

Burlington School District
Equity & Inclusion Data Report 2014
(Assessment School Year: 2013 – 2014)

Table of Contents

Preface

Foreword from Superintendent

Equity and Inclusion Report Production

Introduction

A) Methodology

B) Indicators

Evaluation of Outcomes on Indicators

A) Gender Outcomes

B) Family Income Outcomes

C) Race/Ethnicity Outcomes

D) Language Background Outcomes

E) Ability Outcomes

F) Comparison of Gaps ratios across groups 2013-14

G) Conclusion 2013-14

Trends: Comparison of Gaps from 2012-13 to 2013-14

District Resources

A) Staff Recruitment

B) Staff Training

Recommendations

Tables

Preface

In 2011, in response to the Burlington School District Task Force on Diversity's report, the district developed a strategic plan for diversity, equity, and inclusion whose purpose is Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion accordingly. The purpose of this plan is clearly stated as follows:

To develop ongoing strategic plan and action steps to “understand and eliminate race/ethnicity, class, disability, sex/gender, sexual orientation and/or language background as predictors of academic success, discipline, and co-curricular participation by assessing academic achievement, climate and inclusion, and district resources.”

Burlington School District Strategic Plan for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion, Fall 2011

The School Board subsequently adopted the following mission statement:

“In the Burlington School District in the next five years we seek to significantly reduce race/ethnicity, class, ability, sex/gender, and sexual orientation as predictors of academic performance, discipline, and co-curricular participation.”

This Equity Report is in response to the establishment of this goal, the School Board directed the administration to collect, analyze, and share data, in the form of an Equity and Inclusion Report, as the primary tool to measure achievement of this goal.

Equity and Inclusion Report Production By
Nikki A. Fuller, Senior Director
Andrew D. Plumley
Karyn Vogel, BSD Math Coach

FOREWORD

We are pleased to release this third annual Equity Inclusion Report for 2013-2014 for the Burlington School District.

Burlington School District is an innovative, equitable, and collaborative community of learners inspiring and shaping a dynamic and sustainable future for Burlington. We build on the diverse cultures, experiences, and interests of our students and community to support student-centered learning and foster intellectual growth. We partner with families and the community at large to help our students develop the knowledge and skills to become independent, self-directed, and lifelong learners who contribute responsibly to society.

As the new Superintendent this report serves as an analysis of our gaps and targeted areas for improvement.

The results continue to highlight equity disparities in our students similar to previous years. Earnest attempts have been made to develop approaches that improve equity of access, opportunity and outcomes. We still require systemic alignment in the strategies that will yield our desired state. We are not pleased with the results- in fact, these results continue to highlight similar equity issues that were highlighted in previous years. This is a signal, that although staff are working diligently to improve in this area, we lack consensus around what steps to take in order to see a systemic change.

However, we are pleased as we have embarked on a path, a promise to make our data transparent and to then work with the community to review the data, set goals, and report on our progress.

Burlington School District will seek to significantly reduce race/ethnicity, first language background/ELL status, class, ability, sex/gender, and sexual orientation as predictors of academic performance, discipline, and co-curricular participation.

We will endeavor to coordinate our efforts to reach these ideals and goals.

With commitment,



Superintendent

Executive Summary

Academic Achievement

The achievement gap between student groups continues to be a concern in the Burlington School District. Performance on the NECAP (Vermont Agency of Education) reading and math test scores shows significant differences based on race, socio-economic status, and language (ELL). There is also a concern about equal participation in classes, which is manifest most clearly in our most rigorous courses at the high school, which include Honors and AP courses. These gaps are one indicator of how a student's association with a certain demographic group remains a predictor of their academic achievement.

Students who are not eligible for Free and Reduced Lunch (Non FRL) continue to be successful with regards to achievement levels such as NECAP tests and specific course enrollment like Algebra 2, honors, and AP courses. Algebra 2 is a significant indicator for course enrollment because it is a college gateway course. By contrast, there are several demographic groups that continue to show low test scores and low rates of enrollment in these courses. These groups include low-income (FRL) students, black students, and students who are receiving English Language Learner Services or Special Education Services. As you will see in the coming tables, some of the gaps between demographic groups and AP and honors enrollment for instance, are quite significant.

Climate and Inclusion

The data shows that there are similar disparities between students in our measured climate and inclusion indicators related to socio-economic status (FRL), race/ethnicity, and students receiving Special Education Services. The difference in both in and out-of-school suspension rates is of concern as this affects a student's classroom instructional time, which results in a drop in overall academic achievement. The effect of suspension rates on classroom instructional time may be creating a compound effect on most of the achievement gap indicators being measured. Attendance data also shows these same demographic gaps with the exception of students receiving English Language learner Services (ELL), who have the highest rate of all demographic groups.

Overall, the data shows that achievement and inclusion gap results on the whole, are highest for Non-White students and low-income students, or students who are grouped as eligible for Free and Reduced Lunch. This data is not a surprise to the district, as the last Equity and Inclusion Report showed similar outcomes in the data. These gaps are not acceptable. Hence, the district will continue to implement proven strategies as well as seek out new and innovative strategies to close these gaps and ensure that every student is successful.

Burlington School District Equity and Inclusion Report 2014

I. Introduction

This is the Burlington School District's 3rd annual Equity and Inclusion Report (EIR).¹ The Board has established as a primary goal the narrowing and eventual elimination of the achievement gap. As the District continues its efforts to close the achievement gap and to ensure that every student is provided equitable academic instruction, services and opportunities, there is recognition that eliminating the achievement gap requires steadfast data-driven commitment to the implementation of the Diversity and Equity Strategic Plan. This report is a pivotal tool in this effort.

A. Methodology

The purpose of this report is to assess the extent of achievement gaps, through the comparison of outcomes in three domains for 2013-14:

- Academic achievement
- Inclusion and climate
- District resources to support equity and inclusion

The academic achievement and climate and inclusion domains are evaluated based on student outcomes. It is worth noting that climate survey data will be added to this report in future reports as the final version of the Climate Survey will be administered in 2016 to parents, teachers, staff and students grades 6-12. The 3rd domain assesses how district resources are being used to promote equity and inclusion as follows:

- Progress in recruitment, hiring and retention of a diverse and culturally competent workforce, and
- Professional development training of staff in affirmative recruitment training, cultural awareness, responsiveness, and competency.

The focus in this report is on comparing outcomes between defined demographic groups to assess the differences in success indicators. This allows the district to evaluate the extent to which gaps are responding to efforts and to make appropriate adjustments as the indicators may suggest. This also aids the District in setting priorities with regard to limited monetary resources and staffing.

Ensuring equitable outcomes and successful futures for every student is the district's primary goal in closing the achievement gap. We must eliminate the differences in academic achievement, access to services and equal opportunity that are related to race, ethnicity, class, language, sex, and economic status in order to achieve this most important goal. As a school district, we realize that not every student will be the same, or have the same academic outcomes

¹ The inaugural report (April 2013, an assessment of 2012-13) provided a first year baseline overview of the issues of academics achievement, climate and inclusion and district resources.

when it comes to test scores or grades, but having major gaps between specific academic and climate indicators points to institutional shortcomings that must be addressed for there to be equity.

B. Indicators

1) Comparison Groups

Data on academic achievement and climate and inclusion are compared across five key groups for which gaps have tended to be highest not only in the Burlington School District, but across the nation more generally.

- Gender: We compare outcomes for females and males.
- Family Income/Socio-economic status: We compare outcomes of students eligible for Free and Reduced lunch (FRL) with non-FRL students.
- Race/Ethnicity: We compare outcomes for five racial, ethnic groups- White, Black, Asian, Hispanic, and Multi-Ethnic.
- Language background: Data is analyzed for groups- students with Limited English Proficiency (LEP) and non-LEP students.
- Ability: We compare students on an Individualized Education Plan (IEP) to non-IEP students.

2) Indicators of Academic Achievement

There are six indicators of academic achievement. These are shown in Table 1 below:

Table 1. Indicators of Academic Achievement and Definitions

Indicator	Definition
NECAP Reading	The percentage of students who scored proficient or proficient with distinction on the New England Common Assessment program (NECAP) reading test.
NECAP Math	The percentage of students who scored proficient or proficient with distinction on the New England Common Assessment program (NECAP) math test.
Algebra 2	The percentage of high school students who enrolled in Algebra 2 in 2013-14.
Algebra 2 Grades	The percentage of high school students enrolled in Algebra 2 who received an A or B in the class.
Honors	The percentage of high school students enrolled in at least one honors course in 2013-14.
AP	The percentage of high school students enrolled in at least one Advanced Placement (AP) course in that year.

3) Indicators of Inclusion and Climate

There are four indicators of inclusion and climate, shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Indicators of Climate and Inclusion and Definitions

Indicator	Definition
Attendance	The percentage of students with 95% attendance rates or better in a given year.
In-School Suspensions	The percentage of students receiving one or more in-school suspensions.
Out-of-School Suspensions	The percentage of students receiving one or more out-of-school suspensions.
Drop out Rate ²	The four year cohort dropout rate, defined as the percentage of an incoming 9 th grade class that has dropped out of high school by 12 th grade.

Of the climate indicators, the attendance and suspension data are district-wide, while the cohort drop out rate is calculated relative to the size of the incoming 9th grade class.

4) Indicators of District Resources to Promote Equity and Inclusion

Table 3. Indicators of District Resources to Promote Equity and Inclusion

Indicator	Definition
Racial Diversity of District Staff	The racial/ethnic composition of district workforce by job category.
Professional Development in Cultural Competency	The number and percentage of teachers receiving cultural competency training in school year 2013-14.

The Equity Inclusion Report is laid out as follows. Section II discusses and analyzes data on academic achievement and inclusion/climate. Section III compares outcomes to 2012-13 data. Section IV assesses district resources used to support equity and inclusion. Section V summarizes and offers recommendations for future Equity Reports and District efforts on equity and inclusion.

II. Evaluation of Academic and Climate/Inclusion Outcomes

Table 4 summarizes data for all indicators for groups. We measure the difference in outcomes between the groups by:

² The remainder of students-those who have not dropped out- include two different groups. Those who graduated in four years, and those who are still enrolled.

- The percentage point gap between categories within a group (for race/ethnicity, we compare each non-White group to the White group), and
- The percentage point change from 2012-13 to 2013-14.

In the case of gaps, a smaller gap indicates greater equality between the two groups (or in the case of race/ethnicity, between Whites and other racial/ethnic groups).

With regard to the percentage point change from 2012-13 to 2013-14, this would indicate the percentage change in each respective category from last year to this year.

Table 4. Academic and Climate/Inclusion Outcomes 2013-14

Category	Group	Academic						Climate			
		NECAP Reading	NECAP Math	Algebra 2 Enrollment	Algebra 2 Grades	Honors	AP	Attendance (95% plus)	In-School Suspension	Out-of-School Suspension	Drop Out Rate
Gender	Female	71.80%	56.10%	21.90%	14.80%	44.30%	16.90%	70.70%	2.80%	2.70%	9.80%
	Male	58.50%	53.70%	21.10%	10.60%	35.80%	11.90%	67.50%	7.60%	6.50%	8.30%
Family Income	Non-FRL	84.30%	75.20%	24.00%	17.50%	59.90%	24.00%	72.10%	1.80%	1.80%	8.30%
	FRL	43.40%	32.40%	18.60%	7.20%	17.00%	3.20%	65.80%	9.10%	7.70%	15.20%
Race/Ethnicity	White	73.50%	64.40%	21.60%	14.50%	49.00%	18.00%	66.40%	4.20%	3.80%	9.30%
	Black	38.00%	22.60%	16.00%	3.00%	14.20%	8.30%	77.60%	11.10%	11.30%	8.30%
	Asian	37.00%	32.30%	29.10%	16.20%	23.00%	3.40%	76.10%	4.10%	1.80%	8.60%
	Hispanic	73.50%	58.00%	20.80%	16.70%	54.20%	16.70%	64.50%	4.80%	2.40%	16.70%
	Multi-Ethnic	71.40%	60.40%	12.00%	4.00%	48.00%	16.00%	68.60%	5.90%	4.90%	NA
ELL	Non-LEP	72.00%	61.00%	22.30%	13.40%	46.10%	16.80%	67.50%	5.10%	4.60%	9.90%
	LEP	15.40%	14.00%	16.70%	9.00%	3.80%	0.00%	78.20%	6.30%	5.00%	3.00%
Ability	Non-IEP	70.70%	59.70%	23.90%	14.30%	44.50%	16.20%	69.60%	4.50%	3.80%	7.30%
	IEP	22.60%	18.40%	2.50%	0.00%	4.90%	0.00%	65.20%	10.80%	10.60%	22.60%

A. Gender, Academic Achievement, and Inclusion

To determine whether there are any achievement gaps by gender, we compare outcomes of female and male students. The district's goal is to eliminate any and all gaps between these two groups.

1. Academic Achievement

- The data in Table 4 indicates that a larger percentage of females (71.8%) than males (58.5%) scored proficient or proficient with distinction on Reading NECAP tests. On the NECAP Math tests, 56.1% of females scored proficient or proficient with distinction, as opposed to 53.7% of males, which is a smaller gap.
- With regard to the college gateway course Algebra 2, 21.9% of female high school students were enrolled in 2013-14, as opposed to 21.1% of males.
- Of those students enrolled in Algebra 2, 14.8% of females got a score of an A or B in the course, while male's percentages were lower at 10.6%.
- Among female students in high school, 44.3% were enrolled in at least one honors course. Only 35.8% of males at the high school were enrolled in at least one honors course.
- The data in table 4 shows that 16.9% of females were enrolled in an AP course, while the percentage of males enrolled in an AP course was slightly less at 11.9%.

Overall, there are academic gaps between females and males in our district. As we shall see, these gaps are relatively small when compared to other demographic groups.

2. Climate and Inclusion

Attendance rates are indicative of both attachment to school, and also of stressors (both in and out of schools) that limit school attendance.

- There is only a slight difference in attendance rates between genders for 2013-14. Females had an attendance rate of 95% or better 70.7% of the time, while male's attendance was not significantly lower at 67.5%.

School discipline is another important indicator of climate and inclusion. We evaluated both in and out-of-school suspensions, measured as the total number of each type of suspension as a % of the number of students in each group.

- The data in table 4 shows that district-wide, 2.8% of females got an in-school suspension in 2013-14, while males received more in-school suspensions at a rate of 7.6%.

- Out-of-school suspensions had a slightly lower percentage than in-school suspensions for females (2.7%), while males dropped to 6.5%.

3. Gender Gaps in Student Academic Achievement and Inclusion

Table 5 provides data on the percentage point gaps in outcomes for all indicators using the data from Table 4 above.

Table 5. Academic and Inclusion Gaps for All Groups 2013-14

Comparison Groups	NECAP Reading	NECAP Math	Algebra 2 Enrollment	Algebra 2 Grades	Honors	AP	Attendance (95% plus)	In-School Suspension	Out-of-School Suspension	Drop Out Rate
Female-Male	13.30%	2.40%	0.80%	4.20%	8.50%	5.00%	3.20%	-4.80%	-3.80%	1.50%
Non-FRL-FRL	40.90%	42.80%	5.40%	10.30%	42.90%	20.80%	6.30%	-7.30%	-5.90%	-6.90%
White-Black	35.50%	41.80%	5.60%	11.50%	34.80%	9.70%	-11.20%	-6.90%	-7.50%	1.00%
White-Asian	36.50%	32.10%	-7.50%	-1.70%	26.00%	14.60%	-9.70%	0.10%	2.00%	0.70%
White-Hispanic	0.00%	6.40%	0.80%	-2.20%	-5.20%	1.30%	1.90%	-0.60%	1.40%	-7.40%
White-Multi-Ethnic	2.10%	4.00%	9.60%	10.50%	1.00%	2.00%	-2.20%	-1.70%	-1.10%	NA
Non-LEP-LEP	56.60%	47.00%	5.60%	4.40%	42.30%	16.80%	-10.70%	-1.20%	-0.40%	6.90%
Non-IEP-IEP	48.10%	41.30%	21.40%	14.30%	39.60%	16.20%	4.40%	-6.30%	-6.80%	- 15.30%

In the case of gender, this is measured simply as the female rate minus the male rate.

- As the data shows in Table 5, there is a 13.3-percentage point difference in reading proficiency between females and males in the district on NECAP tests. For math NECAP scores, there is only a 2.4-percentage point gap.
- The gap in Algebra 2 enrollment between females and males is only .8 percentage points.
- The data indicates however, that there is a 4.2 percentage point gap in females and males who receive an A or B in Algebra 2.
- There are, however, academic gaps between females and males in both enrollment in honors and AP courses. There is an 8.5 percentage point gap between females and males who are enrolled in honors courses, while there is a slightly smaller 5.0 percentage point gap in females to males when it comes to AP courses.

4. Climate/Inclusion Gender Gaps

- As it relates to climate and inclusion factors, there is a 3.2 percentage point gap between females and males who had a 95% or better attendance rate.
- There was a -4.8³ percentage point difference between females and males who got in-school suspensions. Out-of-school suspensions percentage point difference dropped between genders to -3.8.

Lastly, there was a 1.5 percentage point difference between females to males who dropped out over a four-year period in 2013-14.

B. Family Income, Academic Achievement, and Inclusion

In order to understand achievement gaps by family income (or socio-economic status), we compare outcomes of students identified as recipients of Free and Reduced Lunch (FRL), and those not eligible for Free and Reduced Lunch (Non-FRL). Again, the district's goal is to eliminate gaps between these two groups.

1. Academic Achievement

³ In this report, a negative percentage point difference means that the second group we are comparing has a larger number than the first group we are comparing. In other words, in the gender example above (Females-Male), Females got fewer in school suspensions than males. This means that the percentage point difference will be a negative number as males tended to be put into in school suspension at a greater rate than their female counterparts.

- When referring back to table 4, there is a wide gap between non-FRL students and FRL students as it relates to both NECAP reading and NECAP math scores. 84.3% of non-FRL students scored proficient or better on the NECAP reading, while only 43.4% of FRL students did. For math scores, 75.2% of non-FRL students scored proficient, yet only 32.4% of FRL had the same outcomes.
- Among high school students, 24% of non-FRL students were enrolled in Algebra 2 (a gateway college course), as opposed to 18.6% of FRL students in that same year.
- Out of the students who were enrolled in Algebra 2, 17.5% of the non-FRL students received an A or B in the class. Only 7.2% of FRL students received an A or B in those same classes in 2013-14.
- Wide gaps also exist in enrollment in honors and AP courses between non-FRL students and FRL. Among non-FRL students, 59.9% of them were enrolled in at least one honors course, while only 17% of FRL students were enrolled in an honors class in 2013-14. The AP enrollment gap is also significant as 24% of non-FRL students were enrolled in at least one AP course, while only 3.2% of FRL students were enrolled in an AP course.

2. Climate and Inclusion

- The percentage of non-FRL students with 95% or better attendance rates in 2013-14 is 72.1%, compared to 65.8% for FRL students.
- Data in table 4 shows that FRL students were significantly more likely to receive both in and out-of school suspensions. 9.1% of FRL students had an in-school suspension compared to only 1.8% of non-FRL students. Out-of-school suspensions were the same for non-FRL students at 1.8%, while 7.7% of FRL were suspended.
- Finally, the four year cohort drop out rate for non-FRL students was 8.3%, while the rate for FRL students was higher at 15.2%.

3. Family Income Gaps in Academic and Inclusion Student Outcomes

Table 5 provides data on percentage point gaps in outcomes for all indicators using the larger data from Table 4. In the case of non-FRL to FRL students, we measure this by simply subtracting the FRL rate from the non-FRL rate.

- As the data shows, there is a 40.9 percentage point gap between non-FRL, and FRL students in NECAP reading scores. There is an even greater 42.8 percentage point gap between these two groups when looking at NECAP math scores.
- The gap in Algebra 2 enrollment between non-FRL students and FRL students was 5.4 percentage points in 2013-14. In terms of Algebra 2 grades, there was a 10.3 percentage point difference between non-FRL students who received an A or B compared to FRL students.

- When looking at honors and AP course enrollment, there is a substantial percentage point gap of 42.9% between non-FRL students and FRL students in terms of honors course enrollment. The gap narrows in AP course enrollment, but is still significant, with a percentage point gap is at 20.8% between non-FRL students and FRL students.
- The gap in the share of students in each group having 95% attendance rate or better is 6.3 percentage points.

4. Discipline and In/Out of School Suspension and Drop out Rates

- The difference in discipline outcomes is stark when comparing non-FRL students to FRL students. The difference is -7.3 percentage points between non-FRL students and FRL students for in school suspensions. Out-of-School suspensions between these two groups is -5.9%. Again, the negative numbers indicate that FRL students are getting suspended at higher levels than non-FRL students, the percentage point to be negative.
- Drop out rates tell a similar story between the non-FRL students and the FRL students. There is a gap of -6.9% between them. This means that FRL students are dropping out at much higher rates than their Non-FRL student counterparts.

C. Race/Ethnicity, Academic Achievement, and Inclusion

In order to understand achievement gaps by race and or ethnicity, we compare outcomes of White students relative to all other racial/ethnic groups: Black, Asian, Hispanic, and Multi-Ethnic. The district's goal is to eliminate gaps between all racial/ethnic groups.

For the purposes of transparency and total inclusion, this report has included information that includes raw numbers of students, regardless of how small. It is important that in our effort to become more inclusive and culturally competent of all people and all cultures, we include ALL people of diverse cultures, languages, race, and ethnicities in this report.

1. Academic Achievement

- White, Hispanic and Multi-Ethnic students tested as either proficient or very proficient in NECAP reading scores with 73.5%, 73.5%, and 71.4% respectively. Asian and Black students did not fare as well as only 38% of black students and 37% of Asian students tested as proficient or better.
- A similar pattern is seen when looking at NECAP math scores. White, Hispanic, and Multi-Ethnic students received scores of proficient or better in math with 64.4%, 58%, and 60.4% respectively. On the other hand, Black and Asian students fared worse with only 22.6% of Black students and 32.3% of Asians students scoring proficient in math scores in 2013-14.

- Among high school students enrolled in Algebra 2, racial/ethnic differences were smaller. 21.6% of White students, 16% of Black students, 29.1% of Asian students, 20.8% of Hispanic students, and 12% of Multi-Ethnic students were enrolled in Algebra 2 in 2013-14
- In terms of Algebra 2 grades, White, Asian, and Hispanic students tended to receive A's or B's at higher rate than Black and Multi-Ethnic students. White students were at 14.5%, Asian students were at 16.2%, and Hispanic students were at 16.7%. Conversely, Black students were only at 3% while Multi-Ethnic students were at 4%.
- About half of the district's White students were enrolled in at least one honors course at 49%, while Hispanic students were enrolled at a greater percentage of 54.2%. Multi-Ethnic students dropped a bit to 48%. Again, when looking at Black and Asian students, numbers sharply fall. Only 14.2% of Black students, and 23% of Asian students were enrolled in an honors course.
- Numbers are much smaller, in general, when looking at AP courses, but the trends remain the same. White students (18%), Hispanic students (16.7%), and Multi-Ethnic students (16%) are all very close in percentages, while Black students (8.3%) and Asian students (3.4%) lag behind.

2. Climate and Inclusion

- Attendance rates of 95% or better were highest in Black (77.6%) and Asian (76.1%) students. White (66.4%), Hispanic (64.5%) and Multi-Ethnic (68.6%) students were all very close in percentages as well.
- There are massive differences in suspension rates between all demographic groups and their Black counterparts. White (4.2%), Asian (4.1%), Hispanic (94.8%) and Multi-Ethnic (5.9%) students all received similar numbers in in school suspensions. There is a massive spike though, when we look at Black students in school suspension numbers in that same year at 11.1%.
- Out-of-School suspension data tells a similar story as with in-school data . White (3.8%), Asian (1.8%) Hispanic (2.4%), and Multi-Ethnic (4.9%) students are all generally clustered together. Black students however are at a much higher number at 11.3%.
- Lastly, when looking at dropout rates, Hispanic students had the widest gap in rates with 16.7%. The dropout rates for all other groups are between 8.3% and 9.3% respectively.

3. Race/Ethnicity Gaps in Academic and Inclusion Student Outcomes

Table 5 provides data on the percentage point gap for each indicator. In the case of Race/Ethnicity, we compare outcomes of White students to all other racial or ethnic groups. Thus, the gaps are measured as White minus Black student outcomes, White minus Asian student outcomes and so on.

Academic Gaps

- The data shows that there are wide gaps between Black and Asian students and their White counterparts. There is a 35.5 percentage point difference in NECAP reading scores between White and Black students, and a 36.5% difference for Asian and White Students. There is no difference between White and Hispanic students in NECAP reading, while there's a slight 2.1 percentage point difference between White and Multi-Ethnic students.
- Math NECAP gaps are widest between White and Black students at 41.8%. Second is White to Asian students at 32.1%. The White and Hispanic student math NECAP gap was at 6.4%, while the White and Multi-Ethnic gap is 4%.
- Gaps in Algebra 2 enrollment between White and Black students was 5.6 percentage points. White and Asian students had a -7.5 percentage point gap, meaning Asian students were enrolled in Algebra 2 at a higher rate than their White counterparts. The White and Hispanic gap was only at .8%, while the White and Multi-Ethnic gap was much greater for Algebra 2 enrollment at 9.6 percentage points.
- There were significant gaps between both White and Black, and White and Hispanic students when looking at Algebra 2 grades. There was an 11.5 percentage point gap between White and Black students who were enrolled in Algebra 2 and received an A or B in the class and a 10.5 percentage point gap for Hispanic students. In other words, White students received an A or B at a significantly higher rate than Black students enrolled in the same course in 2013-14.
- Both Asian and Hispanic students received A's or B's in Algebra 2 at slightly higher rates than their White student counterparts. The percentage point gaps were -1.7% and 2.2% respectively.
- When looking at Honors and AP class enrollment, there is a drastic difference between White and Black students in terms of enrollment. There is a massive 34.8 percentage point gap between White and Black students who enrolled in an honors course in 2013-14. That is the largest gap of any group in this indicator by far. Next is the White to Asian student academic gap which is 26 percentage points. There are only slight gap differences of Hispanic and Multi-Ethnic students of -5.2 and 1 percentage point respectively.

Climate Gaps

- A higher percentage of Black, Asian, and Multi-Ethnic students had attendance of 95% or better than both White and Hispanic students in 2013-14. The percentage point gap between Black and White students was -11.2 percentage points, White and Asian students was -9.7 percentage points, White and Multi-Ethnic students was -2.2 percentage points, and finally, the White and Hispanic gap was at a 1.9 percentage point gap difference.
- In and out-of-school suspension gap differences were greatest between White and Black students. The in school suspension gap between White and Black students was -6.9 percentage points, while the out-of-school suspension gap difference was -7.5 percentage points. The percentage point difference between White and Asian students was .1% for in school, and 2% for out-of-school suspensions. The White to Hispanic student gap difference was -.6 percentage points for in school suspensions and 1.4 percentage points for out-of-school suspensions. Lastly, White to Multi-Ethnic student suspension gaps were -1.7% for in school, and -1.1% for out-of-school suspensions.
- When looking at cohort drop out rates between these groups, the biggest gap is between White and Hispanic students with a -7.4 percentage point gap. Every other group is between 1 percentage point of one another.

D. Language Background Academic Achievement and Inclusion

There are over fifty languages other than English that are spoken in the Burlington School District. The mission of the BSD English Language Learner (ELL) program is to provide instruction to ensure that ELL's gain the linguistic, social, and academic skills they need as members of the Burlington school community.

The Burlington School District has three main goals⁴:

- **70% of ELL students make at least .5 English language proficiency level gain annually.** The gain is measured using the composite score of the state English language proficiency assessment.
- **70% of ELL students exit the ELL program within 7 years.** Students exit when they are reclassified as fluent English proficient after attaining at least 5.0 composite score and 4.0 in reading and writing on ACCESS test.
- **Former ELL's achieve a grade level at the same rate as their non-ELL peers 2 years after exit from ELL programming.** Achievement at grade level is based on students' scores on the state content assessment in English Language Arts (reading and writing) and math two years after reclassification as fluent English proficient.

⁴ *BSD ELL Program Report 2012-13*, submitted by Linda Wasleban, ELL Director, March 31, 2014.

With this context, in order to understand achievement gaps by language background, we compare outcomes of students who are English language learners and are deemed Limited English Proficient students (LEP), and students who are non-LEP students. Included in the non-LEP student category are the students who were once LEP students who have tested out and are now considered Fluent English Proficient-Monitored (FEPM). The district's goal is to eliminate gaps between LEP and non-LEP students.

1. Academic Achievement

- The data in Table 4 shows that there is a wide gap in performance on NECAP reading between non-LEP students and LEP students with 72% of non-LEP students getting proficient or better in testing while only 15.4% of LEP students getting proficient or better.
- The gap in NECAP math scores are also large with 61% of non-LEP students getting proficient or better and only 14% of LEP students receiving the same scores in 2013-14.
- Among high school students, 22.3% of non-LEP students were enrolled in Algebra 2, while 16.7% of LEP students were enrolled in the same course.
- Of those non-LEP students enrolled in Algebra 2, 13.4% of them received an A or B in the class, while only 9% of LEP students received an A or B in Algebra 2 in 2013-14.
- In terms of students enrolled in Honors and AP classes, 46.1% of non-LEP students were enrolled in at least one Honors course and 16.8% were enrolled in an AP course. Only 3.8% of LEP students were enrolled in an Honors course, while there were no LEP students at all enrolled in an AP course in 2013-14.

2. Climate and Inclusion

- The percentage of non-LEP students with 95% or better attendance rate was 67.5%, compared to 78.2% of LEP students. For this indicator, LEP students seem to be attending school at higher rates than non-LEP students.
- The data shows that 5.1% of non-LEP students received in school suspensions while 6.3% of LEP students did. In terms of out-of-school suspensions, 4.6% of non-LEP students got out-of-school suspension while 5% of LEP students did.
- Lastly, the four year cohort drop out rate for non-LEP students was 9.9%, while the drop out rate for LEP students was only at 3%.

3. Gaps in Academic and Climate/Inclusion Outcomes

Table 5 provides data on gap outcomes. As for other groups, gaps are calculated by subtracting LEP outcomes with non-LEP outcomes.

Academic Gaps

- There is a 56.6 percentage point gap between non-LEP and LEP students when it comes to NECAP reading scores, and a slightly lower percentage point gap in NECAP math scores at 47 points. We see here that these are some of our largest gaps between any groups in the Burlington School District.
- For Algebra 2 enrollment, there is a 5.6 percentage point gap between non-LEP students and LEP students. Within that, we see a 4.4 percentage point gap between non-LEP and LEP students who receive an A or B in those Algebra 2 courses.
- There is a huge gap between non-LEP and LEP students who are enrolled in at least one Honors course at 42.3 percentage points.
- That percentage point gap goes down drastically when we look at AP course enrollment. But here, we must remember that there were no LEP students enrolled at all in any AP course in 2013-14.

Climate and Inclusion Gaps

- The percentage point difference in attendance rates was -10.7 percentage points. This means that LEP students were actually attending school at a higher rate than non-LEP students, hence the negative percentage point gap.
- There was a -1.2 percentage point gap between non-LEP students and LEP students in school suspensions.
- For out-of-school suspensions, there was only a 0.4 percentage point gap difference between these two groups.
- Lastly, there was a 6.9 percentage point difference in cohort dropout rates between non-LEP and LEP students in 2013-14.

E. Ability/Disability Academic Achievement and Inclusion

In order to understand achievement gaps by ability/disability, we compare outcomes of students who are defined as students who are on an Individualized Education Plan (IEP) and those who are not on IEP plans. The district's goal is to eliminate gaps between these two groups.

1. Academic Achievement

- The data in Table 4 shows that 70.7% of non-IEP students scored proficient in NECAP reading, while 22.6% of IEP students scored the same.

- When looking at NECAP math scores, 59.7% of non-IEP students received a score of proficient or better, and only 18.4% of IEP students received the same scores in 2013-14.
- Among high school students, 23.9% of non-IEP students were enrolled in an algebra 2 course, while 2.5% of IEP students were enrolled.
- Of those 23.9% of non-IEP students enrolled in an algebra 2 course, 14.3% received an A or B in the class. There were no IEP students who received an A or B in Algebra 2 of the 2.5% who were in enrolled.
- When looking at Honors and AP enrollment, 44.5% of non-IEP students were enrolled in an Honors course, and 16.2% were enrolled in an AP course respectively. There were only 4.9% of IEP students enrolled in an Honors course and zero IEP students enrolled in an AP course.

2. Climate and Inclusion

- The percentage of non-IEP students with a 95% or better attendance rate was 69.6%, while 65.2% of IEP students had a 95% or better attendance rate.
- When looking at in school suspensions, 4.5% of non-IEP students received an in school suspension, and 10.8% of IEP students received one.
- Out-of-school suspensions were around the same numbers as in school. 3.8% of non-IEP students got an out-of-school suspension, while 10.6% of IEP students got an out-of-school suspension.
- Lastly, when looking at drop out rates, 7.3% of non-IEP students dropped out, while a much larger 22.6% of IEP students did.

3. Gaps in Academic and Climate/Inclusion Outcomes

Academic Achievement

- When looking at the data from Table 5, we can see that there is a 48.1 percentage point gap between non-IEP and IEP students in NECAP reading scores.
- The NECAP math percentage point gap is a little lower between non-IEP and IEP students at 41.3 percentage points.
- There is a 21.4 percentage point gap between non-IEP and IEP students who were enrolled in an Algebra 2 class in 2013-14.

- Table 5 shows that there was a 14.3 percentage point difference in non-IEP and IEP students who received an A or B in Algebra 2. Keep in mind, for this indicator, there were no IEP students who received an A or B in Algebra 2 at all.
- Lastly, there was a 39.6 percentage point gap between non-IEP and IEP students in Honors class enrollment, and a 16.2 percentage point gap in AP enrollment. For AP enrollment, again, there were no IEP students ever enrolled in an AP course in 2013-14.

Climate and Inclusion

- There was a 4.4 percentage point difference in 95% or better attendance rates between non-IEP and IEP students.
- For in school suspension rates, there was a -6.3 percentage point gap between these two groups. This means, that IEP students were given in school suspensions at higher rate than non-IEP students. This is what accounts for the negative percentage point gap here.
- Out-of-school suspension gaps were very similar at a -6.8 percentage point gap difference.
- Lastly, there was a -15.3 percentage point difference in the cohort drop out rate between non-IEP and IEP students in 2013-14.

F. Conclusion for 2013-14

The data clearly shows us that the Burlington School District still has a long way to go in eliminating disparities by family income, race/ethnicity, language background, ability, and by gender. That said, the areas in which gaps do exist vary according to each specific indicator, and by each specific group. There is no single group that performs worse relative to all other groups in each indicator.

We must be clear that the data presented on the previous pages do not tell us why specific gaps exist, and does not provide information on how to close the gaps we see. This data merely indicates whether or not gaps exist between groups, and where greater focus and efforts should be put toward eradicating the gaps. As with the previous Equity Inclusion Reports, this is primarily used as a tool for the School Board, school faculty and staff, and the community to have open and honest discussions on how to close gaps in academics and inclusion, and to make sure every student going through the Burlington School District can and will succeed.

III. A Comparison of Gaps from 2012-13 to 2013-14

The main purpose of this report is to provide detailed data in order to evaluate trends over time. The first Equity Report Card was published in 2011-12. In this section we compare trends in gaps between groups from 2012-13 to 2013-14 shown in Table 6⁵.

⁵ The comparative data for all groups and indicators from 2012-13 to 2013-14 can be found in the appendix.

Table 6. Trends in Achievement Gaps from 2012-13 to 2013-14

Comparison Groups	NECAP Reading	NECAP Math	Algebra 2	Algebra Grades	Honors Enrollment	AP Enrollment	95% Attendance	In School Suspension	Out-of-School Suspension	Drop Out Rates
Female-Male	1.80%	0.00%	-2.20%	2.40%	1.50%	2.30%	3.10%	2.50%	1.50%	-4.70%
Non-FRL-FRL	-1.00%	-1.70%	-7.90%	-2.40%	-3.20%	4.10%	-1.80%	0.30%	0.40%	9.60%
White-Black	-1.00%	-3.50%	2.10%	7.60%	2.50%	-4.90%	-1.50%	4.00%	1.90%	-0.30%
White-Asian	6.60%	6.20%	5.10%	0.80%	2.80%	5.80%	-4.50%	-0.10%	-0.20%	-7.10%
White-Hispanic	-10.60%	-2.80%	0.50%	-1.60%	-3.60%	2.50%	-6.00%	-2.30%	1.20%	-1.70%
White-Multi-Ethnic	-4.60%	-1.80%	6.90%	3.50%	-9.70%	9.00%	1.60%	1.10%	-1.30%	NA
Non-LEP-LEP	1.90%	-1.00%	6.50%	-1.80%	1.80%	2.50%	7.10%	0.80%	-0.20%	2.70%
Non-IEP-IEP	-6.30%	-2.60%	3.70%	3.50%	-2.10%	2.50%	5.00%	3.80%	0.70%	-1.40%

A. Gender Group Trends

Looking closely at Table 6, we can see that trends from 2012-13 to 2013-14 are extremely varied based on respective indicators.

- In terms of NECAP reading scores, we can see that the gap has increased over the last year by 1.8 percentage points. In other words, in 2012-13, there was an 11.50 percentage point gap between females and males, and in 2013-14, there was an increase in difference to 13.3 percentage points, leaving a total of a 1.8 percentage point increase over that year. In NECAP math scores, there was no percentage point change.
- In Algebra 2 enrollment, there was a 2.2 percentage point gap decrease between females and males. In other words, the differences between Algebra 2 enrollment between these groups got smaller by 2.2 percentage points.
- When looking at Algebra 2 grades however, there was a 2.4 percentage point gap increase between females and males from 2012-13 to 2013-14.
- There was a 1.5 percentage point gap increase in Honors class enrollment, and a 2.3 percentage point gap increase in AP class enrollment between females and males.
- The attendance rate gap increased by 3.1 percentage points over this time period.
- The percentage point gap in in school suspensions rose 2.5 percentage points, while the out-of-school suspension gap rose 1.5 percentage points.
- Drop out rates over this time period went down 4.7 percentage points.

B. Non FRL-FRL Comparison Group

- The gap in NECAP reading scores between non-FRL and FRL students between 2012-13 to 2013-14 fell 1 percentage point. For NECAP math scores, there was a 1.7 percentage point decrease.
- There was a sharp decrease of 7.9 percentage points between non-FRL and FRL students in terms of Algebra 2 enrollment over this time period, while Algebra 2 grades also saw a 2.4 percentage point gap decrease as well.
- Honors enrollment saw a 3.2 percentage point gap decrease between non-FRL and FRL students which was good, but AP class enrollment saw a 4.1 percentage point gap increase over the same time.
- Attendance rates gaps fell by 1.8 percentage points.

- In and out of school suspension gaps both rose .3, and .4 percentage points from 2012-13 to 2013-14.
- Drop out rates saw a drastic increase between non-FRL and FRL students of 9.6 percentage points over this period.

C. Race/Ethnicity Comparison Group

1) White-Black

- The gap between White and Black students dropped by 1 percentage point in NECAP reading scores, and it also decreased by 3.5 percentage points for NECAP math scores.
- There was an increase of 2.1 percentage points between these groups in Algebra 2 enrollment.
- When looking at Algebra 2 grades, there was a sharp 7.6 point increase between these groups over this time period.
- There was a 2.5 percentage point gap increase in Honors classes' enrollment, but a 4.9 percentage point gap decrease AP class enrollment in 2012-13 to 2013-14.
- In terms of attendance rates, there was a 1.5 percentage point decrease between White and Black students.
- There was a 4 percentage point increase in in-school suspensions, and a 1.9 percentage point gap increase in out-of-school suspensions over this time period.
- Drop out rates saw a slight decrease of .3 percentage points.

2) White- Asian

- When looking at both NECAP reading and math scores, there were significant increases between White and Asian students. For NECAP reading there was 6.6 percentage point gap increase, while math saw a 6.2 percentage point increase.
- There was a 5.1 percentage point increase in Algebra 2 enrollment between these groups, and a .8 percentage point gap increase in Algebra 2 grades over this time period.
- For both Honors and AP enrollment, we see a 2.8 and a 5.8 percentage point gap increase respectively in those two indicators, for those two groups of students.
- There was however a 4.5 percentage point gap decrease between these groups in attendance rates.

- Both in and out-of-school suspensions saw a slight decrease of .1 and .2 percentage points.
- Drop out rates saw a drastic decrease between White and Asian students by 7.1 percentage points.

3) White-Hispanic

- When looking at NECAP reading and math scores, there was a significant 10.6 percentage point gap decrease in reading scores, and a 2.8 percentage point gap decrease in math scores between White and Hispanic students in the Burlington School District.
- There was slight .5 percentage point increase in Algebra 2 enrollment from 2012-13 to 2013-14, and a 1.6 percentage point decrease in Algebra 2 grades.
- Honors enrollment saw a decrease in the gap between students of 3.6 percentage points, but increased by 2.5 percentage points in terms of AP enrollment.
- Attendance rates saw a decrease of 6 percentage points between White and Hispanic students over this time period.
- In school suspension rates decreased by 2.3 percentage points between these two groups, but then rose 1.2 percentage points for out-of-school suspensions.
- Lastly, there was a 1.7 percentage point decrease in cohort drop out rates.

4) White-Multi-Ethnic

- NECAP math and reading scores saw decreases of 4.6 and 1.8 percentage points respectively between White and Multi-Ethnic students.
- There was a large percentage point increase of 6.9 percentage points between these two groups in terms of overall Algebra 2 enrollment, and a 3.5 percentage point increase in Algebra 2 grade outcomes.
- There was a drastic decrease 9.7 percentage point gap difference between White and Multi-Ethnic students for Honors enrollment which is great, but then almost the same increase in the percentage point gap for AP enrollment of 9 points.
- Attendance rates went up 1.6 percentage points.
- We see that there is a 1.3 percentage point increase in in school suspensions, but we see a 1.3 percentage point decrease in percentage points for out-of-school suspensions.

D. Non-LEP-LEP Comparison Group

- The gap in NECAP reading grew 1.9 percentage points over this time period, but NECAP math scores dropped 1 percentage point as well.
- We see a substantial increase of 6.5 percentage points for overall Algebra 2 enrollment, but a 1.8 percentage point gap decrease in Algebra 2 grades.
- There were percentage point gap increases in both Honors and AP enrollment of 1.8 and 2.5 points respectively.
- Attendance rates have seen an increase in the gap between non-LEP and LEP students of 7.1 percentage points over this time period.
- There was a slight increase of .8 percentage points for in school suspensions, and a .2 percentage point decrease in out-of-school suspensions.
- Lastly, the 4 year cohort drop out rate between these groups of students increased by 2.7 percentage points.

E. Non-IEP-IEP Comparison Group

- We saw a sharp decrease of 6.3 percentage point gaps in NECAP reading scores, and a decrease of 2.6 points for NECAP math.
- There was a 3.7 percentage point gap increase in overall Algebra 2 enrollment in 2012-13 to 2013-14, and a 3.5 percentage point gap increase in Algebra 2 grades between these two groups.
- We see a 2.1 percentage point gap decrease in Honors enrollment, but a 2.5 percentage point increase in AP course enrollment.
- Attendance rate gaps have gone up 5 percentage points over this time period.
- There's a 3.8 percentage point gap increase in in school suspensions, but only a .7 percentage point increase in out-of-school suspensions.
- Lastly, we've seen a 1.4 percentage point decrease between non-IEP and IEP students on cohort drop out rates.

F. Achievement Gap Trends Conclusion

Overall, trends in achievement gaps have mixed outcomes. When looking at the data from a wider view, some specific comparison groups saw a relatively continuous decrease in achievement gaps, while others saw a continuous increase. Most comparison groups though showed no continuous decrease in achievement gaps through all indicators used.

1) Academics

- 5 of the 8 comparison groups saw a decrease in achievement gaps in NECAP reading scores. 6 of the 8 comparison groups saw a decrease in achievement gaps in NECAP math scores. Specifically, the White-Asian student category saw significant increases in achievement gaps for both NECAP reading and math, while Non-IEP-IEP students saw a relatively high decrease in achievement gaps for NECAP tests. The White-Hispanic comparison group saw the highest decrease in achievement gaps with 10.6 percentage points.
- Almost every comparison group saw an increase in gaps between students when looking at overall Algebra 2 enrollment. The standout to the norm here was the substantial decrease in gaps in Algebra 2 enrollment between non-FRL and FRL students with a 7.9 percentage point reduction in the gap between those two groups.
- Again, for Algebra 2 grades, there were mostly only increases to student gaps between groups from 2012-13 to 2013-14. The most significant increase being between White and Black students at an increase of 7.6 percentage points.
- When looking at Honors class enrollment, the district saw no real pattern. Some categories saw an increase in achievement gaps while others saw a decrease. The highest decrease in achievement gaps seen was between White and Multi-Ethnic students with a 9.7 percentage point reduction.
- AP enrollment saw an overall increase in achievement gaps between all student comparison groups except for the White-Black student comparison group.

2) Climate and Inclusion

- Attendance rates data was mixed over this time period with non-LEP to LEP students seeing the greatest increase in achievement gaps at 7.1 percentage points, while White to Hispanic students saw the greatest decrease of 6 points.
- For both in and out-of-school suspensions, most student comparison groups saw an increase in achievement gaps, but no group saw a drastic change in gaps from 2012-13 to 2013-14.
- Lastly, drop out rates between most student comparison groups saw a decrease in achievement gaps with the exception of non-FRL to FRL students who saw a significant increase in gaps with a 9.6 percentage point increase.

IV. District Resources

The goals of equity and inclusion require the commitment of resources, both to increase the diversity of the workforce, and to train teachers, staff, and administrators in cultural competency. The more our educators and administrators understand our ever growing and

changing student population, the better we will all be at serving their specific needs. Along with training, we need to continue to hone our hiring practices to promote non-bias and diverse hiring. The District has committed the following goals:

- Progress in recruitment, hiring, and retention of a diverse workforce;
- Professional development training for all staff in cultural awareness, cultural responsiveness and sensitivity, and to continue to build and enhance cultural competency;
- The provision of equitable distribution of services and opportunities for all students.

A. Racial Diversity of District Staff

Table 7 shows the racial/ethnic composition of the workforce. The job categories in this year's report are the same as last years, so it is possible to evaluate changes year over year here. In 2011-12 95.6% of all teachers were white, and in 2012-13 (last year's report) that number had risen to 97%. As you can see, this year, it has gone down to 96.5% for 2013-14. When looking at the data over these three years, one can conclude from the data that there has been no significant progress in teacher diversification over this time period.

Table 7. Racial/Ethnic Composition of District Workforce by Category 2012-13/2013-14

	American Indian and Native Alaskan		Black		Asian		Hispanic		Multi-Ethnic		White		Total	Total
	12-13	13-14	12-13	13-14	12-13	13-14	12-13	13-14	12-13	13-14	12-13	13-14	12-13	13-14
Teachers	0%	0%	1%	1.5%	1%	1%	0%	1%	0%	0%	97%	97%	100%	100%
Central Office Administrators	0%	0%	15%	25%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	85%	75%	100%	100%
Building Administrators	0%	0%	13%	13%	0%	0%	3%	3%	0%	0%	84%	84%	100%	100%
Other professional staff/liaisons	0%	0%	45%	45%	45%	45%	0%	0%	0%	0%	9%	9%	100%	100%
All other staff	1%	0%	3%	9%	4%	6%	1%	2%	0%	1%	91%	82%	100%	100%
Para educators	0%	0%	2%	2%	3%	2%	1%	2%	2%	2%	92%	93%	100%	100%

B. Workforce Training

Training is a key component of achieving equity and inclusion goals. In this section, we provide data on the number of cultural competency trainings done in 2013-14. Cultural competency staff training was developed by the Washington Consulting Group who has been an outside consultant with the District for a few years now. The training entitled, *Building Equitable Schools: Critical Cultural Competencies for Leaders*, has three main objectives:

- Deepen the level of authentic dialogue about the dynamics of race, racism, and other intersecting identities in the District;
- Consider key elements of creating a safe environment for students, staff, teachers, and administrators to engage about issues of race, racism, and other intersecting identities;
- Explore ways to continue to develop more inclusive and welcoming schools that support the academic, emotional, and social development of all students.

As the data in Table 8 shows, the highest training rates in 2013-14 within the district were at Central Office, followed by Flynn School, On Top School, and Horizon School. The lowest training rate were at Burlington High School, Burlington Technical Center, and Edmunds Middle school.

**Table 8. Cultural Competency Training for Teachers
and Central Office 2012-13 and 2013-14**

School/Entity	Numbers Trained		Total Number of Teachers		Percentage Trained	
	12-13	13-14	12-13	13-14	12-13	13-14
Burlington High School	17	6	100	101	17	6%
Burlington Technical Center	5	1	17	16	29	6%
Champlain Elementary	10	5	33	29	30	17%
Edmunds Elementary School	9	4	35	34	26	12%
Edmunds Middle School	10	3	47	46	21	7%
Flynn School	16	12	35	30	46	40%
Horizon School	2	2	5	6	40	33%
Hunt Middle School	10	7	45	45	22	16%
Integrated Arts Academy	11	3	31	29	35	10%
On top School	4	2	8	5	50	40%
Sustainability Academy	10	6	26	27	38	22%
C.P. Smith Elementary	10	4	27	30	37	13%
Central Office	22	18	40	41	55	45%
Total	136	73	449	439	30	23%

V. Recommendations

After reviewing all data that was collected throughout the district for 2013-14, the following recommendations have been made in response to the analysis and this report.

- 1) The Equity and Inclusion Advisory Committee should be a year-round entity, meeting on a quarterly basis to review data throughout the year.
- 2) Future report cards should include Positive Behavior and Intervention System (PBIS) Data. This will help the district assess types of behavior issues and consistency in discipline.
- 3) In addition, future reports should include the following data:
 - The percentage of students taking the SAT and ACT tests.
 - Student arrest and police referral data.
 - Planning room referrals.
 - Data on guidance counselor and teacher referrals/recommendations for Honors and AP course enrollment to ensure equity (making sure students of all background are referred or recommended).
 - Post-Secondary tracking (to include military enlistment) following the fall after completion of high school.
- 4) Create new discipline data category that checks for disproportional patterns for types of incidents based on gender, family income, race/ethnicity, ELL, and ability status.
- 5) Expand analysis of data to include family and community involvement and use of external resources such as:
 - After School Program: Burlington Kids/ Expanded Learning Data
 - Create parent programs to help parents understand the school system, understand the achievement gap, develop parenting skills, and to provide students assistance at home.
- 6) Increase efforts to recruit and retain a diverse district personnel, particularly at the teacher level.
- 7) Increase professional development focused on cultural proficiency and other ongoing professional development that ensures that teachers are current and effective.
- 8) Provide intensive courses and workshops for teachers. These could include summer and weekend institutes, as well as cohort programs (UVM and Champlain have great programming available). Teachers could possibly work with the local colleges for credit.
- 9) Develop an institute on Cultural Competence.
- 10) On-going development of culturally inclusive curriculum for all grades.

- 11) Teacher and leader quality should be assessed by performance evaluations and reviews on cultural competence. Cultural competence should and needs to be a major component in expected knowledge base.
- 12) Include student voice and input on diversity, equity, and inclusion experience.
- 13) Future reports should include data from climate surveys that will be going out throughout the district.

APPENDIX

Table A.1 Demographic and Academic/Inclusion Data School year 2013-14

Category	Group	Academic											Climate and Inclusion			
		Total Population	High School Population	9 th Grade Cohort	NECAP Reading Takers	NECAP Math Takers	NECAP Reading Proficient	NECAP Math Proficient	Algebra 2 Enrollment	Algebra Grades	Honors	AP	Attendance	In School Suspension	Out-of-School Suspension	Drop Out Rate
Gender	Female	1753	539	143	900	904	646	507	118	80	239	91	1239	49	47	14
	Male	1891	545	133	943	943	549	506	115	58	195	65	1277	144	122	11
Family Income	Non-FRL	1892	583	144	970	968	818	728	140	102	349	140	1364	34	34	12
	FRL	1752	501	132	868	879	377	285	93	36	85	16	1152	159	135	20
Race/Ethnicity	White	2425	716	204	1247	1240	916	799	155	104	351	129	1611	101	91	19
	Black	513	169	48	255	257	97	58	27	50	24	14	398	57	58	4
	Asian	389	148	35	173	186	64	60	43	24	34	5	296	16	7	3
	Hispanic	124	24	6	68	69	50	40	5	4	13	4	80	6	3	1
	Multi-Ethnic	185	25	*	91	91	65	55	3	1	12	4	127	11	9	*
ELL	Non-LEP	3106	928	243	1604	1604	1160	979	207	124	428	156	2095	159	142	24
	LEP	537	156	33	243	243	35	34	26	14	6	0	420	34	27	1
Ability	Non-IEP	3181	962	245	1621	1630	1146	973	230	138	428	156	2214	143	120	18
	IEP	463	122	31	217	217	49	40	3	0	6	0	302	50	49	7

Note: The data in this table are the raw numbers on which the data in Tables 4 and 5 are calculated.

Table A.2 Definitions of Terms and Acronyms

Indicator	Definition
NECAP Reading	The percentage that scored proficient or proficient with distinction on the New England Common Assessment program (NECAP) reading test.
NECAP Math	The percentage that scored proficient or proficient with distinction on the New England Common Assessment program (NECAP) math test.
Algebra 2	The percentage of high school students who enrolled in Algebra 2 in 2013-14.
Algebra 2 Grades	The percentage of high school students enrolled in Algebra 2 who received an A or B in the class.
Honors	The percentage of high school students enrolled in at least one honors course in 2013-14
AP	The percentage of high school students enrolled in at least one Advanced Placement (AP) course in that year.
Attendance	The percentage of students with 95% attendance rates or better in a given year.
In-School Suspensions	The percentage of students receiving one or more in-school suspensions.
Out-of-School-Suspensions	The percentage of students receiving one or more out-of-school suspensions.
Drop out Rate ⁶	The four year cohort dropout rate, defined as the percentage of an incoming 9 th grade class that has dropped out of high school by 12 th grade.

⁶ The remainder of students-those who have not dropped out- include two different groups. Those who graduated in four years, and those who are still enrolled.

Table A.3 Academic and Climate/Inclusion Outcomes 2013-14

Category	Group	Academic						Climate			
		NECAP Reading	NECAP Math	Algebra 2 Enrollment	Algebra 2 Grades	Honors	AP	Attendance (95% plus)	In-School Suspension	Out-of-School Suspension	Drop Out Rate
Gender	Female	71.80%	56.10%	21.90%	14.80%	44.30%	16.90%	70.70%	2.80%	2.70%	9.80%
	Male	58.50%	53.70%	21.10%	10.60%	35.80%	11.90%	67.50%	7.60%	6.50%	8.30%
Family Income	Non-FRL	84.30%	75.20%	24.00%	17.50%	59.90%	24.00%	72.10%	1.80%	1.80%	8.30%
	FRL	43.40%	32.40%	18.60%	7.20%	17.00%	3.20%	65.80%	9.10%	7.70%	15.20%
Race/Ethnicity	White	73.50%	64.40%	21.60%	14.50%	49.00%	18.00%	66.40%	4.20%	3.80%	9.30%
	Black	38.00%	22.60%	16.00%	3.00%	14.20%	8.30%	77.60%	11.10%	11.30%	8.30%
	Asian	37.00%	32.30%	29.10%	16.20%	23.00%	3.40%	76.10%	4.10%	1.80%	8.60%
	Hispanic	73.50%	58.00%	20.80%	16.70%	54.20%	16.70%	64.50%	4.80%	2.40%	16.70%
	Multi-Ethnic	71.40%	60.40%	12.00%	4.00%	48.00%	16.00%	68.60%	5.90%	4.90%	NA
ELL	Non-LEP	72.00%	61.00%	22.30%	13.40%	46.10%	16.80%	67.50%	5.10%	4.60%	9.90%
	LEP	15.40%	14.00%	16.70%	9.00%	3.80%	0.00%	78.20%	6.30%	5.00%	3.00%
Ability	Non-IEP	70.70%	59.70%	23.90%	14.30%	44.50%	16.20%	69.60%	4.50%	3.80%	7.30%
	IEP	22.60%	18.40%	2.50%	0.00%	4.90%	0.00%	65.20%	10.80%	10.60%	22.60%

Table A.4 Academic and Inclusion Gaps for All Groups 2013-14

Comparison Groups	NECAP Reading	NECAP Math	Algebra 2 Enrollment	Algebra 2 Grades	Honors	AP	Attendance (95% plus)	In-School Suspension	Out-of-School Suspension	Drop Out Rate
Female-Male	13.30%	2.40%	0.80%	4.20%	8.50%	5.00%	3.20%	-4.80%	-3.80%	1.50%
Non-FRL-FRL	40.90%	42.80%	5.40%	10.30%	42.90%	20.80%	6.30%	-7.30%	-5.90%	-6.90%
White-Black	35.50%	41.80%	5.60%	11.50%	34.80%	9.70%	-11.20%	-6.90%	-7.50%	1.00%
White-Asian	36.50%	32.10%	-7.50%	-1.70%	26.00%	14.60%	-9.70%	0.10%	2.00%	0.70%
White-Hispanic	0.00%	6.40%	0.80%	-2.20%	-5.20%	1.30%	1.90%	-0.60%	1.40%	-7.40%
White-Multi-Ethnic	2.10%	4.00%	9.60%	10.50%	1.00%	2.00%	-2.20%	-1.70%	-1.10%	NA
Non-LEP-LEP	56.60%	47.00%	5.60%	4.40%	42.30%	16.80%	-10.70%	-1.20%	-0.40%	6.90%
Non-IEP-IEP	48.10%	41.30%	21.40%	14.30%	39.60%	16.20%	4.40%	-6.30%	-6.80%	-15.30%

Table A.5 Trends in Achievement Gaps from 2012-13 to 2013-14

Comparison Groups	NECAP Reading	NECAP Math	Algebra 2	Algebra Grades	Honors Enrollment	AP Enrollment	95% Attendance	In School Suspension	Out-of-School Suspension	Drop Out Rates
Female-Male	1.80%	0.00%	-2.20%	2.40%	1.50%	2.30%	3.10%	2.50%	1.50%	-4.70%
Non-FRL-FRL	-1.00%	-1.70%	-7.90%	-2.40%	-3.20%	4.10%	-1.80%	0.30%	0.40%	9.60%
White-Black	-1.00%	-3.50%	2.10%	7.60%	2.50%	-4.90%	-1.50%	4.00%	1.90%	-0.30%
White-Asian	6.60%	6.20%	5.10%	0.80%	2.80%	5.80%	-4.50%	-0.10%	-0.20%	-7.10%
White-Hispanic	-10.60%	-2.80%	0.50%	-1.60%	-3.60%	2.50%	-6.00%	-2.30%	1.20%	-1.70%
White-Multi-Ethnic	-4.60%	-1.80%	6.90%	3.50%	-9.70%	9.00%	1.60%	1.10%	-1.30%	NA
Non-LEP-LEP	1.90%	-1.00%	6.50%	-1.80%	1.80%	2.50%	7.10%	0.80%	-0.20%	2.70%
Non-IEP-IEP	-6.30%	-2.60%	3.70%	3.50%	-2.10%	2.50%	5.00%	3.80%	0.70%	-1.40%

Table A.6 Racial/Ethnic Composition of District Workforce by Category 2012-13/2013-14

	American Indian and Native Alaskan		Black		Asian		Hispanic		Multi-Ethnic		White		Total	Total
	12-13	13-14	12-13	13-14	12-13	13-14	12-13	13-14	12-13	13-14	12-13	13-14	12-13	13-14
Teachers	0%	0%	1%	1.5%	1%	1%	0%	1%	0%	0%	97%	97%	100%	100%
Central Office Administrators	0%	0%	15%	25%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	85%	75%	100%	100%
Building Administrators	0%	0%	13%	13%	0%	0%	3%	3%	0%	0%	84%	84%	100%	100%
Other professional staff/liasons	0%	0%	45%	45%	45%	45%	0%	0%	0%	0%	9%	9%	100%	100%
All other staff	1%	0%	3%	9%	4%	6%	1%	2%	0%	1%	91%	82%	100%	100%

Table A.7. Cultural Competency Training for Teachers and Central Office 2012-13 and 2013-14

School/Entity	Numbers Trained		Total Number of Teachers		Percentage Trained	
	12-13	13-14	12-13	13-14	12-13	13-14
Burlington High School	17	6	100	101	17	6%
Burlington Technical Center	5	1	17	16	29	6%
Champlain Elementary	10	5	33	29	30	17%
Edmunds Elementary School	9	4	35	34	26	12%
Edmunds Middle School	10	3	47	46	21	7%
Flynn School	16	12	35	30	46	40%
Horizon School	2	2	5	6	40	33%
Hunt Middle School	10	7	45	45	22	16%
Integrated Arts Academy	11	3	31	29	35	10%
On top School	4	2	8	5	50	40%
Sustainability Academy	10	6	26	27	38	22%
C.P. Smith Elementary	10	4	27	30	37	13%
Central Office	22	18	40	41	55	45%
Total	136	73	449	439	30	23%