EXPLANATION AND LIMITATIONS OF THE DATA

This report provides student test scores; college readiness, enrollment, and persistence rates; access and success in advanced courses; attendance; discipline; and teacher quality data disaggregated by race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, disability, and limited English proficiency when possible.

- The data represents a “snapshot” of performance and enrollment. The most current data available from each publicly available data source is used in the analysis.
- When possible, data and analysis includes NOLA Public Schools, BESE charter schools, and independent charter schools in New Orleans.
- The analyses focus on race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and students with disabilities and limited English proficiency when possible. Other dimensions of education equity, although important, were not included in the scope of this report.
- Economically disadvantaged refers to students eligible for the free- and reduced-price lunch program. Various degrees of poverty exist but are not differentiated in this metric.
- “Mastery or above” is used as the measure of student performance on assessments. The percentage of students scoring Mastery or above does not indicate the degree to which students score above Mastery and does not consider the number or percentage of students scoring “Basic” or below.
- Data from groups of schools is calculated as the sum and average of the group of schools, not the average of the schools.
- Although we may provide research on the various causes of gaps, the analysis cannot conclude why the gaps exist.

SCHOOL-LEVEL, DISAGGREGATED DATA - WHY IT MATTERS:

Improvements in local and state data systems allow data to be disaggregated and reported by subgroups. The LDOE reports disaggregated data by various subgroups at the state, district, and school levels. Data used in this report are publicly available from the Louisiana Department of Education and can be found at www.Louisianabelieves.com.

Disaggregated data allows community stakeholders to identify disparities in performance and outcomes among the various subgroups (for example by race/ethnicity or socioeconomic status). Persistent differences in academic performance are referred to as “achievement gaps.” Federal, state, and local departments of education are obligated to identify disparities and provide targeted support to implement strategies designed to close the gaps.

Findings Include all Public Schools in New Orleans

Public schools in New Orleans include OPSB charter schools (Type 1, Type 3, and Type 3B), as well as BESE-authorized Type 2 charter schools and independent schools authorized by the Louisiana Legislature. Enrollment in OPSB charter schools is reserved for students residing in Orleans Parish, while enrollment in Type 2 and independent charter schools is open to any resident of the state. The analysis in this update includes all public schools in New Orleans when possible.

This report provides analysis of data across the following areas that impact equity:

Academic Outcomes
- Elementary and Middle School Performance
- High School Performance
- College Enrollment

School Climate
- Student Attendance
- Grade Retention
- Discipline Rates
- Dropout Rates

Access
- Access to School of Choice
- Access to High Quality Schools
- Access to Rigorous Curriculum
- Access to Resources/Funding
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Foreword

This report reflects a deep belief that every child deserves the opportunity to receive a high-quality education.

Since 1938, the Urban League of Louisiana (ULLA) has actively worked to assist underserved communities in securing economic self-reliance, parity, power, and civil rights. Educational equity is a central priority of ULLA. Educational equity focuses on distributing resources, supports, and opportunities to students based on their degree of need in order to prepare all students for success in college and careers. We believe educational equity is a vital prerequisite for the ability of communities to thrive.

ULLA is committed to ensuring that public schools in New Orleans promote equity, access, and excellence. In addition to our programmatic efforts, we believe systemic change is also needed to ensure equity and excellence in public education. A data-driven approach is necessary. Analyzing data can help communities understand how we are collectively living up to the fundamental promise of public education – provide equity, excellence, and opportunity to all.

This update to the 2017 Advancing Educational Equity report provides detailed insight into important indicators of educational equity. It examines several key metrics through an equity lens and identifies gaps in outcomes and access.

Although progress has been made, economically disadvantaged and African American students continue to face challenges accessing the resources that provide a foundation for academic success. As a community, we are falling short of our promise to provide a level playing field and ensure that all students have opportunities to succeed in school and beyond.

The goal of this update is to spark conversations and action – in the assemblies of the state capitol, in the OPSB and CMO board rooms, in the hallways of local schools, and at the dinner tables in our communities – about how our public schools can improve educational equity, excellence, and opportunity for all students.

We hope this update will lead to actionable change. Informed and empowered community members are a critical force for driving improvement in our schools. Armed with data, community members can successfully advocate for their children, articulate their vision for success, and hold school leaders and policy makers accountable.

Judy Reese Morse
President and CEO, Urban League of Louisiana
Summary of Findings

Since the publication of Advancing Educational Equity in New Orleans Public Schools 2017, there have been significant changes in the public education landscape in New Orleans. As a result of Act 91, schools formerly under governance of the Recovery School District (RSD) have been placed under the Orleans Parish School Board. New Orleans is the first unified district with oversight responsibilities of a citywide system of charter schools. All public schools, with the exception of a handful of schools authorized by the state Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (BESE) are governed by the locally-elected Orleans Parish School Board (OPSB).

The unification has the potential to provide OPSB with the authority to address citywide inequities that limit the potential of our city’s youth, particularly the most vulnerable. Our 2017 report highlighted many of these inequities by identifying gaps in academic outcomes and in educational opportunities.

In 2017, we identified significant achievement gaps in LEAP 2025 assessments between economically disadvantaged students and their higher income peers, between African American and White students, and between students with disabilities and regular education students. Similarly, there were gaps in high school students’ performance on the End-of-Course exams and ACT. Lower academic performance has a lasting impact on students’ ability to graduate and succeed in college or careers beyond high school.

Consequently, in 2017, we found that economically disadvantaged students, African American and Hispanic students, English language learners, and students with disabilities were less likely to graduate high school on time and more likely to drop out of high school. Furthermore, our analysis indicated that African American students in New Orleans public schools were at least three times more likely to be suspended than their peers. Our system of schools is struggling to serve our most vulnerable students well.

In 2017, we also identified issues in access. We noted that economically disadvantaged students and African American and Hispanic students were underrepresented in our city’s highest performing public school. Access to high-demand schools were limited by the supply of available seats. Furthermore, access to high-quality schools was restricted to many students due to selective admissions criteria. Economically disadvantaged students and African American students were underrepresented in high-rated schools and overrepresented in the city’s failing schools. In 2017, we found that high-poverty/high-minority schools were more likely to be staffed by inexperienced, uncertified, and out of field teachers.

This report provides an update on the metrics we explored in 2017. Our analysis finds that many of the inequities in quality and in access that were identified in 2017 continue to plague our education system today.
We continue to see achievement gaps in elementary/middle school performance, particularly in third grade English language arts (ELA) and eighth grade math. Economically disadvantaged students and African American students are underrepresented in schools where the majority of students are performing at grade level in ELA and math.

We identified similar trends in high school performance. Between 2017 and 2019, we found increases in achievement gaps for high school students. The performance of economically disadvantaged students and African American students continues to lag behind their peers in high school End-of-Course exams and ACT; in many cases the gap has grown.

While graduation rates for economically disadvantaged students and African American students have increased since 2017, gaps continue to exist. Economically disadvantaged students and African American students are more likely to attend a high school where fewer students graduate on time, earn additional academic or career credentials, and enroll in college after graduation.

Since 2017, school options have increased. New schools have been authorized and many existing schools have expanded. The majority of schools participate in the OneApp enrollment process; yet a few selective admissions schools continue to be responsible for their application and enrollment processes. Nevertheless, there continues to be a shortage of available seats in high-demand schools. Selective admissions and restrictive eligibility policies prevent access for many families. Economically disadvantaged students and African American students are underrepresented in high-rated schools and overrepresented in under-performing schools. Furthermore, the data show that when it comes to the distribution of the best teachers (rated “highly effective”), economically disadvantaged students and African American students do not have equitable access.

Since 2017, OPSB has invested in interventions to address many of the inequities that were identified in our report. For example, in 2019, the district launched a campaign to curb truancy. OPSB was the first district in the state to implement an “alternative graduation model” program providing high school students with a fifth year to complete high school graduation requirement and college or career credentials. OPSB is committed to growing and developing a diverse and highly effective teacher force. And, after engaging school leaders and education stakeholders, the Board approved a new differentiated school funding formula to help “level the education playing field.”

While there has been significant progress made, challenges exist. Unification has provided OPSB with the authority to hold all NOLA Public Schools accountable and provide appropriate support when needed.

The district must continue to focus on recurring gaps – in academic achievement and in access – to ensure that all students in New Orleans have the opportunity to reach their highest potential.

The Urban League of Louisiana believes that the inequities revealed in this report can be addressed through determination and dedicated action.
Background: NOLA Public Schools – A District of Charter Schools

Since the publication of Advancing Educational Equity in New Orleans Public Schools, 2017 and the implementation of Act 91, oversight of charter schools that were previously under the Recovery School District-New Orleans (RSD-NO) is now the responsibility of the Orleans Parish School Board (OPSB). As a result of unification, almost all public schools in New Orleans are under the local, publicly-elected governing body, OPSB. Charter schools authorized by the state Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (BESE) are governed by the publicly-elected state school board.

In addition to the shift of RSD schools to OPSB, New Orleans is home to the nation’s first unified district with oversight of a citywide system of schools, referred to as NOLA Public Schools (NOLA-PS). New Orleans Public School Superintendent Henderson Lewis describes the unique district as “a system that is neither decentralized nor completely centralized. We have the most unusual management structure of any school district in America.”1 As a rule, the district no longer directly runs schools but has oversight of all NOLA-PS schools. OPSB provides oversight in accordance to Louisiana law and policy, as well as their own accountability standards which can be found at urbanleaguela.org/opsb_csa.

OPSB Accountability Framework Components
- Manage charter school renewals, extensions, and contracts
- Provide annual charter school oversight
- Serve as monitoring agent of struggling schools and respond to academic concerns

How can we ensure educational equity for New Orleans students and their families under the current governing structure?

Despite the long-awaited unification of charter schools under OPSB, there are concerns regarding the district’s authority and capacity to improve educational equity for New Orleans students and families. Since charter schools are independently operated, the role of OPSB is limited to oversight. OPSB lacks the authority to mandate interventions. Their most effective lever for change is revocation, but revocation is an action of last resort.

Although the unification of the system of independently operated charter schools returned governance of most schools to the locally-elected OPSB, the district continues to face many challenges.

- Academic Achievement Gaps
- Chronically Low-Performing Schools
- Limited Supply of High-Demand Schools
- Increased Costs Associated with Decentralization
- Attraction and Retention of a Diverse, High-Quality Teaching Force

This update identifies gaps in academic achievement and access to opportunities.

Overview: Public Schools in New Orleans

In 2016-17, of 86 public school campuses, 31 schools were governed by OPSB (24 charter school campuses, 6 district-run schools, and one contract school); five were BESE-authorized charter schools; 49 were RSD charter schools; and one independent school was authorized by the Louisiana Legislature.2 This includes two schools that are not included in the state’s list of public schools in New Orleans. In 2016-17, there were 86 public school campuses (including the Youth Study Center) serving 48,977 students in New Orleans with more than half (55 percent) of students enrolled in Type 5 charter schools (RSD schools).

In 2019-20, the majority of schools (75 of 86 schools in New Orleans) were governed by OPSB and three were OPSB-contract schools. Seven public schools in New Orleans were BESE-authorized charter schools. One independent school authorized by the Louisiana Legislature was located in New Orleans.3 There are no longer Type 5 (RSD) charter schools operating in New Orleans. In the 2019-20 school year, 84 public schools in New Orleans served 50,815 students. Type 3B schools (schools that were previously under the RSD but were placed under OPSB governance) enrolled 54 percent of students.

Charter Schools in Louisiana

Charter schools are public schools that are operated independent of the local school district. Charter schools can be authorized by the local school board or by the state Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (BESE). Charter schools have autonomy, increased accountability, and provide families with choice.

There are six types of charter schools:

- Type 1: A new school authorized by the Local School Board
- Type 2: A new or conversion school authorized by BESE.
- Type 3: A conversion school authorized by the Local School Board
- Type 3B: A former Type 5 charter school that has been transferred from the RSD and returned to the local school district.
- Type 4: A new or conversion school authorized by the local school board and BESE.
- Type 5: A RSD school authorized by BESE

---

2 Louisiana Department of Education. October 2016 Multi-Statistics, Total by Site and LEA. www.Louisianabelieves.com
NOLA Public Schools: District Performance
The LDOE provides District Performance Scores for each public school district and the RSD. District performance scores are based on a variety of indices, including:
- Performance on K-8 and high school assessments;
- Progress (growth) on K-8 and high school assessments;
- ACT scores;
- Credit accumulation;
- Strength of diploma; and
- Graduation rates.

K8 & High School Academic Achievement and Progress Index
The Academic Achievement Index measures the extent to which students are mastering the curriculum and ready to advance to the next level of study – a snapshot measure of student performance. The Student Progress Index measures the extent to which students show academic growth no matter what achievement level the students begin – a measure of growth between two points in time.

Louisiana Department of Education measures progress in two ways.
- Students are “on track” to scoring Mastery by 8th grade (elementary/middle school) or 10th grade (high school).
- Students “out-perform” their expected score, based on a comparison to similar students statewide.

In 2016, OPSB/RSD-NO schools earned a District Performance Score (DPS) of C; Louisiana Statewide reported a grade of B.

In 2019, NOLA Public Schools (NOLA-PS) received a letter grade of a C; Louisiana statewide reported a B. The table below provides letter grades for the 2019 District Performance Scores and Indices for Louisiana statewide and NOLA-PS.
In 2019, NOLA-PS reported an increase (from 2018 to 2019) in the Graduation Index from a C in 2018 (with a 2017 cohort graduation rate of 72.9 percent) to a B in 2019 (with a 2018 cohort graduation rate of 77.8 percent). There were no changes in the letter grades of the other indices.

### How is Strength of Diploma Measured?

The calculation of the Strength of Diploma measurement gives various weights to diplomas based on the completion of rigorous courses or industry-recognized credentials.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Diploma Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>High School Diploma (four-year) PLUS passing score on AP, IB, or CLEP exams AND Advanced statewide Jump Start credential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>High School Diploma (four-year) PLUS passing score on AP, IB, CLEP exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>High School Diploma (four-year) PLUS Advanced statewide Jump Start credential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>High School Diploma (four-year) PLUS one passing score for TOPS Core Curriculum in AP, IB, college credit, or dual enrollment course AND Basic statewide Jump Start credential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>High School Diploma (four-year) PLUS one passing score for TOPS Core Curriculum in AP, IB, college credit, or dual enrollment course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Regular High School Diploma (four-year) includes Career Diploma students with a regional Jump Start credential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>High School Diploma earned through pathway for students assessed on the LAA1 (students with disabilities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>Five-year graduate earning High School Diploma PLUS passing score on AP, IB, or CLEP exams AND Advanced statewide Jump Start credential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Regular High School Diploma (five-year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Regular High School Diploma (six-year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>HiSet PLUS Jump Start credential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>HiSet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Non-graduate without HiSet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Academics: Student Outcomes

Each year Louisiana public school students in grades three through high school take state tests through the Louisiana Educational Assessment Program (LEAP). LEAP assessments measure students’ knowledge and skills in each subject area and assess their readiness to advance to the next grade level. LEAP results are used to measure how well schools and school systems are serving the needs of their students and helping students achieve high expectations.

For high school students, new five-level assessments replaced the former four-level end-of-course (EOC) exams and reflect students’ college and career readiness for that course. The transition to the five-level assessments allows for a consistent measure of student performance and growth from third grade through high school. State assessments are now referred to as LEAP 2025 to reflect the shift toward higher expectations and goals set forth in LDOE’s ESSA plan.

Students in grades three through eight are tested in English language arts, math, science and social studies. High school students take LEAP 2025 assessments in English I and II, Algebra I and Geometry, and U.S. History. LDOE reports assessment results of all students tested and subgroups for schools and school systems.

Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)

Under ESSA, states adopt academic standards in core subjects that are aligned with indicators of college and career readiness. ESSA requires that all students in tested grades are assessed and that results are disaggregated by subgroups to address student equity gaps. In compliance with ESSA, LDOE created and submitted a plan to the U.S. Department of Education which was approved in August 2017 and the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (BESE) incorporated Louisiana’s ESSA plan into state policies.

Signed into federal law in December 2015, ESSA reauthorized the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and revised the provisions know as No Child Left Behind (NCLB). ESEA, enacted in 1965, is authorized to create specific, targeted support for low-income students through Title I.

In 2002, NCLB was created and requires schools to measure student achievement by subgroup performance and holds schools and school systems accountable for closing achievement gaps between subgroups (disadvantaged students and their peers). ESSA requires states to measure student achievement by subgroup and report the information to parents and the community. ESSA provides states with flexibility in their efforts to support students’ academic progress and spend federal funds.

In compliance with ESSA, LDOE created and submitted a plan to the U.S. Department of Education. Louisiana’s plan was approved in August 2017 and the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (BESE) incorporated Louisiana’s ESSA plan into state policies. Louisiana’s plan outlines academic expectations for students through 2025. Louisiana’s ESSA Plan:https://www.louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/louisiana-believes/louisianas-essa-state-plan.pdf?sfvrsn=f219971f_23.
Achievement Gaps

“Achievement Gap” refers to differences in the average standardized test scores of students by various subgroups. Achievement gaps are a key measure of educational equity.

Achievement Gap refers to **OUTPUTS** – the unequal or inequitable distribution of educational results. Examples of outputs include:

- Acceptable or exceptional academic performance (scoring mastery level of above on state assessments);
- The ability to earn college credit or industry-recognized career and technical credentials during high school;
- Graduating high school within four years; and
- Matriculating to post-secondary education or securing employment in high-wage, high-growth industry sectors.

Opportunity Gap refers to **INPUTS** – the unequal or inequitable distribution of resources and opportunities provided to students and/or groups of students. Examples of inputs include:

- Rigorous academic courses and test preparation programs;
- Highly effective instructional staff and leadership;
- Professional support staff, such as school psychologists, guidance counselors, and college advisors; and
- Computers and other types of technology.

Elementary and Middle School

**LEAP 2025 Assessments: 2019**

**3rd through 8th Grade Performance**

In 2019, 26 percent of students in grades 3 through 8 tested in NOLA-PS 4 scored at the Mastery performance level or above. Louisiana reported an average of 35 percent of third through eighth graders scoring Mastery or above in 2019 on LEAP 2025 assessments.

Disaggregating data by race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, students with disabilities, and other subgroups reveals distinct differences in performance.

---

4 NOLA-PS includes Type 1, 3, and 3B charter schools in Orleans Parish. Type 2 charter schools and independent schools are not included in NOLA-PS District data.
Disparities in Performance

Economically Disadvantaged
Students are classified as "economically disadvantaged" if they are eligible for free- or reduced-price meals under the National School Lunch and Child Nutrition Program or other public assistance. In 2019, 21 percent of economically disadvantaged students scored Mastery or above on the LEAP 2025 assessments (grades 3 through 8); 58 percent of students not economically disadvantaged scored Mastery or above. This represents a gap of 37 percentage points.

Ethnicity/Race
Differences in academic performance by race/ethnicity for NOLA-PS students are significant. Of students tested in 2019, nearly three-quarters (73 percent) of White students scored Mastery or above on the LEAP 2025 assessments (grades 3 through 8). Only one-fifth of African-American students (21 percent) and one-quarter of Hispanic students (25 percent) scored Mastery or above. This represents significant achievement gaps between African American and Hispanic students compared to performance of White students.

Students with Disabilities
An achievement gap of 20 percentage points exists between students with disabilities and regular education students. In 2019, 28 percent of regular education students scored Mastery or above on the LEAP 2025 assessments (grades 3 through 8), while only 8 percent of students with disabilities scored Mastery or above.5

---

5 Students with the most significant disabilities may be eligible to take LEAP Connect in grades 3 through 8 and 11 in English language arts and LEAP Alternative Assessment Level 1 for science in grades 4, 8, and 11 (LAA1).
Third Grade Reading: An Educational Milestone

**What it is and why it’s important:** Reading at grade level by the end of third grade is a significant turning point in a child’s educational trajectory. During the first three years of elementary school, students learn to read. Beginning in fourth grade, emphasis focuses on reading to learn. Many subjects require literacy in order to progress; students use their reading skills to gain information, think critically, and solve problems.

It is essential to examine third grade literacy levels to identify and address achievement gaps that will have long-term implications on students’ ability to succeed in school and life.

**How has third grade performance in English language arts changed since 2017?**

In 2019, NOLA-PS public schools reported 33 percent of third graders scored Mastery or above on the LEAP 2025 English language arts (ELA) assessment (the 2019 statewide average was 46 percent), compared to 31 percent in 2017 \(^6\) (the 2017 statewide average was 44 percent) \(^7\).

Since 2017, there has been a 2 percentage point increase in the overall percentage of third graders scoring Mastery or above in ELA. While some subgroups reported an increase in the percentage scoring Mastery or above, others reported a decrease.

The percentage of economically disadvantaged students scoring Mastery or above increased 1 percentage point (from 26 to 27 percent); the percentage of not economically disadvantaged students scoring Mastery or above increased by 3 percentage points (64 to 67 percent) resulting in an increase in the achievement gap.

The percentage of African American students scoring Mastery or above increased 1 percentage point (from 27 to 28 percent) but the percentage of Hispanic students scoring Mastery or above decreased by 5 percentage points. The percentages of White students and Asian students scoring Mastery or above increased by 3 percentage points (75 to 78 percent) and 5 percentage points (54 to 59 percent) respectively, resulting in an increase in the achievement gaps.

The percentage of students with disabilities scoring Mastery or above decreased 4 percentage points (from 16 to 12 percent) while the percentage of regular education students scoring Mastery or above increased by 1 percentage point resulting in an increase in the achievement gaps.

---

\(^6\) 2017 data includes OPSB and RSD schools

\(^7\) Louisiana Department of Education, 2017 and 2019 School LEA LEAP 2025 by Achievement Level Summary
Achievement gaps increased by socioeconomic status, by race/ethnicity, and between regular education students and students with disabilities.

How has school-level performance in third grade English Language Arts (ELA) changed since 2017?

2017: School level performance in third grade ELA ranged from a high of 91 percent to a low of 0 percent of third graders tested scoring Mastery or above. Of schools reporting third grade LEAP 2025 scores in 2017, 10 schools reported 50 percent or more of their third graders scoring Mastery or above.

2019: School level performance in third grade ELA ranged from a high of 91 percent to a low of 5 percent of students tested scoring Mastery or above. Of schools reporting third grade LEAP 2025 scores in 2019, 10 schools reported 50 percent or more of their third graders scoring Mastery or above (8 of the 10 are the same schools as in 2017)

Economically disadvantaged students and African-American students are underrepresented in schools where the majority of third graders scored Mastery or above in English language arts.
How have the demographics of schools where the majority of third graders scored Mastery in ELA changed since 2017?

### Number of Schools by Percentage of 3rd Graders Scoring Mastery or Above: ELA (2017 and 2019)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage Range</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100 - 80%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.9 - 60%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.9 - 40%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 20%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 20%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Louisiana Department of Education, 2017 and 2019 School LEA LEAP 2025 by Achievement Level Summary

### School Level Demographics Based on 3rd Grade Performance Levels in English Language Arts (2017 vs. 2019)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schoolwide % of Students scoring Mastery of above in 3rd grade ELA</th>
<th>Economically Disadvantaged</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Multiple Races</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80% or More</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79-60%</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59-40%</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
<td>73.8%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>68.6%</td>
<td>68.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-20%</td>
<td>92.1%</td>
<td>92.7%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>87.3%</td>
<td>87.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 20%</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>94.4%</td>
<td>94.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Schools</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>80.5%</td>
<td>80.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eighth Grade Math: A Strong Predictor of Post-Secondary Success

What it is and why it's important: The level of academic achievement that students attain by eighth grade has a larger impact on their college and career readiness by the time they graduate than anything that happens academically in high school. This is particularly true for eighth grade math. Concepts taught during eighth grade provide the foundation for understanding future math concepts. Math prepares and develops the ability to accept, analyze, and execute complex ideas. Even more than student demographics and gender, math performance has found to be a better predictor of post-secondary success. Because of its impact on student success in high school and beyond, it is critical to examine eighth grade proficiency levels in math to identify and address gaps.

How has eighth grade performance in math changed since 2017?

OPSB and RSD-NO schools reported 26 percent Mastery or above in 2017. In 2019, NOLA-PS reported 23 percent of eighth graders scored Mastery or above on the LEAP 2025 math assessment. The state average was 27 percent in 2017 and 28 percent in 2019.

Between 2017 and 2019, the percentage of students scoring Unsatisfactory increased from 21 percent in 2017 to 28 percent in 2019.

![8th Grade Performance by Achievement Levels: Math (2017 and 2019)](chart)

Source: Louisiana Department of Education, 2017 and 2019 School LEA LEAP 2025 by Achievement Level Summary

---

How has school level performance in eighth grade math changed since 2017?

Among schools, there continues to be an extreme range in eighth grade math performance levels.

2017: School level performance in eighth grade math ranged from a high of 89 percent to a low of 0 percent of students tested scoring Mastery or above. Of schools reporting eighth grade LEAP 2025 scores in 2017, six schools reported 50 percent or more of their third graders scoring Mastery or above. Nearly half reported fewer than 20 percent score Mastery or above in math.

2019: School level performance in eighth grade math ranged from a high of 95 percent to a low of 0 percent of students tested scoring Mastery or above. Of schools reporting eighth grade LEAP 2025 scores in 2019, three schools reported 50 percent or more of their third graders scoring Mastery or above. More than half of the public schools with eighth grade test-takers reported less than 20 percent of students scoring Mastery or above in math.
How has the demographics of schools where the majority of eighth graders scored Mastery or above in math changed since 2017?

Demographics Based on 8th Grade Performance Levels in Math (2017 Vs. 2019)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schoolwide % of Students scoring Mastery of above in 3rd grade ELA</th>
<th>Economically Disadvantaged</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Multiple Races</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80% or More</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79-60%</td>
<td>93.3%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>96.8%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59-40%</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
<td>68.5%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-20%</td>
<td>85.2%</td>
<td>89.6%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>82.0%</td>
<td>84.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 20%</td>
<td>93.1%</td>
<td>93.9%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>93.2%</td>
<td>88.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Schools</td>
<td>84.4%</td>
<td>85.3%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>83.8%</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Louisiana Department of Education, 2019 School LEA LEAP 2025 by Achievement Level Summary and Feb 2019 Multi-Stats Total by Site and School System

Economically disadvantaged students and African American students continue to be underrepresented in schools where the majority of 8th graders scored Mastery or above in math.
High School

LEAP 2025 Assessments: 2019
High school students take LEAP 2025 assessments in English I and II, Algebra I, Geometry, and U.S. History and end-of-course (EOC) exams in Biology and English III. 2019 results represent tests taken in Fall 2018 and Spring 2019 semesters.

Percentage of High School Students Scoring Mastery or Above on LEAP 2025 Assessments by Subgroup (2019)

Achievement gaps for individual subjects have increased since 2017. Achievement gaps in English II, Algebra I, Geometry, and US History (percent of students scoring Excellent/Good or Mastery or Above) have increased for economically disadvantaged students and African American students. For details, see Appendix 1 on page 56.

ACT Performance
What it is and why it’s important: Students take the ACT exam beginning in the eleventh grade. The ACT exam is a national test that measures academic readiness for college and careers and evaluates what students learn in high school courses of English, math, reading, and science. ACT composite scores range from 1 - 36.

In addition to gauging school performance and students’ academic readiness for college or careers, ACT scores are often used to determine high school students’ eligibility for dual enrollment courses, acceptance into many four-year colleges and universities, and eligibility for Taylor Opportunity Program (TOPS) scholarship awards. TOPS is a state scholarship for Louisiana residents who attend an in-state college or university.
The LDOE reports ACT composite scores for seniors using Best Score methodology (using the student’s highest score not the most recent score). The state average ACT composite score was 18.9. For NOLA-PS, the Class of 2019 reported an average ACT composite score of 18.\(^{11}\) (Included scores of 2,661 public school students). Disaggregating by subgroups identifies significant achievement gaps in ACT performance. For example, for the Class of 2019, White and Asian students reported average composite scores of 27.9 and 25.9 respectively. African American students in NOLA-PS reported an average composite score of 16.9 and Hispanics reported 17.8. Economically disadvantaged students reported an average ACT composite score of 16.7.

Colleges and universities use ACT composite scores as a factor in admissions decision-making. For example, the minimum ACT composite score for students considered for admissions at Southern University is 20. The ACT composite cut-score for guaranteed admissions at University of Louisiana at Lafayette (ULL) is 23. ACT math and English sub-scores are also used to place students in remedial, non-credit course.

### Average ACT Composite Scores by Subgroup in New Orleans (2017 vs. 2019)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Average Composite Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learner</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with Disabilities</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HIGHLIGHT:**
For many Orleans Parish public school high school seniors, post-secondary opportunities are limited due to low ACT scores. For example, the average composite scores for African-American students (16.9) and economically disadvantaged students (16.7) are well below the ACT minimum for admissions to many four-year colleges.

**How have achievement gaps in ACT composite scores changed since 2017?**

The achievement gap in ACT composite scores between African-American students and White students grew from 10.7 points in 2017 to 11.0 points in 2019. The achievement gap between Hispanic students and White students decreased from 14.5 points to 10.1 points.

The LDOE reports the numbers of seniors who score a composite score of 18 or higher and 21 or higher out of 36 on the ACT. Statewide, 53.9 percent of the Class of 2019 scored 18 or higher and 33.2 percent scored 21 or higher on the ACT.

---

\(^{11}\) Includes NOLA-PS and does not include Type 2 charter schools in Orleans Parish
In 2017, 51.4 percent of students scored 18 or higher and 27.4 percent scored 21 or higher on the ACT. In New Orleans’ Class of 2019, 1,107 (41.6 percent) of test-takers scored 18 or higher and 646 (24.3 percent) scored 21 or higher on the ACT.

**ACT and the Taylor Opportunity Program (TOPS) Eligibility: Class of 2018**

ACT composite scores and high school GPA are used to determine eligibility for the TOPS scholarship awards. Payments of TOPS awards are contingent upon appropriations by the Louisiana Legislature.

Of 2,297 New Orleans 2018 public school graduates processed for TOPS, 1,187 students (51.7 percent) met the eligibility requirements for a TOPS scholarship: of those 205 were eligible for the Honors Award (17.3 percent); 206 for the Performance Award (17.4 percent); 428 for the Opportunity Award (36.1 percent); and 358 for the Tech Award (30.2 percent).

### TOPS Awards by School-Level Socioeconomic Status

**Seniors at schools with relatively lower percentages of economically disadvantaged students are more likely to be processed for a TOPS Award.** More than 90 percent of seniors in schools with less than 40 percent of economically disadvantaged students were processed for the TOPS award. Of seniors enrolled in schools with between 70 to 80 percent economically disadvantaged students, 82 percent were processed for TOPS awards. Of seniors at schools with between 80 and 90 percent economically disadvantaged students, 77 percent were processed for TOPS awards; 60 percent of seniors at schools with more than 90 percent economically disadvantaged students were processed for TOPS awards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class of 2018</th>
<th>Processed</th>
<th>Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 40 percent economically disadvantaged students</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
<td>94.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 70 and 80 percent economically disadvantaged students</td>
<td>82.2%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 80 and 90 percent economically disadvantaged students</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 90 percent economically disadvantaged students</td>
<td>60.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Schools</td>
<td>75.3%</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Louisiana Department of Louisiana. TOPS Class of 2018 TOPS Eligibility by School; February 2018 Multi-Stats Total by Site and School System*
TOPS Honor scholarship eligibility by type is correlated to school poverty rates and high school admissions policies. Of the 205 students in New Orleans public schools eligible for the TOPS Honor Award, 188 (91.2 percent) were graduates of three selective admissions high schools with the lowest percentage of economically disadvantaged students enrolled. TOPS Honor Award provides the highest amount of financial assistance. The TOPS Performance Award provides students with less financial assistance than TOPS Honor Award but more than TOPS Opportunity Award.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class of 2018: School Profile</th>
<th>TOPS Awards by Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 40 percent economically disadvantaged students</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 70 and 80 percent economically disadvantaged students</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 80 and 90 percent economically disadvantaged students</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 90 percent economically disadvantaged students</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Schools</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Louisiana Department of Louisiana. TOPS Class of 2018 TOPS Eligibility by School; February 2018 Multi-Stats Total by Site and School System

Nearly two-thirds (60 percent) of students eligible for the TOPS Tech Award graduated from high-poverty schools with 80 percent or more of students who were economically disadvantaged. The TOPS Tech Award provides financial assistance to students who enroll in skills or occupational training programs at technical colleges and universities that do not offer a baccalaureate degree. The award amounts differ by the type of post-secondary institution attended.

**Graduation Rates: Diplomas and Credentials**

**What it is and why it’s important:** Louisiana uses a four-year cohort graduation rate as a measure of high school performance. Students who graduate within four years after beginning ninth grade are included in the cohort rate. Exceptions are made for students with disabilities.

13 There are two types of graduation pathways: University Pathway and Jump Start Career Pathway. Graduation requirements differ based on the diploma track.

**TOPS University Pathway** is for students who plan to continue their education at a four-year college or university. Students in the TOPS University Pathway complete coursework required for admission at most colleges and qualify them for the TOPS scholarship.

**Jump Start TOPS Pathway** is Louisiana’s Career and Technical Education (CTE) program allows students to earn industry credentials while in high school. Jump Start coursework prepares students to attain entry-level employment or continue their education at a technical or community college.
In 2018, the state reported a cohort graduation rate of 81.4 percent; Orleans Parish public school reported a rate of 77.8 percent\(^\text{14}\).

Since 2016, there have been improvements in the graduation rates, for all students and for many subgroups of students. Graduation rates for Asian, African American, White, and Multi-Race students have increased. Graduation rates for economically disadvantaged students and students with disabilities also increased. Despite the increases, African American students and economically disadvantaged students are less likely to graduate on time than their White and Asian peers.

### School-level Graduation Rates: Class of 2018

Six schools reported cohort graduation rates of greater than 95 percent. These schools enrolled 4,632 high school students (grades 9 through 12) and 51.9 percent of the students in the schools were economically disadvantaged.

Three schools reported a cohort graduation rate of between 95 to 90 percent. These schools enrolled 1,795 high school students; 80.8 percent of students in these schools were economically disadvantaged.

Six schools reported a cohort graduation rate of between 89 to 80 percent. These schools enrolled 3,536 high school students; 90.7 percent of students in these schools were economically disadvantaged.

Eight schools reported a cohort graduation rate of 79 percent or less. These schools enrolled 3,091 students; 91.5 percent of students were economically disadvantaged.

Nearly one quarter (24 percent) of high school students attended a school with a graduation rate of 79 percent or less; 92 percent of students in these schools were economically disadvantaged.

\(^{14}\) This rate does not include graduates of Type 2 or independent charter schools.
Advanced and Basic Credentials

What it is and why it’s important: The state of Louisiana offers three levels of diplomas based on the credentials students earn. Students can graduate with a standard diploma – completing all the required high school coursework. Students can graduate with Basic credentials – earn a Basic Jump Start credential (attained proficiency with an industry-valued skill set recognized by the Workforce Investment Council) or pass a college-level course. Students who earn an Advanced Jump Start credential or pass a college-level exam graduate with an Advanced credential.

Earning a diploma with Basic or Advanced credentials provides students with a head start in a successful future. For example, a student earning a Basic credential can leave high school with his/her NCCER Welding Level 1 certificate or experience with rigorous college-level curriculum. A student earning an Advanced credential can leave high school with his/her NCCER Welding Level 2 certificate or receive college credit by passing a college-level exam. Students received different levels of academic preparation based on their racial or economic group.

HIGHLIGHT: Of the class of 2018, 75 percent of White students earned a diploma with an Advanced credential, compared to 5 percent for African American students and 16 percent for Hispanic students. Economically disadvantaged students were also less likely to earn a diploma with Advanced credentials (5 percent).

Percentage of Class of 2018 Who Did Not Graduate with Cohort by Subgroup

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Race</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learners</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with Disabilities</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the Class of 2018, 22 percent of seniors did not graduate within four years. Students who take more than four years to graduate or complete high school with a “certificate of attendance” are not counted as graduates in the four-year cohort graduation rate. Students who leave school or dropout are not counted as graduates in the graduation rate.

Nearly one-quarter of economically disadvantaged students and African American students do not graduate “on-time” or dropout of high school. Hispanic students (55 percent), English language learners (64 percent), and students with disabilities\(^\text{15}\) (34 percent) do not graduate “on-time” or dropout.

**College Enrollment**

The LDOE collects college enrollment data on high school graduates through the Louisiana Board of Regents and the National Student Clearinghouse. The National Student Clearinghouse is a nonprofit organization that collects and verifies college enrollment in 99 percent of colleges and universities, (public and private, two- and four-year) in the United States.

**Class of 2016:** Of the 2,773 graduates of New Orleans public schools, 1,624 (58.6 percent) enrolled in a post-secondary institution for the fall semester following their graduation; the statewide average was 57 percent. Of New Orleans students enrolled in college, 81 percent enrolled in an in-state college or university. Sixty-six percent of students enrolled in a four-year institution and 34 percent enrolled in a two-year institution.

**Class of 2018:** Of the 2,912 graduates of New Orleans public schools, 1,722 (59.1 percent) enrolled in a post-secondary institution for the fall semester following their graduation, slightly higher than the statewide average of 57.4 percent. Of these students, 73 percent enrolled in an in-state college or university. Seventy-one percent of students enrolled in a four-year institution and 29 percent enrolled in a two-year institution.

Gaps in college enrollment rates exist. For the Class of 2018, although 59.7 percent of all graduates enrolled in college, only 48.5 percent of economically disadvantaged students enrolled.

**College Enrollment by School**

The percentage of graduates who enroll in college varies by high school. There were three schools with 100 to 80 percent of graduates enrolled in college – all with selective admissions criteria, and with a lower rate of economically disadvantaged students and the lowest rates of English language learners. Details of college enrollment by school can be found in Appendix 2 on page 59 which show as the percentage of graduates enrolled in college decreases, the schools are also found to have increasingly higher rates of students who are English language learners, economically disadvantaged, and more students who are African American and Hispanic.

Economically disadvantaged students and African American students are less likely to attend schools where 80 percent or more of high school graduates enrolled in college.

\(^{15}\) Students with disabilities/special education students have an extended time period to graduate (five years).
Environment: School Climate

A positive school climate is vital for learning. It contributes to academic achievement, improves outcomes for youth, especially economically disadvantaged students, and influences teacher effectiveness. Research shows that a positive school climate has more influence on school success (high academic achievement and graduation rates) than increased resources and can negate the impact associated with high-poverty rates.\(^{16}\) A positive school climate is evidenced by a supportive, caring staff; a sense of safety from violence and bullying; student connectedness and engagement in school; and parental and community involvement.

As school climate improves, students are more likely to be engaged, resulting in increased student performance on assessments, increased graduation rates, and increased attendance rates. A positive school climate impacts teacher satisfaction and the ability to attract and retain high-quality staff. Conversely, a negative or disorderly school environment is associated with reductions in attendance, student learning, and participation in school activities.

What is a Positive School Climate?
National Center on Safe and Supportive Learning Environments defines a positive school climate as: A school environment that fosters social and physical safety, provides support so that students and staff reach high behavioral and academic standards, and encourages and maintains respectful, trusting, and caring relationships. (www.safesupportivelearning.ed.gov)

Student Attendance

Students are unlikely succeed if they are not in school and learning in a positive environment. In Louisiana, students are required to attend school from the age of seven to 18 years, or until they graduate. In order to earn credit and progress to the next grade, students must attend 167 (of the minimum 177)\(^{17}\) days.

There are four categories of absences that impact student attendance rates\(^{18}\).

- Exempt and Excused Absence: The absence is allowed and not counted against the attendance requirement. Students submit an authorized document (or for a religious holiday) and make up work they missed.
- Non-Exempt and Excused Absence: Students can make up missed work but the absence is counted against the attendance requirement. Students submit an “unofficial notice” (like a note from a parent) and make up missed work.
- Unexcused Absence: The student is not allowed to make up missed work and the absence is counted against the attendance requirement. An example of an unexcused absence is skipping school.
- Suspensions: The student is required to miss school due to a disciplinary action and can make up missed work. The absence is counted against the attendance requirement.

In New Orleans, student attendance rates vary by school and by grade level. During the 2018-19 school year, for public elementary schools in New Orleans, the average attendance rate was 92.3 percent, with a high of 98.4 percent and a low of 85.3 percent (statewide elementary school average was 94.6 percent.) This is slightly below the 2016-17 average of 93.8 percent for elementary schools (high of 98.3 percent and low of 87.6 percent).

The middle school/junior high average was 93.1 percent in 2018-19 (93.5 percent in 2016-17). In 2018-19, students in combination schools averaged 94.4 percent attendance (96.5 percent in 2016-17).

---

\(^{16}\) Voight, A., Austin, G., and Hanson, T (2013). A climate for academic success: How school climate distinguishes schools that are beating the odds (Report Summary). San Francisco: West Ed.

\(^{17}\) Districts and schools can include more than 177 instructional days in their calendar; 177 days is the state minimum.

\(^{18}\) Louisiana Department of Education. “Attendance Requirements.” https://www.louisianabelieves.com/courses/attendance-requirements
For high schools, the average attendance rate was 90.0 percent during the 2018–19 school year, with a high of 98.7 percent and a low of 58.4 percent. The 2018–19 average attendance rate for high schools was slightly higher than the average rate (89.1 percent) for high schools in 2016–17; in 2016–17, average rates ranged from a high of 94.4 percent to a low of 69.2 percent.

**Truancy**

**What it is and why it’s important:** Students who are chronically absent – miss more than 10 percent of the school year – are considered truant. Truancy has significant consequences for youth, from falling behind academically, dropping out, to incarceration. During the 2017–18 school year, 47.8 percent of public school students in statewide were considered truant.19

For New Orleans public schools at least 16,11920 students missed 10 percent or more school days during the 2017–18 school year. This is up from 2016–17: 10,801 students were considered truant. Days missed due to disciplinary incidents are included as an absence.

**Truancy Rates by School:**

- In 2017–18, six schools reported more than 75 percent of their students were truant. The average percentage of economically disadvantaged students in these schools was 89.2 percent. In 2016–17, no school reported more than 75 percent of students as truant.
- In 2017–18, 24 schools reported between 74 and 50 percent of their students were truant. The average percentage of economically disadvantaged students in these schools was 84.2 percent. In 2016–17, 17 schools reported between 74 and 50 percent of students as truant.
- Ten schools reported between 49 and 25 percent of their students were truant. The average percentage of economically disadvantaged students in these schools was 82.7 percent. In 2016–17, 13 schools reported between 49 and 25 percent of their students as truant.
- In 2017–18, 25 schools reported less than 25 percent of their students were truant (fourteen reported less than 5 percent of students were truant). The average percentage of economically disadvantaged students in these schools was 68.5 percent. In 2016–17, 23 schools reported less than 25 percent of students as truant.
- Data was not available for 20 schools in New Orleans in 2017–18 or for 33 schools in 2016–17.

---

19 Louisiana Department of Education. 017–2018 School District State Student Truancy Rates.

20 Data includes the alternative high schools and Type 2 charter schools in New Orleans; 20 schools did not report data.
Nationally, poverty has been linked to truancy. Economically disadvantaged students may have unstable housing, problems connecting to transportation, or familial responsibilities (especially for older youth who have need to look after their younger siblings or other family members). Older students may have conflicts associated with employment. Youth may have physical health issues, mental health issues, or be suffering from substance abuse. Students who are court-involved and dealing with juvenile justice issues may also experience higher rates of truancy.

Although many causes of truancy are beyond the student’s control, in some cases causes of truancy can be controlled or corrected. When students are behind in their schoolwork, make bad grades, or bored, they may skip school. Students who are bullied or feel threatened at school may choose to stay home. Students are truant when they are not engaged or feel like a part of the school community. Discipline issues, expulsions, and out-of-school suspensions also affect truancy rates.

### Progressing in School

#### Grade Retention

Students are held back a grade level when they don’t meet the requirements for promotion, have not mastered the skills needed to be successful in the next grade level, or have excessive absences.

Schools retain students with the hope that, by repeating the previous year’s instruction, the student will “catch up” and be better prepared for the next grade level. Many studies, however, have found that grade retention is often counter-productive. Students who are retained, even in elementary school, are more likely to drop out in high school.²¹

In 2017-18, New Orleans public schools retained 1,348 students in grades K through 12. The figure below shows the percentage of students who are retained by grade level in New Orleans public schools. In 2017-18, 5.8 percent of ninth graders, 6.0 percent of tenth, and 5.6 percent of twelfth graders were retained. These data align with the high number of dropouts in 9th and 10th grades in 2018.

---

**Discipline Rates**

Students serving suspensions or who are expelled miss valuable instructional days. The Louisiana Department of Education reports the numbers and percentage of students who serve in-school or out-of-school suspensions; in-school or out-of-school expulsions; and alternative site suspensions and expulsions (students serve their suspension or expulsion at an alternative site). Discipline rates are based on cumulative enrollment which is the number of students enrolled in the school at any time during the year.

### Percentage of Students by Disciplinary Action

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016/2017</th>
<th></th>
<th>2018/2019</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schools in New Orleans</td>
<td>All of Louisiana</td>
<td>Schools in New Orleans</td>
<td>All of Louisiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-School Suspensions</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-school Suspensions</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-school Expulsions</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-School Expulsions</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Site Suspensions</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Site Expulsions</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Louisiana Department of Education. 2016-17 School District State Discipline Rates.*
Economically disadvantaged students and African American students are overrepresented when it comes to disciplinary actions.

**Disciplinary Action by Socioeconomic Status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In-School Suspensions</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OPSB and RSD-NO</td>
<td>LA Statewide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>90.4%</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Out-of-School Suspensions</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OPSB and RSD-NO</td>
<td>LA Statewide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>93.0%</td>
<td>87.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2019, 76.9 percent of students who received an in-school expulsion were economically disadvantaged; 93.1 percent of students with an out-of-school expulsion were economically disadvantaged.

**Disciplinary Action by Race/Ethnicity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In-School Suspensions</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OPSB and RSD-NO</td>
<td>LA Statewide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>93.1%</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Race</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Out-of-School Suspensions</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OPSB and RSD-NO</td>
<td>LA Statewide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Race</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2019, 96.2 percent of students who received an in-school expulsion were African American; 100 percent of students with an out-of-school expulsion were African American.
School Level Discipline Rates:

Discipline rates can vary by school and district for many reasons. Often schools have discretion on when and how to issue disciplinary actions. For example, one school may issue a suspension for a particular action, while another school assigns the student to detention or an in-school Time Out Center (TOC) for the same action.

How have school discipline rates changed since the 2016-2017 school year?

Elementary/middle schools: The average rate of in-school suspensions for the 2016-17 school year was 2.8 percent; in 2019, the average was 1.8 percent. The average out-of-school suspension rate went from 11.6 percent in 2017 to 8.7 percent in 2019. In 2017, two schools reported at least one in-school expulsion, whereas in 2019, twelve schools did. In 2017, 20 schools reported at least one out-of-school expulsions, whereas in 2019, eight schools did. Sixteen elementary/middle school students were expelled (in-school or out-of-school) in 2016-17, compared to eighteen schools in 2019.

Combination schools (serving elementary/middle/high school grades): In 2017, 2.0 percent of students received an in-school suspension; in 2019, 6.4 percent of students did. In 2017, 13.4 percent received an out-of-school suspension; In 2019, 8.2 percent of students did. Two schools reported an in-school or out-of-school suspensions (16 students total); whereas one school reported an in-school expulsion (1 student) in 2019 and there were no out-of-school expulsions reported in combination schools.

High schools: The average rate of in-school suspensions for the 2016-17 school year was 5.7 percent; in 2019, the average was 3.2 percent. The average out-of-school suspension rate went from 11.7 percent in 2017 to 12.5 percent in 2019. Three schools in 2017 and six schools in 2019 reported at least one in-school expulsion. 11 schools reported at least one out-of-school expulsions in 2017, compared to 7 schools in 2019. Forty-one high school students were expelled (in-school or out-of-school) in 2017 and forty high school students were expelled (in-school or out-of-school) in 2019.

Dropout Rates

The LDOE collects dropout data for grades 7 through 12. Statewide, 2.7 percent of students in seventh through 12th grade dropped out of school; for high school, the percentage is 3.7 statewide (2017-18 school year). Although dropping out of school is thought of as a single event in time, the process of dropping out occurs over time. It is a culmination of a series of events or circumstances.

When students are not well prepared for middle and high school curricula, fall behind, and fail their classes, they are likely to drop out. Students who have excessive absences or experience disciplinary incidents (are suspended or expelled) are more likely to drop out. Students who are considered over-aged and under-credited often drop out of high school. When students are not connected or have a sense of belonging, they are more likely to drop out.

22 Event dropout rate is a measure of the percentage of students who enrolled in one school year but not the following school year, leaving before he/she graduated. Students who moved to another school, died, moved out of the country, or who are out of school due to a verified illness are not considered dropouts.

Sometimes students drop out of school based on personal circumstances. For example, students may have family obligations that prevent them from completing school. Caring for family members or employment may cause a student to drop out of school.

During the 2017-18 school year, 1,040 students (5.1 percent) grades 7 through 12 dropped out of school: 225 (3 percent) middle school students (grades 7 and 8) and 815 (6 percent) high school students (grades 9 through 12). Among New Orleans public high schools, the alternative high schools have the highest dropout rates. Excluding alternative high schools and the Youth Study Center, the high school dropout rate was 3.9 percent in 2017-18. The charts below provide a breakdown of the demographics of schools by the range of dropout rates.

**Drop Out Rates Across High Schools**

- Dropout rate of less than 1% - 10%
- Dropout rate of 1-5% - 9%
- Dropout rate of 5-10% - 3%
- Dropout rate of more than 10% - 7%

*Does not include alternative high schools.

**Demographics of the Ten High Schools with a Dropout Rate of Less than 1 Percent**

**Demographics of the Nine High Schools with a Dropout Rate Between 1 and 5 Percent**

**Demographics of the Seven High Schools with a Dropout Rate Greater Than 10 Percent**

**Demographics of the Three High Schools with a Dropout Rate Between 5 and 10 Percent**
Access: High Quality Schools

Traditionally, children are assigned to a public school according to where they live. School attendance zones by neighborhood have the propensity to create inequities: higher level income families can afford to move neighborhoods with high quality schools or enroll their children in private schools. Generally, parents with limited income have to send their children to the schools in their neighborhood or assigned to them by the district. In theory, school choice gives parents the power and opportunity to choose the schools their children attend, selecting schools that best fit the needs of their children. Charter schools in New Orleans allow for parents to select schools regardless of where they live.

School Choice

Parents apply to schools through a unified enrollment system, OneApp. Through OneApp, parents can apply to up to 12 of the school participating in OneApp; 92 percent of public schools in New Orleans participate in the OneApp process, enrolling 84 percent of New Orleans’ public school students. Parents also apply to Early Childhood Education (ECE) programs and private schools that participate in the Louisiana Scholarship program (vouchers). OneApp is administered by EnrollNOLA.

OneApp priorities for open enrollment schools:

- **Geography**: Beginning in 2019-20, K-8 applicants who live within one-half mile of a ranked school will receive priority to 25 percent of open seats. Applicants who live within the designated “geographic zone” receive priority to 25 percent of open seats; there are seven geographic zones in New Orleans. The remaining 50 percent of open seats do not have a geographic priority. All open enrollment schools authorized by OPSB provide families with a geographic priority.

- **Sibling**: If a student applies to a school where his/her sibling already attends, the students will receive priority in the OneApp process.

- **Other priorities**: Some schools offer priority admissions to children of school staff or a partner organization staff. Some schools offer priority incoming ninth graders of a school within the same Charter Management Organization. Other schools offer priority to applicants who qualify as economically disadvantaged, applicants with a current IEP, or high school applicants who are over-aged and/or under-credited.

Some schools have eligibility requirements. Immersion language programs may require set levels of language proficiency, while others require that parents or guardians attend a curriculum meeting, open house, or tour.

The four public schools that do not participate in the OneApp application process accept applications and make school assignment decisions at the school level. Many of these schools have selective admissions requirements which may include an academic or skills assessment.

During the 2019-20 OneApp main round application, 12,790 OneApp applications were submitted for placement in grades PreK4 to 12. Seventy-five percent of eligible applicants were matched to a school listed on their application; 68 percent were matched to one of their top three listed schools. For students applying for kindergarten or ninth grade, 82 percent were assigned to one of their top three schools; this is slightly less than the 2016-17 results where 85 percent were assigned to one of their top three schools (kindergarten or ninth grade).

24 https://enrollnola.org/about/enrollnola-oneapp/
The Top 10 Most Demanded K-8 Schools in 2019-20

Edward Hynes Charter School
Seats available: 55
Demand: 830

Audubon Charter School (Gentilly campus)
Seats available: 14
Demand: 749

Benjamin Franklin Elementary
Seats available: 68
Demand: 740

Bricolage Academy
Available seats: 74
Demand: 635

Edward Hynes Charter School (UNO campus)
Available seats: 78
Demand: 583

Lycee Francais de la Nouvelle-Orleans
Available seats: 85
Demand: 552

Alice Harte Elementary
Available seats: 45
Demand: 535

International School of Louisiana – Spanish program (Eagle St campus)
Available seats: 81
Demand: 484

Morris Jeff Community School
Available seats: 23
Demand: 467

Audubon Charter School – Montessori
Available seats: 31
Demand: 457

The Top 10 Most Demanded High Schools in 2019-20

Warren Easton High School
Seats available: 262
Demand: 2,466

Edna Karr High School
Seats available: 328
Demand: 2,134

Eleanor McMain Secondary School
Seats available: 312
Demand: 1,524

CA: Abramson Sci Academy
Available seats: 194
Demand: 1,021

CA Livingston Collegiate Academy
Available seats: 198
Demand: 983

KIPP Renaissance High School
Available seats: 210
Demand: 928

CA: G.W. Carver High School
Available seats: 214
Demand: 893

NO Charter Science and Math High School (Sci High)
Available seats: 148
Demand: 890

John F. Kennedy High School at Lake Area
Available seats: 380
Demand: 860

International High School
Available seats: 184
Demand: 699
Access to High Quality Schools

School Performance Scores

What it is and why it’s important: According to the National Education Association, quality public schools “close achievement gaps, prepare all students for the future with 21st century skills, and create enthusiasm for lifelong learning.” Based on NEA’s Great Public Schools criteria, quality schools are schools that have the qualities listed on the right.  

Beginning in 1999, the LDOE calculates and issues School Performance Scores (SPS) as a measure of the quality of schools. SPS range from 0 to 150. The SPS is converted to a letter grade (A to F), similar to the grades that students receive, to “clearly communicate the quality of school performance to families and the public.”

Elementary School Performance Scores

Schools are assessed based on the absolute performance of students on the state LEAP 2025 exams, as well as a progress index that measures how much students have learned during the school year. Seventy-five percent of an elementary school’s SPS is based on their students’ performance on state assessments in English language arts, math, science, and social studies. Twenty-five percent of the SPS is based on the student progress index. The progress index measures academic gains toward Mastery regardless of where students start at the beginning of the school year.

Middle School Performance Scores

For schools serving middle school students, including students in 8th grade, 70 percent of the SPS is based on student performance on the LEAP 2025 assessments in English language arts, math, science, and social studies. Twenty-five percent of the SPS is based on the student progress index. And 5 percent of the SPS is based on the Credit Accumulation Index. This index is determined by the high school credits their students earn as a freshman in high school.

High School Performance Scores

For schools serving high school students, 25 percent of the SPS is based on student performance on state assessments in English, Algebra, Geometry, U.S. History, and Biology High schools and on student progress in English language arts and math. Twenty-five percent is based on how well the school is preparing students for success in college or the workforce and is based student performance on the ACT or WorkKeys tests. Twenty-five percent is based on the Strength of Diploma index, which weights diplomas with Advanced or Basic levels of college credit and industry-recognized credentials.

Equitable access can be demonstrated by the degree to which the demographics of high performing schools match the demographics of the student population districtwide. The analysis includes the 2019 school performance scores and October 2019 enrollment.

25 “Great Public Schools Criteria.” NEA. http://www.nea.org/gpsindicators#GPSC
Representation of Students by Sub-Group

In New Orleans, there were 56 elementary and middle schools serving students (including combination schools) during the 2019-20 school year; 51 schools received an SPS letter grade in 2019. There were 29 high schools serving grades 9 through 12 (including combination schools) during the 2019-20 school year; 24 schools received an SPS letter grade in 2019. Profiles by SPS Score for all elementary, middle and high schools can be found in Appendix 3 on page 61.

How has the representation of economically disadvantaged students and African American students in elementary and middle schools by SPS letter grade changed since 2017?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2017</th>
<th>Number of Schools with an SPS</th>
<th>Number of Students (K-8)</th>
<th>Economically Disadvantaged</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Multiple Race</th>
<th>English Language Learner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Schools</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5,385</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Schools</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,959</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Schools</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14,209</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
<td>88.1%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Schools</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8,740</td>
<td>90.1%</td>
<td>88.5%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Schools</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,758</td>
<td>93.8%</td>
<td>95.9%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80.2%</td>
<td>79.8%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Seven schools with enrollment data in October 2017 did not have a 2017 SPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2019</th>
<th>Number of Schools with an SPS</th>
<th>Number of Students (K-8)</th>
<th>Economically Disadvantaged</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Multiple Race</th>
<th>English Language Learner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Schools</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2,690</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Schools</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4,559</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Schools</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10,581</td>
<td>87.9%</td>
<td>82.1%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Schools</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11,212</td>
<td>92.8%</td>
<td>84.4%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Schools</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3,755</td>
<td>96.4%</td>
<td>95.9%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>81.5%</td>
<td>74.4%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Six schools with enrollment data in October 2019 did not have a 2019 SPS
How has the representation of low income students and African American students in high schools by SPS letter grade changed since 2017?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Schools with an SPS</th>
<th>Number of Students (K-8)</th>
<th>Economically Disadvantaged</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Multiple Race</th>
<th>English Language Learner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Schools</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4,973</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Schools</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,760</td>
<td>79.6%</td>
<td>89.7%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Schools</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2,902</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
<td>86.3%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Schools</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3,609</td>
<td>89.2%</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Schools</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Schools with an SPS</th>
<th>Number of Students (K-8)</th>
<th>Economically Disadvantaged</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Multiple Race</th>
<th>English Language Learner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Schools</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4,761</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Schools</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3,305</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
<td>89.1%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Schools</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4,356</td>
<td>85.1%</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Schools</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,117</td>
<td>91.1%</td>
<td>95.9%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Schools</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>72.1%</td>
<td>68.9%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Economically disadvantaged students and African American students are underrepresented in schools with higher ratings and over-represented in lower rated and failing schools.
**Academic Growth**

**What it is and why it’s important:** Measuring schools based on the percentage of students who score Mastery or above can mask the hard work and progress that students make during the school year. High levels of performance may be attributed to the achievement levels students bring into the school, a result of their economic status or admissions policies that attract and retain the highest performing students. Absolute academic performance alone does not capture the quality of instruction and the academic growth of students during the school year.

To measure and recognize the academic gains that students make from year to year, the LDOE incorporated a measure of progress into the SPS. Schools earn an “A” in progress if their students are “on track” to reach Mastery or above by the end of 8th grade (or 10th grade for high schools) or earn scores that are “higher than expected” based on the scores of peers of similar characteristics: previous three year academic performance, attendance, behavior (discipline history), student mobility, and socioeconomic status.

**In 2019, 71 schools in New Orleans received a progress letter grade for K-8 and high schools.**

Twenty-three schools earned an “A” in progress. Of these schools, 17 were elementary/middle schools, 2 were combination schools, and 4 were high schools. The SPS letter grades from these schools ranged from “A” to “F” (A=5; B=3; C=3; D=4; F=8). In the majority of these schools (13), 80 percent or more of students were economically disadvantaged, with a range from 19 to 96 percent.

**High-poverty schools in New Orleans are working hard to have their students “on track” to reach Mastery.**

Thirty-three schools earned a “B” rating for progress. These schools included 23 elementary/middle schools, two combination schools, and 25 traditional district-run schools. The SPS letter grades for these schools ranged from “A” to “F” (A=1; B=4; C=12; D=14; F=2). In the majority of these schools (26), 80 percent or more of their students were economically disadvantaged (range from 52 to 100 percent).

Twelve schools earned a “C” rating for progress. These schools included seven elementary/middle schools and five high schools. The SPS letter grades for these schools ranged from “A” to “F” (A=1; B=0; C=3; D=3; F=5). Ten of the twelve schools were high-poverty schools with 80 percent or more of their students economically disadvantaged; the range was 77 to 100 percent.

Three schools earned a “D” rating for progress, all high schools. The SPS letter grades of these schools were B, D, and F. All of these schools had 80 percent or more economically disadvantaged students, with a range of 83 to 92 percent.
Taking a Closer Look:  
Has the expansion of high performing schools like Hynes and Audubon led to more diverse student populations?

Authorized by OPSB, Edward Hynes Charter School – UNO opened its doors in Fall 2019. The extension of the A-rated elementary/middle school, Edward Hynes Charter School – Lakeview, is a partnership with the University of New Orleans. The school offers two programs: a traditional program and a French immersion program. The school is temporarily located in a modular campus while awaiting a land donation from UNO for a newly constructed building.¹ In 2019, during its first year of operation, the school served 107 kindergarten students and expected to add a grade each year through eighth grade.

Compared to the Lakeview campus, Hynes – UNO serves a more economically diverse student population (35 percent economically disadvantaged student in Lakeview compared to 58 percent at the UNO campus). The UNO campus also serves a higher percentage of African American students (66 percent compared to 33 percent at the Lakeview campus). Although the new campus’ kindergarten class is more diverse than the Lakeview campus (K-8), the school’s demographics does not mirror that of New Orleans public schools.

Admissions Processes

Edward Hynes Charter School – UNO (includes the French immersion program) participates in the OneApp enrollment process. Priorities for enrollment include:

- Siblings of continuing students
- Applicants who are children of full-time UNO faculty for up to 15 percent of open seats
- Applicants who reside within one-half mile of the school for up to 25 percent of open seats
- Applicants who reside in the geographic zone (West) for up to 25 percent of available seats

Edward Hynes Charter School – Lakeview Campus (includes the French immersion program) participates in the OneApp enrollment process. Priorities for enrollment include:

- Siblings of continuing students
- Applicants who reside within one-half mile of the school for up to 25 percent of open seats
- Applicants who reside in ZIP code 70124² for up to 42 percent of available seats

Edward Hynes Charter School – French Immersion program participates in the OneApp enrollment process. There are two entry points: K-1 and grades 2-5. Priorities for enrollment include:

**Grades K-1**

- Siblings of continuing students
- Applicants who reside within one-half mile of the school for up to 25 percent of open seats
- Applicants who reside in ZIP code 70124 for up to 42 percent of available seats
- Grades 2-5 (Eligibility contingent on previous attendance in a French Immersion program)
- Siblings of continuing students
- Applicants who reside within one-half mile of the school for up to 25 percent of open seats
- Applicants who reside in ZIP code 70124 for up to 42 percent of available seats

---

² According to the US Census, 2013-2017 American Community Survey 5-year Estimate: Residents in ZIP code 70124 were 92 percent White and 6 percent African American; 29 percent of adults 25 years and older have at least a Bachelor’s degree; the median income was $51,123. For Orleans Parish residents, 34 percent were White and 60 percent African American; 12 percent of adults 25 years and older have a Bachelor’s degree; the median income was $33,014.
OPSB approved Audubon’s application to replicate its model and to open for the 2018-19 school year.

Audubon Charter School - Gentilly offers a bilingual Montessori-French immersion model, where students receive instruction from both a Montessori lead teacher and a French-speaking co-teacher. The Gentilly campus was approved to offer a pre-K3 program (pre-kindergarten for 3-year old children). The replication of the B-rated elementary/middle school located Uptown serves grades pre-K to third grade (188 students) in Fall 2019 and is expected to add a grade each year through eighth grade.

Compared to the Uptown campus, Audubon - Gentilly serves a more economically diverse student population (45 percent economically disadvantaged student in Uptown compared to 61 percent in Gentilly). The Gentilly campus also serves a higher percentage of African-American students (70 percent compared to 47 percent at the Uptown campus). Although the Gentilly school is more diverse than the Uptown campus, the school’s demographics does not mirror that of New Orleans public schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Enrollment (October 2019)</th>
<th>% Economically Disadvantaged</th>
<th>% African American</th>
<th>% Asian</th>
<th>% Hispanic</th>
<th>% White</th>
<th>% Multiple Race</th>
<th>% English Language Learners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edward Hynes Charter School</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Hynes Charter School - UNO</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audubon Charter School</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audubon Charter School - Gentilly</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Admissions Processes

Audubon Charter School – Gentilly participates in the OneApp enrollment process. There are three entry points: PreK3, PreK4, and K-4. Priorities for enrollment include:

**PreK3:**
- Applicants with an IEP
  - Siblings of continuing students
  - Children of current Audubon school staff
  - Applicants who reside within one-half mile of the school for up to 25 percent of open seats
  - Applicants who reside in the geographic zone (West) for up to 25 percent of available seats

**PreK4:**
- Current Pre-K3 students attending Audubon Gentilly
- Applicants with an IEP
- Siblings of continuing students
- Children of current Audubon school staff
- Applicants who reside within one-half mile of the school for up to 25 percent of open seats
- Applicants who reside in the geographic zone (West) for up to 25 percent of available seats

---

Grades K-4
- Siblings of continuing students
- Applicants who reside within one-half mile of the school for up to 25 percent of open seats
- Applicants who reside in the geographic zone (West) for up to 25 percent of available seats

Audubon Charter School Montessori participates in the OneApp enrollment process. There are four entry points: PreK3, PreK4, K, and 1-8. Priorities for enrollment include:

PreK3:
- Applicants with an IEP
- Siblings or Children of current Audubon school staff
- Applicants currently enrolled in an accredited Montessori program

PreK4
Current PreK3 students attending Audubon Uptown Montessori
- Applicants with an IEP
- Siblings or Children of current Audubon school staff
- Applicants currently enrolled in an accredited Montessori program

K (Eligibility contingent of attending a curriculum meeting)
- Siblings of continuing students
- Applicants currently enrolled in an accredited Montessori program

Grades 1-8 (Eligibility contingent of attending a curriculum meeting AND pass a language proficiency exam)
- Siblings of continuing students
- Applicants currently enrolled in an accredited Montessori program

Audubon Charter School French: participates in the OneApp enrollment process. There are four entry points: PreK3, PreK4, K, and 1-8. Priorities for enrollment include:

PreK4 (Eligibility contingent on attending a curriculum meeting) - Applicants with an IEP

K (Eligibility contingent of attending a curriculum meeting)
- Siblings or Children of current Audubon school staff
- Applicants currently enrolled in an accredited French School or French Immersion School

Grades 1-8 (Eligibility contingent of attending a curriculum meeting AND pass a language proficiency exam)
- Siblings or Children of current Audubon school staff
- Applicants currently enrolled in an accredited French School or French Immersion School

Are selective admissions and restrictive eligibility policies undermining the equity goals of the NOLA-PS?

Schools with selective admissions or restrictive eligibility requirements deny many families with access to high quality schools. These policies disproportionately impact economically disadvantaged students and African American and Hispanic students.

Several schools participating in the OneApp enrollment process report restrictive eligibility requirements. Language immersion schools, such as Audubon Charter School (French program), Edward Hynes Charter School (French program), International School of Louisiana (French and Spanish programs), and Lycee Francais de la Nouvelle-Orleans, have eligibility requirements that include language proficiency or prior enrollment in a language immersion program for enrollment in school beginning in first grade.
Eligibility for enrollment in Audubon Charter School Montessori, grades 1 through 8, require parents/guardians to attend a curriculum meeting and students to pass a language proficiency exam. Other schools, such as New Orleans Military and Maritime Academy require parents/guardians to attend a campus tour and open house.

Schools that do not participate in the OneApp enrollment process accept applications and make enrollment decisions at the school-level. Schools such as Ben Franklin High School, Lake Forest Elementary School, Lusher Elementary School, Lusher Middle/High School, and New Orleans Center for Creative Arts have unique admissions process with varied application deadlines. Eligibility for admissions is based on academic performance.

Selective admissions and restrictive eligibility policies have an impact of school-level demographics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School-level Demographics by Admissions/Eligibility Requirements</th>
<th>October 2019 Enrollment</th>
<th>% Economically Disadvantaged</th>
<th>% African American</th>
<th>% Asian</th>
<th>% Hispanic</th>
<th>% White</th>
<th>% Multi-Race</th>
<th>% English Language Learner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schools with Academic Entrance Requirements</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools with Restrictive Eligibility Requirements</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compared to All Schools /All Grade Levels4</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Louisiana Department of Education. October 2019 Multi-Stats Total by Site and School System

Economically disadvantaged students and African American students are underrepresented in schools with selective admissions and restrictive eligibility policies.

4 Does not include alternative schools.
Alternative Education Options for Students

**What it is and why it’s important:** Alternative education (AE) programs provide students with the services and supports that best meet their individual needs. Many AE programs target students who are over-aged and under-credited or who have disciplinary or social and emotional challenges. Students can elect to attend or can be referred to an AE program. Students enrolled in AE programs receive access to remedial instruction and individualized support to help them address their academic deficiencies, earn high school credit (Carnegie credits), and complete high school with a diploma or HiSET/GED. AE programs give students appropriate academic, and social and emotional interventions to support their transition back to their home school or to post-secondary education of the workforce.

Five AE schools in New Orleans serve students in grades 7 through 12. Of 718 students enrolled in AE schools in October 2019:

- 92.3 percent were economically disadvantaged;
- 92.8 percent were African American;
- 0.6 percent were Asian;
- 3.6 percent were Hispanic;
- 2.5 percent were White;
- 0.4 percent were multiple race; and
- 2.6 percent were English language learners.

The majority of students were high school students (9th grade: 19.5 percent; 10th grade: 17.4 percent; 11th grade: 23.4 percent; and 12th grade: 37.0 percent).

Four of the five AE schools received a 2019 SPS. All four schools received the letter grade of C.

Access to Rigorous Curriculum

**Advanced Placement**

**What it is and why it’s important:** The Advanced Placement (AP) is a program offered by the College Board and gives students the opportunity to take rigorous, college-level courses and earn college credit and placement while in high school. Many colleges offer credit for a passing AP score (3 points or more). By earning college credits while in high school, students have an opportunity to graduate early, saving them money in tuition. Many colleges recognize that passing AP scores demonstrate mastery in those courses and will allow students to skip those courses in college. Earning advanced placement allows students to “free up space” in their schedule to earn a double major, participate in special programs, or graduate early.

Research cited by the Louisiana Department of Education shows that students who complete AP courses are better prepared for college work, have higher college persistence rates, and are more likely to graduate college in four or five years. Enrolling in an AP course can also increase access to college; students who take AP courses are favored in the college admissions process, and are more competitive in qualifying for scholarships.

In 2016-17, 2,121 high school students (18 percent) in OPSB and RSD-NO schools took AP tests. Just over one-third (37 percent) of students tested scored a 3 or more on at least one test taken and may be eligible for college credit or advanced placement in college courses. The statewide pass rate was 34 percent.

---

27 https://www.louisianabelieves.com/courses/advanced-placement
28 Does not include Type 2 or independent charter schools.
In 2018-19, 2,150 (18 percent) of high school students took at least one AP test; 41 percent of test takers earned a 3 or more on at least one test taken and may be eligible for college credit or advanced placement in college courses. The statewide pass rate was 35 percent.

Economically disadvantaged students were underrepresented in AP courses: 77 percent of high school students were economically disadvantaged but about 10 percent of AP test-takers were economically disadvantaged.

African-American students were underrepresented in AP courses: 78 percent of high school students were African American but about 11 percent were of AP test takers were African American.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage in Grades 9-12</th>
<th>Enrolled in at least one AP course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Race</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of economically disadvantaged students who enrolled in AP was about 1,190 of the 2,150 test-takers. If 77 percent were economically disadvantaged, then 1,656 students would have taken AP. This represents a difference of 466 seats.

The number of African American students who enrolled in AP was about 1,250 of the 2,150 test-takers. If 78 percent were African American, then 1,677 students would have taken AP. This represents a difference of 427 seats.

Passage rates on AP tests also vary by subgroups. AP scores range from one to five. Students earning a score of 3 or higher may receive college credit.

In New Orleans, about 40.9 percent of AP test-takers passed with a score of 3 or higher on at least one AP test in 2018-19.

Economically disadvantaged students were almost half as likely to score a 3 or higher; 21.5 percent of economically disadvantage students scored a 3 or higher. Of Asian test-takers, 70.6 percent scored a three or higher; 81.0 percent of White students scored a three or higher; 63.1 percent of Hispanic students scored a three or higher. Only 17.1 percent of African American students scored a 3 or higher on AP tests.

---

29 Does not include Type 2 or independent charter schools.
30 Some students take more than one test but are counted only once in this data, representing unduplicated counts of students.
The number and percentage of students taking AP courses also varies by school. Schools with higher percentages of students enrolled in AP courses have fewer students who are economically disadvantaged and African American:

- Two high schools reported more than half of their students enrolled in AP courses. Together these schools enrolled 28.4 percent economically disadvantaged students; 26.4 percent African American students; 8.9 percent Asian students; 7.4 percent Hispanic students; 50.2 percent White students; and 6.9 percent students of multiple race.
- Five schools reported between 30 and 20 percent of their students enrolled in AP courses. Together these schools enrolled 84.2 percent economically disadvantaged students; 88.4 percent African American students; 3.1 percent Asian students; 5.3 percent Hispanic students; 2.0 percent White students; and 0.8 percent students of multiple race.
- Four schools reported between 20 and 10 percent of their students enrolled in AP courses. Together these schools enrolled 87.1 percent economically disadvantaged students; 76.8 percent African American students; 0.5 percent Asian students; 11.2 percent Hispanic students; 10.0 percent White students; and 1.2 percent students of multiple race.

While most schools offer AP courses, some schools opt to offer an International Baccalaureate (IB) curriculum or to provide students with opportunities to enroll in dual enrollment courses. For example, one high school does not offer AP but has a majority of students enrolled in the IB curriculum; another school does not offer AP but has a more than half of their students enrolled in dual enrollment courses.

The IB Diploma Programme is recognized by universities across the world as providing students with a high quality preparation for post-secondary success. Dual enrollment courses are college classes, taught by college instructors. Classes may be held at the college campus or at the school. Through dual enrollment courses, students who pass the course(s) can earn college credit while in high school.

**Access to Highly Effective Teachers**

**Teacher Quality**

**What it is and why it’s important:** The most influential school-related factor of student learning is the quality of the teacher. More than socioeconomic status, race/ethnicity, class size, and school funding, the effectiveness of the teacher is the major determinant in student academic growth.

Research has found that students taught by a highly effective teacher for one year outperform their peers, even in subsequent years. Furthermore, the effect of quality teaching is both additive and cumulative; the more often students are taught by a highly effective teacher, the greater their growth, relative to their peers. Unfortunately, the opposite is true as well. The effect of being taught by an ineffective teacher is also additive and cumulative and has a major impact of students’ current and future learning potential. Economically disadvantaged and African American students are more likely to be taught by an ineffective teacher.

In 2010, Act 54, mandating a system to evaluate teacher effectiveness, became law. After a series of pilot tests, the LDOE implemented the evaluation and development system called COMPASS to assess the quality and effectiveness of instructional and administrative positions.

---


The COMPASS evaluation consists of two components:

- Student Growth – a quantitative measure of the academic gains students make during the school year.
- Professional Practice – measured by classroom observations and other qualitative evaluation techniques.

Teachers and school leaders are evaluated annually and receive a COMPASS rating. The LDOE provides school-level data on the percentage of teaching staff at each level of teacher effectiveness: Highly Effective; Effective: Proficient; Effective: Emerging; and Ineffective. Schools with less than 10 teachers do not receive a rating.

In New Orleans, teacher effectiveness ratings for 46 schools were reported for the 2017-18 and enrolled students during the 2019-20 school year. These schools enrolled 31,818 students during the 2019-20 school year. For demographic details about Teacher Effectiveness Ratings by School, see Appendix 4 on page 63.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School-level Percentage of Teachers Rated Highly Effective</th>
<th>Number of Schools (2017-18)</th>
<th>Economically Disadvantaged</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Multi-Race</th>
<th>ELL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100-80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.9-60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.9-40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.9-20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.9-0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL students</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Louisiana Department of Education. 2017-2018 COMPASS Teacher Results by District and School. And October 2019 Multi-Stats Total by Site and School System.

The data show that when it comes to the distribution of the best teachers (rated highly effective), economically disadvantaged students and African American students do not have equitable access.

Furthermore, students in New Orleans are in need of a more diverse teaching force. Research shows that students benefit in many ways from having a teacher of the same race/ethnicity. Studies suggest that African American students do better in reading and math and are less likely to be suspended. Race/ethnicity match in elementary, middle, and high school has been linked to reduced rates of exclusionary discipline for African American students.34

Race/ethnicity match also influences teachers’ expectations for their students. Researchers found that non-black teachers have significantly lower expectations for African American students than African American teachers. The effects were greater for African American male students and math teachers.35 Additionally teachers that mirror the students’ demographic can more effectively serve as role models, mentors, and advocates and support cultural competencies.

---

33 Includes Type 2 and independent charter schools.
In New Orleans, 2017-18 data show a mismatch in teacher-student demographics. The student population was nearly 80 percent African American, but teachers in public schools (including Type 2 and independent charter schools) were 51.4 percent African American (12.7 percent were African American male and 38.7 percent were African American female teachers).

Similarly, nearly 8 percent of students were Hispanic while 4.2 percent of teacher were Hispanic. There were significantly more White teachers (42 percent) compared to 9 percent of White students.

### Has the number of Inexperienced, Out-of-Field, or Emergency Credentialed teachers changed since 2016-17?

**Inexperienced Teachers:**
- 2016-17: 68 teachers
- 2018-19: 314 teachers

**Out-of-Field Teachers:**
- 2016-17: 1,289 teachers
- 2018-19: 1,646 teachers

**Teachers on Emergency/Provisional Credential:**
- 2016-17: 13 teachers
- 2018-19: 9 teachers

### NOLA-PS and OPSB Plan to Increase Teacher Quality

Recognizing that attracting, developing, and retaining a diverse teaching force must be a priority, NOLA-PS Superintendent is focused on growing and diversifying the teacher pipeline. Using funds from the state Systemwide Needs Program (SWNP), OPSB is working with partners to attract and retain diverse teacher talent to fill teaching vacancies and increase the number of certified teachers in high-need areas.

**OPSB’s SWNP plan proposes to:**
- Incentivize undergraduates from local university programs to participate in teacher residency programs;
- Incentivize current teachers to attain certification in high-need areas and to attain National Board Certification;
- Support local programs that recruit teachers to teach in NOLA-PS; and
- Continue to recruit and train new teachers through existing pipeline programs.

OPSB also wants to ensure that new teachers have the support to succeed by developing a mentorship program. The district’s SWNP will support training for existing teachers to gain state-required Mentor Teacher Certification.
Access to Resources/Funding

Equitable Funding

What it is and why it’s important: Equity in funding provides schools with resources based on the needs of their students and the costs to meet those needs. Equitable funding structures allow district leadership to allocate scarce resources to schools with the hopes of addressing achievement gaps, changing and complex demographics patterns, and declining state and federal support.

Student-based budgeting (SBB), also referred to as “differentiated funding” or “weighted student formula funding”, is a more equitable and transparent way of funding students than traditional funding models. With SBB, schools receive funds based on the number of students and their individual needs (such as economically disadvantaged, English language learners, special needs or gifted and talented, etc.), allows dollars to “follow children” directly to the school where they enroll, and gives schools more control over how to allocate those funds. Traditional models distribute funds based on staffing positions.

In 2014, the RSD adopted SBB based on a differentiated funding formula. OPSB implemented citywide SBB in 2016. The differentiated funding formula adjusts Minimum Foundation Program (MFP) funding to distribute funding to schools based on the needs of their students and the costs of programs to meet their needs.

In September 2019, the OPSB Superintendent, after months of engagement with school leaders and education stakeholders, announced a new differentiated funding formula with weights adjusted to promote CTE and provide more funding to schools serving English language learners, Gifted and Talented learners, and other students with special needs (formerly incarcerated or expelled students). The new formula will be effective July 1, 2020.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOLA-PS Differentiated Funding Formula Weights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-8 Base (Grades K -8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Base (Grades 9 -12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need Categories (Added to Base)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED Tier 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED Tier 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED Tier 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED Tier 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED Tier 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifted/Talented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL Tier 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL Tier 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past Incarcerated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past Expelled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career and Technical Education (CTE)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SBB has the potential to alleviate or eliminate achievement gaps by using equitable funding across schools and empowering school leaders to design schools and fund programs to best meet the unique and varied needs of their students. But the adoption of SBB alone is not sufficient to transform schools. The additional funding and flexibility of SBB doesn’t ensure success but helps create the conditions for success.

Successful implementation of SBB is associated with the following:

A clear vision for how SBB supports the city’s overall strategy of school empowerment.
Successful SBB is more than a weighted funding formula. It is a critical component of strategic school design. With strategic school design, school leaders identify their students and teacher needs, implement an engaging and rigorous curriculum, and then reorganize resources (people, time, technology, and funds, etc.) to implement supportive strategies.

A clear understanding of how to successfully implement and support SBB.
School leaders must learn to reallocate and manage resources based on a well-defined school vision and their strategic school design. NOLA-PS may need to provide training and support to school leaders who do not have experience in this type of management. Similarly, the role of the NOLA-PS central office may shift to serve as a more collaborative service center.

When implemented successfully, SBB can help achieve equity, transparency, and flexibility.
Conclusion:

From Hope to Action

Inequities in quality and access exist in public education in New Orleans but the Urban League of Louisiana strongly believes that an equitable system is possible. Economically disadvantaged students and students of color (African American and Hispanic)

- are **systemically excluded** from rigorous, high-quality curricula and instruction.
- are **underrepresented** in the highest performing schools and in rigorous, college-level courses that would level the academic playing field and place them on track to succeed in school and in life.
- are faced with **systemic disadvantages** leading to underperformance on standardized state assessments (LEAP 2025) and national (ACT) assessments.
- attend an elementary school where the majority of 3rd graders are not reading at grade level and are not prepared to advance to the 4th grade.
- attend a middle school where 8th graders are not prepared to succeed in high school, especially in math.

The **first step** in addressing these inequities is **recognizing that they exist and the effects they have on our youth and therefore the greater community**.

The data and analysis in this report look at important metrics to inform an honest evaluation of public education and its ability to provide equity, access, and excellence to the students and families of New Orleans and empower the community to demand better for all students. The data is intended to provide all stakeholders with information to begin asking why inequities exist and identify how to systematically address them. While there is significant work to be done, the Urban League of Louisiana believes that the issues revealed in this report can be addressed through determination and dedicated action.

The following section includes many of the steps that NOLA-PS has taken to address many of the inequities identified in our Advancing Educational Equity 2017 report and then provides our recommendations for moving forward.

**Acknowledging that our most vulnerable youth require additional supports and resources to succeed, NOLA-PS has pushed to support the success of all students evidenced by the steps below:**

**Policy** - In May of 2018, the Charter School Accountability Framework (“CSAF”) was modified by NOLA-PS by increasing requirements to attain a maximum contract with the district by highlighting how well schools serve all students. In order for schools to attain a ten year maximum charter extension, in addition to academic outcomes, schools must also show that for three of the four years prior to renewal they received a Progress Index of 100 or higher for economically disadvantaged students and a re-enrollment rate of 90% or higher for economically disadvantaged students.

In the spring of 2019, OPSB approved funding increases to its equity-based Differentiated Funding Formula, to help direct more dollars to specific students in need of additional services such as English Language Learners and by adding a new designation and set of weights for students who had been previously incarcerated or previously expelled from school. OPSB increased funding for gifted and talented students as well.

In the spring of 2019, OPSB also approved the reallocation of a portion of dollars from the Citywide Exceptional Needs Fund (“CENF”) to support the development and expansion of high-quality programming for students with significant cognitive and behavioral health needs. These actions are anticipated to result in the expansion of seats for students starting in the 2020-2021 academic school year. And, these programs were selected through a detailed process during the 2019-2020 school year to ensure they met a specific quality threshold for families.
Programming - In 2018, NOLA-PS invested in expanding its Child Search services, which provide free special education evaluation and identification services for all children in Orleans Parish ages 3-5. This expansion aligns with the increased investments being made by the City of New Orleans in its funding of the City Seats Program for infants and toddlers being administered by Agenda for Children.

In 2018, NOLA-PS began hosting the annual Transitions Fair, which serves as a pathway to connect students and families with resources and opportunities to assist students with special needs transitioning into adult, independent living after their high school careers conclude.

In the fall of 2019, NOLA-PS began funding The Bridge, a therapeutic and restorative-centered expulsion program for middle school students. The Bridge is scheduled to expand to serve additional middle school students seeking an alternative, restorative-focused program for learning and supports.

NOLA-PS supported the expansion of the Center for Resilience through funding and advocacy over the past several years to ensure K-8 students with significant behavioral health needs have a setting in which to thrive, as well as the extension of these services in 2019-2020 academic year to high school students.

Authorizing - In 2018, NOLA-PS approved the expansion of two high-quality schools, Audubon and Hynes, to increase the number of high-quality options for families citywide and to provide access to more high-performing operators. This illustrates that increasing the number of seats at high-performing schools remains a priority for NOLA-PS.

We applaud and support the above steps, and others, taken by OPSB and NOLA-PS leadership and staff since 2017. And, although NOLA-PS has made gains and progress in supporting students and their families, providing resources to schools based on student needs, and piloting or expanding innovative programming and initiatives, the data show that despite these efforts, inequities continue to exist and impede the overall performance of the district; especially for our special education, English language learners, and economically disadvantaged student population.

Recommendations for Improving Educational Excellence

1. OPSB Must Expand Equitable Access to High Quality Schools and Teachers

As a 100 percent charter school district, all students have the opportunity to attend the school of their choice – which in theory, should all be high-quality options. Yet the demand for high quality seats exceeds the supply. OPSB should re-examine policies and practices that limit or restrict access to high quality schools or highly effective teachers, resulting in gaps in academic achievement, particularly for economically disadvantaged students and African American students.

The data show that when it comes to the distribution of the best teachers, economically disadvantaged students and African American students do not receive equitable access. We applaud OPSB’s efforts to make attracting, developing, and retaining highly effective teachers a priority. We encourage OPSB and charter management organization leadership to work to recruit a more committed and diverse workforce by establishing and maintaining strong partnerships with Historically Black Universities and Colleges (HBCU). Without a doubt, inequitable distribution of highly effective teachers is a complex problem and will require honest conversations with a broad range of stakeholders.

Adoption of the Charter School Accountability Framework outlines the district’s strategic plan to support struggling schools, as well as guide charter school renewal, extension, and revocation decisions. We urge OPSB to make the tough decisions leading to equity and academic excellence, while ensuring that students and their families are not unintentionally burdened by these interventions, which will require continuous review of data with an equity lens.
Specifically, we recommend that OPSB and NOLA-PS:

- Develop an aggressive plan to grow and support new leadership
  - OPSB must lead efforts to implement innovative and creative initiatives, such as a leadership residency program, to identify second tier leadership at high quality schools and provide an intensive training and mentoring residency that prepares a culturally competent leadership pipeline to transform struggling schools
  - Continue to work with partners, particularly HBCUs to develop, recruit, and retain highly effective teachers
    - In 2016, NSNO, Xavier University and partners launched the Norman C. Francis Teacher Residency program, the first teacher residency program between a HBCU and CMOs in the country. In January 2020, OPSB approved the use of almost $7 million over the next three years for teacher preparation and development. OPSB should continue to partner with HBCUs in these efforts and to support local Grow Your Own (GYO) programs to achieve equity, excellence, and diversity in the new teacher pipeline.

- Continue to work with partners, particularly HBCUs to develop, recruit, and retain highly effective teachers
  - In 2016, NSNO, Xavier University and partners launched the Norman C. Francis Teacher Residency program, the first teacher residency program between a HBCU and CMOs in the country. In January 2020, OPSB approved the use of almost $7 million over the next three years for teacher preparation and development. OPSB should continue to partner with HBCUs in these efforts and to support local Grow Your Own (GYO) programs to achieve equity, excellence, and diversity in the new teacher pipeline.

- Conduct a gap analysis to identify gaps between the needs of our students and the various services provided by our nonprofit and community organizations.
  - While there have been some related efforts to do this, educational inequities are reflective of our schools’ inability to serve all students well. OPSB should work with school leadership to conduct in-depth analyses of school-level practices, as well as research the root cause of the core challenges facing school leaders to improve their individual charter or charter network performance.
  - Continue to pursue partnerships, strategic alliances, and collaborations.
    - OPSB and NOLA-PS should continue to solidify effective partnerships to expand counseling services for our youth, to provide professional development to school-level staff, and to offer youth development programs.

2. **OPSB Must Coordinate Community Efforts for Educational Equity and Excellence**

We know that improving our public education system in New Orleans cannot be done only by OPSB and NOLA-PS. However, we believe that the effort must be coordinated, aligned, and lead by OPSB, and implemented strategically by NOLA-PS. And, the untapped resources of nonprofits and service providers must be leveraged to benefit students and families.

Specifically, we recommend that OPSB:

- Facilitate and direct community nonprofit and service providers in efforts to improve educational equity.
  - The New Orleans community is fortunate to have a wealth of community organizations dedicated to supporting success for our students and schools. OPSB should support organized and focused collaborations to secure funding, serve as accountability partners, and provide a targeted school improvement approach to systematically address educational inequities.

- Conduct a gap analysis to identify gaps between the needs of our students and the various services provided by our nonprofit and community organizations.
  - While there have been some related efforts to do this, educational inequities are reflective of our schools’ inability to serve all students well. OPSB should work with school leadership to conduct in-depth analyses of school-level practices, as well as research the root cause of the core challenges facing school leaders to improve their individual charter or charter network performance.

- Continue to pursue partnerships, strategic alliances, and collaborations.
  - OPSB and NOLA-PS should continue to solidify effective partnerships to expand counseling services for our youth, to provide professional development to school-level staff, and to offer youth development programs.

3. **NOLA-PS Must Increase Transparency**

The data and analyses in this report provide a look at important metrics to inform an honest evaluation of public education and its ability to provide equity, access, and excellence to the students and families of New Orleans. A commitment to reflection, data review, and honest dialogue will be critical to moving forward.

Adoption of the Charter School Accountability Framework outlines the district’s strategic plan to support struggling schools, as well as guide charter school renewal, extension, and revocation decisions. We urge OPSB to make the tough decisions leading to equity and academic excellence, while ensuring that students and their families are not unintentionally burdened by these interventions, which will require continuous review of data with an equity lens.

Specifically, we recommend that NOLA-PS:

- Provide analysis of district- and school-level performance through an equity lens.
  - Working with the community, NOLA-PS must identify key indicators of educational success (metrics that are meaningful, measurable, and consistent) and provide timely updates of progress made toward closing achievement and opportunity gaps. Data should be disaggregated regularly to identify any disparities among various subgroups.
Embrace the facts as they exist regarding the systemic inequities that have historically and continuously plagued our school system so that a community-based plan can be developed and executed by NOLA-PS.

- In order to initiate and sustain meaningful and lasting change, NOLA-PS must conduct an honest and transparent analysis of the systemic inequities embedded in Board, district, and school-level policies and practices.

- Apply rigorous accountability measures while maintaining respect of and sensitivity to our community
  - OPSB must hold all schools accountable to high standards and take appropriate actions when schools fail to meet expectations. OPSB should work closely with parents and communities when making tough decisions regarding school closures.

### 4. OPSB Must Continue to be Strong and Bold Leaders

Closing consistently under-performing schools is likely the toughest decision OPSB has to make as an elected body. Finding money to support special populations of students during normal times, let alone during the time of a global health pandemic is no small feat as well. But, with the unification of schools, OPSB has the opportunity and the imperative to improve access and eliminate the educational inequities that exist for New Orleans students and families. And, although societal issues such as generational poverty, a low-wage economy based on leisure activities and tourism, and health disparities that clash with consistent student attendance may impact the performance of the district indirectly, OPSB, through NOLA-PS, must continue to lead and position the district by identifying, promulgating, and strictly enforcing policies and practices that eradicate performance and equity gaps for students.

OPSB must consistently provide strong and bold leadership to guide the future of the system of public schools in New Orleans. Although the elected Board has a unique role - providing oversight and implementing accountability but not directly operating schools - NOLA-PS has the authority and responsibility to implement measures that move the system toward successfully ensuring all students have the opportunity to attend a high-quality school, have access to highly effective teachers, and have the resources to succeed in rigorous courses that will prepare them for college and careers.

**Specifically, we recommend that OPSB:**

- **Build a Board for the future of NOLA-PS**
  - OPSB must continue to work collaboratively to create a culture and environment that fosters true innovation and creativity to continue the gains that have been made and address areas where inequities continue to exist.
- **Transition the role of the Board from myopic “regulators” to active ambassadors who garner the interests and attention of funders, new operators, and new educators to the district.**
- **Hold the Superintendent and NOLA-PS staff accountable for reducing the existing achievement and opportunity gaps**
  - OPSB must require the Superintendent to create a detailed plan that gives specific strategies and tactics, as well as partnerships and collaborations, likely to lead to demonstrable gains in a specific time frame.
  - OPSB should conduct quarterly public meetings that include parents, students, and educators, to gauge whether the progress of the strategic plan is on schedule and whether modification is needed in any aspect.
  - Encourage innovation and “thinking outside the box” to address gaps, including seeking partnerships with business and industry, policy think tanks, community colleges, and others.

The Urban League of Louisiana makes these recommendations because we believe them to be achievable and because we are here to help see them through. We strongly believe that all students can meet/exceed academic expectations when given appropriate support and resources. And, we believe that the community supports through nonprofits and service providers can carry some of the load when given a vision and a plan. In order to achieve this, OPSB must continue to provide bold and unwavering leadership.

ULLA will remain steadfast in our efforts to identify and analyze educational inequities. We will continue to engage our community, convene partners, and serve as a catalyst for change.
## Appendix 1: High School Leap 2025 Achievement Gaps by Subject

### English II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2017</th>
<th>% of Students Scoring Excellent or Good</th>
<th>% Excellent</th>
<th>% Good</th>
<th>% Fair</th>
<th>% Needs Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Education</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with Disability</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learner</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2019</th>
<th>% of Students Scoring Excellent or Good</th>
<th>% Advanced</th>
<th>% Mastery</th>
<th>% Basic</th>
<th>% Approaching Basic</th>
<th>% Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Education</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with Disability</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learner</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Louisiana Department of Education, 2019 State, LEA, School High School EOC Achievement Level Summary with Subgroups
### Algebra I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2017</th>
<th>% of Students Scoring Excellent or Good</th>
<th>% Excellent</th>
<th>% Good</th>
<th>% Fair</th>
<th>% Needs Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Education</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with Disability</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learner</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2019</th>
<th>% of Students Scoring Excellent or Good</th>
<th>% Advanced</th>
<th>% Mastery</th>
<th>% Basic</th>
<th>% Approaching Basic</th>
<th>% Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Education</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with Disability</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learner</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Louisiana Department of Education, 2019 State, LEA, School High School EOC Achievement Level Summary with Subgroups
## Geometry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2017</th>
<th>% of Students Scoring Excellent or Good</th>
<th>% Excellent</th>
<th>% Good</th>
<th>% Fair</th>
<th>% Needs Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Education</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with Disability</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learner</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2019</th>
<th>% of Students Scoring Excellent or Good</th>
<th>% Advanced</th>
<th>% Mastery</th>
<th>% Basic</th>
<th>% Approaching Basic</th>
<th>% Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Education</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with Disability</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learner</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Louisiana Department of Education, 2019 State, LEA, School High School EOC Achievement Level Summary with Subgroups
## U.S. History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2017</th>
<th>% of Students Scoring Excellent or Good</th>
<th>% Excellent</th>
<th>% Good</th>
<th>% Fair</th>
<th>% Needs Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Education</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with Disability</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learner</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2019</th>
<th>% of Students Scoring Excellent or Good</th>
<th>% Advanced</th>
<th>% Mastery</th>
<th>% Basic</th>
<th>% Approaching Basic</th>
<th>% Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Education</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with Disability</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learner</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: Demographic Profiles of Schools by Letter Grade

100 to 80 percent of graduates enrolled in college:
- Three schools – all with selective admissions criteria
- Economically disadvantaged: 26 percent
- Student population by Race/ethnicity:
  - African American: 28 percent
  - Asian: 8 percent
  - Hispanic: 8 percent
  - White: 50 percent
  - Multiple: 7 percent
- English language learner: 1 percent

79-60 percent of graduates enrolled in college:
- Six schools
- Economically disadvantaged: 83 percent
- Student population by Race/ethnicity:
  - African American: 94 percent
  - Asian: 1 percent
  - Hispanic: 3 percent
  - White: 1 percent
  - Multiple: 1 percent
- English language learner: 3 percent

59 to 40 percent of graduates enrolled in college:
- Nine schools
- Economically disadvantaged: 84 percent
- Student population by Race/ethnicity:
  - African American: 86 percent
  - Asian: 1 percent
  - Hispanic: 8 percent
  - White: 14 percent
  - Multiple: 7 percent
- English language learner: 5 percent

Less than 40 percent of graduates enrolled in college:
- Four schools – all alternative education programs
- Economically disadvantaged: 92 percent
- Student population by Race/ethnicity:
  - African American: 92 percent
  - Asian: 0 percent
  - Hispanic: 7 percent
  - White: 1 percent
  - Multiple: 0 percent
- English language learner: 6 percent
Appendix 3: Demographic Profiles of Schools by SPS Score

Based on October 2019 enrollment, of students in schools serving elementary and middle school grades:

- Number of students K-8: 33,985
- Economically disadvantaged: 81.5%
- Race/Ethnicity
  - African American: 74.4%
  - Asian: 1.4%
  - Hispanic: 11.4%
  - White: 10.6%
  - Multiple Race: 2.0%
- English language learner: 7.5%

Profile of A-rated Schools
Four schools, serving elementary and middle school students, received a letter grade of A. Of students in these schools (including two combination schools):

- Number of students K-8: 2,690 (7.9 percent of K-8 students)
- Economically disadvantaged: 44.6%
- Race/Ethnicity
  - African American: 37.1%
  - Asian: 4.7%
  - Hispanic: 11.8%
  - White: 41.3%
  - Multiple Race: 4.7%
- English language learner: 4.1%

Profile of B-rated Schools
Five schools, serving elementary and middle school students, received a letter grade of B. Of students in these schools:

- Number of students K-8: 4,815
- Economically disadvantaged: 56.1%
- Race/Ethnicity
  - African American: 47.4%
  - Asian: 1.3%
  - Hispanic: 14.5%
  - White: 30.9%
  - Multiple Race: 5.3%
- English language learner: 3.0%

Profile of C-rated Schools
Fifteen schools, serving elementary and middle school students, received a letter grade of C. Of students in these schools:

- Number of students K-8: 11,505
- Economically disadvantaged: 87.9%
- Race/Ethnicity
  - African American: 82.1%
  - Asian: 0.4%
  - Hispanic: 11.1%
  - White: 4.7%
  - Multiple Race: 1.4%
- English language learner: 8.2%

Profile of D-rated Schools
Nineteen schools, serving elementary and middle school students, received a letter grade of D. Of students in these schools:

- Number of students K-8: 11,212
- Economically disadvantaged: 92.8%
- Race/Ethnicity
  - African American: 84.4%
  - Asian: 1.5%
  - Hispanic: 11.5%
  - White: 1.6%
  - Multiple Race: 0.9%
- English language learner: 9.8%

Profile of F-rated Schools
Seven schools, serving elementary and middle school students, received a letter grade of F. Of students in these schools:

- Number of students K-8: 3,755
- Economically disadvantaged: 96.4%
- Race/Ethnicity
  - African American: 90.1%
  - Asian: 0.1%
  - Hispanic: 9.3%
  - White: 0.3%
  - Multiple Race: 0.1%
- English language learner: 8.0%
Profile of All High School Students
Based on October 2019 enrollment, of students in schools serving ninth through twelfth grades:
Number of students 9-12: 14,205
- Economically disadvantaged: 72.1%
- Race/Ethnicity
  - African American: 68.9%
  - Asian: 2.3%
  - Hispanic: 10.2%
  - White: 15.6%
  - Multiple Race: 2.4%
- English language learner: 5.3%

Profile of A-rated Schools
Six schools, serving high school students, received a letter grade of A. Of students in these schools (including two combination schools):
- Number of students 9-12: 4,761
- Economically disadvantaged: 51.7%
- Race/Ethnicity
  - African American: 51.1%
  - Asian: 4.7%
  - Hispanic: 10.1%
  - White: 29.8%
  - Multiple Race: 3.8%
- English language learner: 2.8%

Profile of B-rated Schools
Six schools, serving high school students, received a letter grade of B. Of students in these schools:
- Number of students 9-12: 3,305
- Economically disadvantaged: 84.0%
- Race/Ethnicity
  - African American: 89.1%
  - Asian: 1.2%
  - Hispanic: 5.4%
  - White: 1.8%
  - Multiple Race: 1.0%
- English language learner: 3.8%

Profile of C-rated Schools
Eight schools, serving high school students, received a letter grade of C. Of students in these schools:
- Number of students 9-12: 4,356
- Economically disadvantaged: 85.1%
- Race/Ethnicity
  - African American: 76.9%
  - Asian: 1.5%
  - Hispanic: 13.5%
  - White: 6.6%
  - Multiple Race: 1.3%
- English language learner: 9.3%

Profile of D-rated Schools
Three schools, serving high school students, received a letter grade of D. Of students in these schools:
- Number of students 9-12: 1,117
- Economically disadvantaged: 91.1%
- Race/Ethnicity
  - African American: 95.9%
  - Asian: 0.1%
  - Hispanic: 3.4%
  - White: 0.2%
  - Multiple Race: 0.3%
- English language learner: 1.8%

Profile of F-rated Schools
One school, serving high school students, received a letter grade of F. Of students in this school:
- Number of students 9-12: 258
- Economically disadvantaged: 92.5%
- Race/Ethnicity
  - African American: 59.3%
  - Asian: 0.0%
  - Hispanic: 36.0%
  - White: 4.3%
  - Multiple Race: 0.0%
- English language learner: 36.0%
Appendix 4: Demographic Profile of Schools by Teacher Effectiveness Rating

There were two schools where between 79.9 and 60 percent or more of the teachers were rated Highly Effective. Of students enrolled in these two schools, only 57 percent were economically disadvantaged (compared to 82 percent of all students in schools with teacher effectiveness ratings); 32 percent were African American (compared to 77 percent total). Hispanic, White, and Asian students are overrepresented; 20 percent were Hispanic (compared to 11 percent total), 31 percent were White (compared to 8 total) and 11 percent were Asian (compared to 2 percent total).

There were seven schools where between 59.9 and 40 percent of teachers were rated Highly Effective. Of students enrolled in these seven schools, only 71 percent were economically disadvantaged (compared to 82 percent of all students in schools with teacher effectiveness ratings); 65 percent were African American (compared to 77 percent total). Seven percent were Hispanic (compared to 11 % total). White students are overrepresented; 21 percent were White (compared to 8 total). The percentage of Asian enrolled represented the total (3 percent compared to 2 percent).

There were ten schools where between 39.9–20 percent of teachers were rated Highly Effective. Of students enrolled in these two schools, 83 percent were economically disadvantaged (compared to 82 percent of all students in schools with teacher effectiveness ratings); 79 percent were African American (compared to 77 percent total). Hispanic and Asian students are reflective of the total population; 10 percent were Hispanic (compared to 11% total) and 2 percent were Asian (compared to 2 percent total). White students were slightly underrepresented with 6 percent White students (compared to 8 total).

There were 27 schools where fewer than 20 percent of teachers were rated Highly Effective. Of students enrolled in these two schools, 88 percent were economically disadvantaged (compared to 82 percent total for schools with teacher effectiveness ratings); 84 percent were African American (compared to 77 percent total). White students were underrepresented; 3 percent were White (compared to 8 total). Hispanic and Asian populations in these schools reflect the total; 11 percent were Hispanic (compared to 11% total) and 1 percent were Asian (compared to 2 percent total).
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