus	46.4%	30.8%	-15.6%	40.6%	33.8%	-6.7%
Ron Brown MS	Focus	36.5%	30.0%	-6.5%	17.8%	19.4%	1.5%
Seaton ES	Focus	45.2%	67.0%	21.9%	40.9%	34.1%	-6.8%
Shaw MS At Garnet Patterson	Focus	32.6%	26.5%	-6.2%	31.9%	30.7%	-1.2%
Takoma EC	Focus	37.2%	40.2%	3.1%	37.2%	46.5%	9.3%
Turner ES	Focus	22.3%	22.5%	0.2%	22.3%	24.0%	1.7%
Tyler ES	Focus	21.6%	31.3%	9.7%	37.3%	46.5%	9.2%

Results by school (ctd.)

School	Classification	Math			Reading		
		2012	2013	Change	2012	2013	Change
Walker Jones EC	Focus	31.3%	27.5%	-3.8%	29.2%	25.9%	-3.3%
Whittier EC	Focus	42.9%	40.6%	-2.4%	39.4%	34.9%	-4.5%
Wilson HS	Focus	59.5%	60.0%	0.4%	60.3%	61.3%	1.0%
Winston EC	Focus	23.5%	22.8%	-0.7%	22.3%	21.7%	-0.6%
Benjamin Banneker HS	Reward	96.8%	100.0%	3.2%	86.6%	96.1%	9.5%
Bruce Monroe ES At Park View	Reward	40.6%	56.5%	15.9%	27.9%	40.5%	12.6%
Deal MS	Reward	84.7%	88.4%	3.6%	82.1%	82.8%	0.7%
Eaton ES	Reward	83.8%	84.8%	1.0%	85.5%	84.2%	-1.2%
Ellington School Of The Arts	Reward	58.3%	75.4%	17.1%	73.9%	80.3%	6.4%
Hyde Addison ES	Reward	81.2%	80.0%	-1.2%	83.2%	77.4%	-5.8%
J O Wilson ES	Reward	39.5%	64.1%	24.6%	46.5%	53.4%	6.9%
Janney ES	Reward	89.1%	92.5%	3.4%	93.2%	94.2%	1.0%
Jefferson MS	Reward	51.2%	63.4%	12.2%	34.0%	45.3%	11.3%
Ketcham ES	Reward	27.3%	37.5%	10.2%	23.9%	30.0%	6.1%
Key ES	Reward	92.3%	89.9%	-2.5%	90.9%	91.3%	0.4%
Lafayette ES	Reward	90.8%	92.2%	1.3%	90.1%	90.1%	0.0%
Macfarland MS	Reward	34.5%	54.6%	20.2%	27.3%	46.9%	19.7%
Mann ES	Reward	83.1%	89.5%	6.4%	87.1%	91.6%	4.5%
Maury ES	Reward	44.6%	63.9%	19.2%	37.5%	66.3%	28.8%
Mckinley Technology HS	Reward	92.1%	91.1%	-1.0%	90.8%	81.6%	-9.2%
Murch ES	Reward	81.3%	79.7%	-1.5%	85.5%	81.9%	-3.6%
Oyster Adams Bilingual School (Oyster)	Reward	82.2%	84.0%	1.8%	83.4%	81.8%	-1.7%
Ross ES	Reward	72.9%	78.7%	5.8%	64.6%	83.0%	18.4%
School Without Walls Shs	Reward	98.2%	97.3%	-0.9%	98.2%	99.3%	1.1%

Results by school (ctd.)

School	Classification	Math			Reading		
		2012	2013	Change	2012	2013	Change
Stoddert ES	Reward	84.8%	89.7%	4.9%	77.6%	85.0%	7.4%
Brookland EC At Bunker Hill	Developing	37.6%	36.3%	-1.3%	37.1%	38.2%	1.1%
Burrville ES	Developing	34.6%	30.3%	-4.4%	36.2%	38.5%	2.3%
Coolidge HS	Developing	31.6%	27.3%	-4.3%	34.6%	35.2%	0.7%
Hart MS	Developing	29.0%	26.6%	-2.4%	23.2%	29.6%	6.4%
Noyes EC	Developing	33.2%	29.8%	-3.4%	31.6%	29.8%	-1.8%
Plummer ES	Developing	55.7%	39.7%	-16.0%	45.1%	32.5%	-12.6%
Randle Highlands ES	Developing	35.0%	28.2%	-6.8%	40.0%	41.9%	1.9%
Simon ES	Developing	34.4%	36.3%	1.9%	33.3%	39.6%	6.2%
Smothers ES	Developing	30.7%	28.8%	-1.9%	24.0%	24.3%	0.3%
Thomas ES	Developing	48.8%	34.8%	-14.1%	38.4%	40.2%	1.8%
Wheatley EC	Developing	30.4%	37.2%	6.8%	25.6%	31.0%	5.4%
Bancroft ES	Rising	49.4%	52.0%	2.6%	35.1%	42.9%	7.8%
Barnard ES	Rising	58.3%	48.5%	-9.8%	55.8%	53.3%	-2.6%
Beers ES	Rising	43.4%	47.2%	3.7%	44.4%	40.8%	-3.6%
Brent ES	Rising	71.8%	80.7%	8.9%	71.8%	76.1%	4.3%
Burroughs EC	Rising	55.0%	56.7%	1.7%	53.0%	46.8%	-6.2%
Capitol Hill Montessori School At Logan	Rising	44.4%	38.1%	-6.3%	77.8%	64.3%	-13.5%
Cleveland ES	Rising	74.5%	68.1%	-6.4%	67.3%	71.3%	3.9%
Columbia Heights EC	Rising	47.6%	51.9%	4.3%	40.3%	46.8%	6.5%
Eliot Hine MS	Rising	37.3%	42.9%	5.6%	24.4%	36.3%	11.9%
Francis Stevens EC	Rising	49.6%	46.7%	-2.9%	51.8%	56.6%	4.8%
Hardy MS	Rising	68.4%	66.8%	-1.6%	62.8%	62.5%	-0.3%
Hearst ES	Rising	60.2%	67.0%	6.8%	63.3%	70.9%	7.6%

Results by school (ctd.)

School	Classification	Math			Reading		
		2012	2013	Change	2012	2013	Change
Langley EC	Rising	36.7%	44.5%	7.8%	41.2%	46.3%	5.1%
Leckie ES	Rising	38.1%	59.5%	21.4%	38.1%	46.4%	8.3%
Ludlow Taylor ES	Rising	59.7%	64.4%	4.7%	61.0%	69.5%	8.5%
Marie Reed ES	Rising	58.0%	63.6%	5.6%	49.6%	53.3%	3.7%
Marshall ES	Rising	22.2%	36.4%	14.1%	29.6%	33.3%	3.7%
Phelps ACE HS	Rising	47.4%	47.3%	-0.2%	57.7%	43.6%	-14.1%
Powell ES	Rising	50.8%	63.0%	12.2%	36.9%	45.0%	8.1%
Raymond EC	Rising	42.0%	41.5%	-0.5%	40.3%	46.3%	6.0%
Shepherd ES	Rising	69.1%	71.0%	1.9%	76.3%	76.1%	-0.2%
Sousa MS	Rising	48.1%	45.3%	-2.9%	38.3%	35.8%	-2.5%
Stuart Hobson MS (Capital Hill Cluster)	Rising	61.2%	63.9%	2.7%	58.9%	64.2%	5.3%
Thomson ES	Rising	54.5%	68.1%	13.6%	49.3%	56.3%	7.0%
Truesdell EC	Rising	47.2%	52.8%	5.6%	38.4%	47.2%	8.8%
Tubman ES	Rising	65.0%	79.3%	14.3%	51.9%	62.7%	10.8%
Watkins ES Capitol Hill Cluster	Rising	65.4%	60.4%	-5.0%	59.2%	59.2%	0.1%
West EC	Rising	50.4%	60.2%	9.7%	47.9%	54.9%	7.0%

All subgroups have grown significantly in math since 2007...

Math

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Chg from Previous	Chg from 2007
Black (n=13,280)	23.4%	33.5%	38.9%	37.2%	36.0%	37.0%	40.0%	3.0%	16.6%
Hispanic (n=2,747)	36.2%	48.1%	53.6%	47.8%	52.7%	52.9%	57.4%	4.5%	21.2%
White (n=1,945)	81.9%	87.5%	87.4%	88.7%	88.8%	89.1%	91.1%	2.0%	9.2%
Asian (n=359)	70.2%	78.7%	83.0%	83.4%	83.5%	83.6%	85.8%	2.2%	15.6%
ELL (n=2,080)	33.6%	43.1%	53.7%	45.0%	48.3%	47.4%	48.3%	0.9%	14.7%
FARM (n=14,294)	22.3%	32.3%	37.7%	35.3%	34.7%	36.1%	40.4%	4.3%	18.1%
SPED (n=3,575)	8.3%	15.2%	17.2%	16.8%	17.0%	17.2%	20.5%	3.3%	12.2%

... And most are at all-time high proficiency rates.

Math

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Chg from Previous	Chg from 2007
Black (n=13,280)	23.4%	33.5%	38.9%	37.2%	36.0%	37.0%	40.0%	3.0%	16.6%
Hispanic (n=2,747)	36.2%	48.1%	53.6%	47.8%	52.7%	52.9%	57.4%	4.5%	21.2%
White (n=1,945)	81.9%	87.5%	87.4%	88.7%	88.8%	89.1%	91.1%	2.0%	9.2%
Asian (n=359)	70.2%	78.7%	83.0%	83.4%	83.5%	83.6%	85.8%	2.2%	15.6%
ELL (n=2,080)	33.6%	43.1%	53.7%	45.0%	48.3%	47.4%	48.3%	0.9%	14.7%
FARM (n=14,294)	22.3%	32.3%	37.7%	35.3%	34.7%	36.1%	40.4%	4.3%	18.1%
SPED (n=3,575)	8.3%	15.2%	17.2%	16.8%	17.0%	17.2%	20.5%	3.3%	12.2%

All subgroups have grown significantly in reading since 2007...

Reading

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Chg from Previous	Chg from 2007
Black (n=13,295)	30.1%	38.8%	40.3%	38.5%	36.7%	35.1%	38.6%	3.5%	8.5%
Hispanic (n=2,745)	40.6%	48.3%	49.1%	43.1%	47.5%	46.7%	51.2%	4.5%	10.6%
White (n=1,945)	87.0%	89.6%	89.7%	89.6%	88.7%	90.6%	92.1%	1.5%	5.1%
Asian (n=358)	63.6%	69.0%	74.5%	77.0%	70.9%	69.6%	73.2%	3.6%	9.6%
ELL (n=2,075)	35.0%	40.8%	46.3%	39.3%	39.1%	37.9%	36.9%	-1.0%	1.9%
FARM (n=14,306)	28.4%	36.1%	37.6%	35.0%	33.7%	32.5%	37.6%	5.1%	9.2%
SPED (n=3,583)	12.9%	20.7%	19.4%	15.5%	15.4%	15.7%	18.1%	2.4%	5.2%

... And Hispanic, White and low-income students are at all time high proficiency rates.

Reading

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Chg from Previous	Chg from 2007
Black (n=13,295)	30.1%	38.8%	40.3%	38.5%	36.7%	35.1%	38.6%	3.5%	8.5%
Hispanic (n=2,745)	40.6%	48.3%	49.1%	43.1%	47.5%	46.7%	51.2%	4.5%	10.6%
White (n=1,945)	87.0%	89.6%	89.7%	89.6%	88.7%	90.6%	92.1%	1.5%	5.1%
Asian (n=358)	63.6%	69.0%	74.5%	77.0%	70.9%	69.6%	73.2%	3.6%	9.6%
ELL (n=2,075)	35.0%	40.8%	46.3%	39.3%	39.1%	37.9%	36.9%	-1.0%	1.9%
FARM (n=14,306)	28.4%	36.1%	37.6%	35.0%	33.7%	32.5%	37.6%	5.1%	9.2%
SPED (n=3,583)	12.9%	20.7%	19.4%	15.5%	15.4%	15.7%	18.1%	2.4%	5.2%

All grades have shown double-digit gains in math since 2007 . . .

Math

Grade	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Chg from Previous	Chg from 2007
3	30.4%	39.2%	46.9%	39.3%	37.5%	39.5%	43.0%	3.5%	12.6%
4	33.8%	46.1%	52.7%	47.0%	46.7%	50.7%	55.8%	5.1%	22.0%
5	27.2%	40.5%	46.3%	45.9%	43.1%	46.2%	48.9%	2.7%	21.7%
6	28.6%	36.5%	42.1%	40.5%	42.5%	43.7%	47.1%	3.4%	18.5%
7	23.9%	34.6%	42.1%	45.0%	49.1%	50.8%	52.7%	1.9%	28.8%
8	26.5%	33.8%	38.0%	42.5%	51.0%	49.6%	57.1%	7.5%	30.6%
10	27.9%	40.7%	41.8%	44.4%	39.7%	41.8%	44.0%	2.2%	16.1%

...and most grades achieved all-time high proficiency rates.

Math									
Grade	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Chg from Previous	Chg from 2007
3	30.4%	39.2%	46.9%	39.3%	37.5%	39.5%	43.0%	3.5%	12.6%
4	33.8%	46.1%	52.7%	47.0%	46.7%	50.7%	55.8%	5.1%	22.0%
5	27.2%	40.5%	46.3%	45.9%	43.1%	46.2%	48.9%	2.7%	21.7%
6	28.6%	36.5%	42.1%	40.5%	42.5%	43.7%	47.1%	3.4%	18.5%
7	23.9%	34.6%	42.1%	45.0%	49.1%	50.8%	52.7%	1.9%	28.8%
8	26.5%	33.8%	38.0%	42.5%	51.0%	49.6%	57.1%	7.5%	30.6%
10	27.9%	40.7%	41.8%	44.4%	39.7%	41.8%	44.0%	2.2%	16.1%

Most grades have shown double-digit gains in reading since 2007 . .

Reading

Grade	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Chg from Previous	Chg from 2007
3	43.0%	49.7%	49.6%	42.7%	41.0%	40.9%	44.0%	3.1%	1.0%
4	36.8%	46.4%	47.6%	46.2%	45.0%	47.9%	50.7%	2.8%	13.9%
5	36.3%	45.3%	47.3%	46.5%	46.0%	45.7%	51.8%	6.1%	15.5%
6	41.0%	42.5%	51.2%	40.7%	40.4%	38.2%	39.6%	1.4%	-1.4%
7	26.4%	36.6%	37.2%	43.6%	44.0%	43.2%	52.7%	9.5%	26.3%
8	26.4%	35.8%	39.6%	41.9%	42.8%	43.4%	48.0%	4.6%	21.6%
10	30.8%	44.1%	42.8%	45.3%	44.3%	43.6%	44.6%	1.0%	13.8%

...and most grades achieved all-time high proficiency rates.

Reading

Grade	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Chg from Previous	Chg from 2007
3	43.0%	49.7%	49.6%	42.7%	41.0%	40.9%	44.0%	3.1%	1.0%
4	36.8%	46.4%	47.6%	46.2%	45.0%	47.9%	50.7%	2.8%	13.9%
5	36.3%	45.3%	47.3%	46.5%	46.0%	45.7%	51.8%	6.1%	15.5%
6	41.0%	42.5%	51.2%	40.7%	40.4%	38.2%	39.6%	1.4%	-1.4%
7	26.4%	36.6%	37.2%	43.6%	44.0%	43.2%	52.7%	9.5%	26.3%
8	26.4%	35.8%	39.6%	41.9%	42.8%	43.4%	48.0%	4.6%	21.6%
10	30.8%	44.1%	42.8%	45.3%	44.3%	43.6%	44.6%	1.0%	13.8%