

Veteran HUSBAND FATHER Leader SCHOOL
Philanthropist Graduate BUSINESS OWNER
INVESTOR Barber MANAGER UNCLE
Grandfather Professor HOMEOWNER Soldier
Brother PRESIDENT Partner Senator Author
MENTOR Mentee VOLUNTEER ATTORNEY
CONGRESSMAN Engineer Builder
INTERN Musician ATHLETE Teacher
Principal PRIEST Donor ORGANIZER
Police Officer JUDGE ACTIVIST
GENERAL Writer ARCHITECT Voter
Doctor Banker Designer Pastor



BLACK LIVES MATTER:

The Schott 50 State Report on
Public Education and Black Males

Acknowledgments

The Schott Foundation for Public Education gratefully acknowledges our philanthropic partners who supported this report.

J.P. Morgan Chase Foundation

Heinz Endowments

W. K. Kellogg Foundation

Lumina Foundation

Open Society Foundations

Campaign for Black Male Achievement

Winthrop Rockefeller Foundation

Visit the report site for more:

www.blackboysreport.org



**Watch the report video, dig deeper into the report,
find your own state's data, and spread the word!**

The research for this report was conducted by The Metropolitan Center for Research on Equity and the Transformation of Schools at New York University. It was edited by Ann Beaudry. The report was designed by Patrick St. John.

Table of Contents

Preface by John H. Jackson	2
Foreword by Michelle Alexander	4
National Summary	6
State Graduation Data: Black Male Graduation Rates	9
State Graduation Data: Latino Male Graduation Rates	15
Invisible Men: The Nation’s Effort to “Keep Our Brothers” While Failing to Keep Positive Outcome Data on Them	21
Large District Data for Black Males	24
Creating Healthy Living and Learning Districts Matters	29
Climate Matters: America’s Push-out Crisis	31
Quality Matters	36
Multi-Sector Action Steps for Building Healthy Living and Learning Districts	43
Meeting School Climate Needs	44
Meeting Student-Centered Learning Needs	46
Meeting Positive Support Needs	47
Afterword by Pedro A. Noguera	52
Methodology	54
Notes	55
Appendix	56

Preface

by John H. Jackson

America's history, democracy, economy and social infrastructure are undeniably stronger today because of the contributions of Black males past and present, in their roles as fathers, husbands and sons to philanthropists and veterans. There are over two million Black males in the U.S. with a college degree, many of whom have made significant contributions in business, science, education and the arts. There should never be a lack of clarity about the contributions that Black males have made to our country and communities. Yet in the face of these contributions, there still remain systemic challenges that create outcomes far below those we should desire for any person.

Over the past months following the tragic deaths of several Black males across the country, advocates from across the globe and all walks of life have come together to remind Americans that "Black Lives Matter." This has been inspirational and reaffirming, yet it also calls to question whether states and communities are willing to address the issues that declaratively make Black lives matter while they are living, or will we only affirm that after they die?


Black Lives Matter, this fifth edition of the Schott 50-State Report on Public Education and Black Males, highlights many of the systemic opportunities and challenges that exist in states and localities relative to creating the climate where outcomes indicate all lives matter. *Black Lives Matter* provides a national overview of the state of Black and Latino male students, a state-level analysis highlighting high-performing and low-performing states, and a local analysis of school districts with more than 10,000 Black males enrolled. These school districts warrant particular attention since they are charged with the education of over 1.2 million Black male students (approximately 30% of the



John H. Jackson
President and CEO
Schott Foundation for Public Education

total Black male student population) and 1.1 million Latino male students (approximately 18% of the total Latino male student population).

While all lives matter, we cannot ignore the fact that, as this reports once again reveals, Black male students were at the bottom of four-year high school graduation rates in 35 of the 48 states and the District of Columbia where estimates could be projected for the 2012-2013 school year (Latino males are at the bottom in the other 13 states). This fact provides clear evidence of a systemic problem impacting Black males rather than a problem with Black males. Simply stated, while most will say Black lives matter and are important, the four-year graduation results in this report indicate that most states and localities operate at best, and have created at worse, climates that often don't foster healthy living and learning environments for Black males.



It is widely accepted in policy and administration that you measure what matters. Yet, as we highlight in this report, in most states and localities it is easier to find data on the incarceration rates of Black males than their high school graduation rates, or any other data that reinforces Black males' positive attributes.

This report is intended to draw public attention to the serious reality of a danger that does not instantly end young Black males' lives but one that creates a practically insurmountable chasm of denied educational opportunities that consigns them to poverty and limited chances to succeed in life. That danger is the unconscionable opportunity gap that underlies the disparities in graduation rates, suspensions and education. The Schott Foundation is hopeful that this defining "Black Lives Matter" moment catalyzes and strengthens a movement with clearly articulated actions that are powerful enough to enact the systemic changes in policies and practices needed to build healthier living and learning ecosystems where the outcomes support the affirmation that all lives matter, regardless of race or ethnicity, and where all students have an opportunity to learn and to succeed.

Finally, although this report historically focuses on Black males (and state level data on Latino males), we highlight in each edition the systemic disparities that are identifiable by race, ethnicity or socio-economic status impact all. As such, if issues impacting girls of color, who are also often the victims of systemic challenges, are not addressed we not only lose tremendous assets in our communities and nation, we lose a sense of our humanity. To that end, Schott supported the Center for Intersectionality and Social Policy Studies and the African American Policy Forum efforts to highlight these issues in their joint report entitled, *Black Girls Matter: Pushed-out, Overpoliced*

and Underprotected. Furthermore, a new Southern Education Foundation research bulletin, *A New Majority*, indicates that for the first time the majority of students in the public schools are eligible for free and reduced price lunch, a proxy for student poverty rates. This means that if states and our nation are going to prosper we must find ways to improve the educational supports necessary for students with fewer resources—which research shows require more than just traditional academic supports, but health and socio-emotional supports as well. It means that addressing social climate issues in a sustainable way matters.

The public school system is a public good, and the strongest platform in our nation to deliver the supports necessary to create healthy living and learning communities. Through these communities, once we are able to provide all students an opportunity to learn, then we will truly be able to claim that "All Lives Matter."

Since Black lives matter, more than one in eight grants in philanthropy should be dedicated to social justice. Since Black lives matter, a larger percentage of philanthropic resources must be dedicated to addressing issues that matter in providing all students an opportunity to learn. Since Black lives matter, ensuring that states and localities prioritize supporting young people over penalizing them matters. Since Black lives matter, tracking positive outcome data disaggregated by race matters.

Simply stated, we release this report to challenge systems and advocates alike to take action beyond articulating the narrative of "Black Lives Matter." We urge action steps to track what matters, support what matters, and provide a healthy living and learning climate and an opportunity to learn for all who matter.

Foreword

by Michelle Alexander

In recent months, I have marched in the streets with young people who have carried signs saying what shouldn't have to be said: Black Lives Matter. The words are urgent and necessary as we struggle to comprehend how our criminal justice system could deliver so little that looks or feels anything like justice for poor people and people of color, especially for young Black men.

But are these words relevant only as we think of our criminal justice system? I think not. If we pause for a moment and consider the deep meaning and significance of the words — Black Lives Matter — it quickly becomes evident that the words need to be spoken more broadly, far beyond the confines of debates about police practices or criminal justice reform.

Over the past several years, I have traveled from coast-to-coast visiting communities that are struggling to survive in the era of mass incarceration and meeting with people who, having been branded criminals or felons at early ages, are denied basic civil and human rights for life, treated as disposable — as though their lives simply don't matter. I have been encouraged by some of the criminal justice reforms that have been adopted, and the willingness of some elected leaders to admit the failure of the drug war as well as the necessity of downsizing our prison system. But I remain deeply disturbed by the national debates surrounding communities of color, as there is little honest discussion about why some communities in this country are thriving while others are considered to be war zones. We remain reluctant to acknowledge the racial dimensions of our policymaking and our politics. We want to imagine that the differences between “good” and “bad”




Michelle Alexander

Associate Professor of Law, Ohio State University
Author, *The New Jim Crow: Mass Incarceration in the Age of Colorblindness*

neighborhoods can be explained simply by who lives there. But, of course, the glaring inequities have nothing to do with the DNA of the individuals who reside in ghettoized communities or any natural proclivity to violence. Instead the racial divides that persist — and in some cases are growing — are traceable to a choice we, as a nation, have made.

We could have taken a different path. When faced with the economic collapse of inner city communities, we could have responded with care, compassion and concern. For example, as late as the 1970s, more than 70% of African Americans in Chicago worked in



blue-collar jobs. By 1987, due to de-industrialization and jobs moving overseas, hundreds of thousands of African Americans nationwide (a majority of them men) found themselves suddenly jobless. By 1987, the industrial employment of Black males in Chicago had fallen to 28%. Staggering numbers of Black men across the country found themselves suddenly trapped in racially segregated, jobless communities struggling for survival. The economic collapse of inner cities happened almost overnight.

We had a choice. We could have responded to this extraordinary crisis as though Black lives mattered. Stimulus packages and economic development programs could have been adopted. And we could have invested heavily in education so that young people in these communities would have some hope of successfully transitioning from an industrial-based economy to a service-based economy — a new world in which not only a high school diploma is required but quite likely a college education. But instead of following the trail blazed by Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and countless others who dared to dream of an America that provides equal opportunity for all, we ended the war on poverty and launched a war on drugs. Rather than expanding job opportunities, we expanded our jails; rather than high tech schools we built high tech prisons.

Black men, in particular, have been treated as being disposable, no longer necessary to the economy or to building the country. We label them and their communities as irredeemable and hopelessly violent, when in fact when you control for the variable of joblessness, regardless of race, it becomes clear that men of all rac-

es who are chronically unemployed are more likely to be violent. Of course, joblessness is not an excuse for violence, but we cannot put our heads in the sand and pretend that we do not know that creating and maintaining conditions of extreme deprivation and joblessness contributes to violence. Rather than asking repeatedly, “What’s wrong with them?”, we would be better off asking ourselves, “What is wrong with us?” Why have we allowed so much unnecessary suffering to occur on our watch?

I am pleased to say that Schott is asking and answering the right questions. In *Black Lives Matter: Schott’s 50 State Report on Public Education and Black Males*, Schott declines to wonder aloud what might be wrong with the least advantaged in our communities, and instead asks the deeper, more profound question, “What is wrong with the system?” Through this report, Schott boldly proclaims that Black lives do matter. They matter to our families, our communities, our democracy, our houses of worship, and they matter to the success of our nation as a whole. And because Black lives matter, what we choose to do about educational inequity matters. It matters that we provide quality education and employment opportunities. It matters that we give our young people good reason to dream. If we truly believe that Black lives matter we must prove it, by accepting the challenge offered by this report and getting to work building a country that affords dignity and opportunity to us all.

National Summary

On the heels of several national tragedies in Ferguson, Staten Island, Cleveland and Michigan, grassroots advocates nationwide have been joined by ever growing numbers of people of conscience in demonstrations all across the country, fiercely proclaiming “All Lives,” and more specific to the current cases of injustice — “Black Lives Matter.” We fiercely agree.

For over a decade, the Schott Foundation’s efforts to collect and publish national data on the four-year graduation rates for Black males compared to other sub-groups have been to highlight how the persistent systemic disparity in opportunity creates a climate and perception of a population who is less valued.

Black males in America have been cast in a light far too negative for their actual contributions to family, community, democracy, economy, thought leadership and country. There are over two million Black male college graduates and over one million enrolled in college today. Black households in general dedicate 25% more of their income to charities than White households and Black males com-

prise one of the largest percentages of American veterans.¹ Yet, in the face of these positive attributes, the systemic treatment, outcomes and portrayal of Black males in key systems like education, labor and justice have been largely negative. Our data indicates that, once again, of the 48 states where data was collected, in 35 states and the District of Columbia, Black males remain at the bottom of four-year high school graduation rates. (Latino males were at the bottom in 13 states.) This fact, once again, provides clear evidence of a systemic problem impacting Black males rather than a problem with Black males. As such, for states and localities, “Black Lives Matter” must be a declarative action statement rather than a shallow affirmation.

Since Black lives continue to matter to us, this edition of the *Schott 50 State Report on Public Education and Black Males* is intended to again alert the nation to the serious reality of a quieter danger that does not instantly end young lives, but creates an all but insurmountable chasm of denied opportunities that consigns them to limited chances to succeed in life. The failure to close the opportunity gap, whether at the national, state or local level, not only deprives all of us, our communities and our nation of the talents and potential contributions that these young people have proven they can make and would likely replicate, but also constitutes a grave injustice.



This biennial report, the Schott Foundation for Public Education's fifth since we started documenting Black males in public education in 2004, shows that the opportunity gap continues to be the greatest for Black males of all racial/ethnic and gender groups and, while nationally there have been slight increases in their rate of securing a regular diploma four years after beginning high school, the gap between graduation outcomes for Black males compared to their White male counterparts continues to widen.

At the national level, the 2012-13 school year estimates indicate a national graduation rate of 59% for Black males, 65% for Latino males and 80% for White males. In a previous report, the Schott Foundation reported that the national graduation rate for Black males in 2010-2011 was 51 percent. When compared with our current 2012-2013 estimate of 59 percent, this indicates an increase in the Black male graduation rate nationally. It is important to note, however, that later in 2011, in a one-time federal data release, the U.S. Department of Education reported the actual 2011 Black male graduation rate at 61 percent, which would indicate a decrease when compared with our 2012-2013 estimate.

This variance underscores the necessity for consistent annual federal, state, and local reporting of these data disaggregated by race and gender. We measure what matters, and because Black lives matter, the regular reporting of these data points matters. Nonetheless, the decrease from 61 percent to 59 percent shows a need for more progress in increasing the Black male graduation rates in states and districts across the country.

The graduation gap between Black and White males has widened, increasing from 19 percentage points in school year 2009-10 to 21 percentage points in 2012-13. Black males continue to be both pushed out and locked out of opportunities for academic achievement, including notable disparities in their enrollment in Advanced Placement courses and participation in Gifted and Talented programming. Furthermore, Black students were more likely to be classified as students with disabilities and were more likely to be suspended or expelled from school. These trends persisted at the national level as well as when analyzing data for individual states.

Education is a public good and an essential underpinning of our democracy. Our public education system remains the best vehicle and platform to deliver many of the supports necessary to break the intergenerational cycle of poverty. Positioning young people to secure a high school diploma, which prepares them for postsecondary training and education, creates a clear pathway out of poverty. Indeed, Nicholas Kristof of the *New York Times* terms education the "escalator out of poverty." Thus, creating state and local ecosystems that provide healthy living and learning communities with the necessary supports to provide all students an opportunity to learn — including Black males — is essential.

Black Lives Matter! They matter because they are significant to families, communities and our country. More importantly, they matter because they are a part of our interconnected humanity. As such, we cannot allow these racial and gender disparities to persist.

$$40 + 40 =$$

$$41 + 41 =$$

$$42 + 42 =$$

$$43 + 43 =$$

$$44 + 44 =$$

$$45 + 45 =$$

4

41

42

43

44

45





State Graduation Data: Black Male Graduation Rates

The estimated national 2012-13 graduation rate for Black males was 59%.

As Table 1 indicates, Black males graduated at the highest rates in Maine, Idaho, Arizona, South Dakota and New Jersey — each with estimated graduation rates of over 75%. The majority of the states with the top ten highest Black male graduation rates have smaller than average Black male enrollment. New Jersey and Tennessee were the only two states with significant Black male enrollments to have over a 70% Black male graduation rate.

Table 2 shows the alarming data for states with the lowest estimated graduation rate for Black males — Georgia, Michigan, Ohio, Louisiana, Indiana, Mississippi, South Carolina, Nebraska, the District of Columbia and Nevada, each at 55% or less.

With over a 21-percentage point gap respectively, Connecticut, New York, Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Ohio, Nebraska, Nevada, Minnesota, Pennsylvania and Wisconsin have some of the largest gaps between the Black male graduation rate and the White male graduation rates. The majority of the states with the largest gaps are in the Midwest region of the country.

Throughout this report, graduation rates below the national averages and gaps above the national averages are shown in *red*. Numbers are rounded to the nearest whole number.

TABLE 1.

Highest Ranked States for Black Males

Rank	State	2012-13 Cohort				
		Graduation Rates			Gap	
		Black Male	Latino Male	White Male	Black/White	Latino/White
1	Maine	90%	81%	81%	-9%	0%
2	Idaho	80%	73%	81%	1%	9%
3	Arizona	77%	65%	73%	-4%	8%
3	South Dakota	77%	66%	83%	6%	17%
5	New Jersey	76%	77%	92%	16%	15%
6	Montana	73%	72%	83%	9%	11%
6	Hawaii	73%	71%	70%	-3%	-1%
8	New Hampshire	71%	61%	83%	12%	22%
9	Tennessee	70%	74%	81%	11%	7%
10	Colorado	69%	59%	82%	13%	23%

TABLE 2.

Lowest Ranked States for Black Males

Rank	State	2012-13 Cohort				
		Graduation Rates			Gap	
		Black Male	Latino Male	White Male	Black/White	Latino/White
40	Georgia	55%	57%	71%	16%	14%
41	Michigan	54%	59%	80%	26%	21%
41	Ohio	54%	62%	84%	30%	22%
43	Louisiana	53%	70%	69%	16%	-1%
44	Indiana	51%	64%	75%	24%	11%
44	Mississippi	51%	61%	63%	12%	2%
44	South Carolina	51%	62%	68%	17%	6%
47	Nebraska	50%	64%	86%	36%	22%
48	District of Columbia	48%	57%	66%	18%	9%
49	Nevada	40%	44%	62%	22%	18%

States of Emergency

State-by-State Graduation Rates for Black Male Students




TABLE 3.

State Black/White Male Graduation Rates

SORTED BY STATE

State	2012-13 Cohort		
	Graduation Rates		Gap
	Black Male	White Male	Black/ White
Alabama	57%	72%	15%
Alaska	56%	74%	18%
Arizona	77%	73%	-4%
Arkansas	62%	74%	12%
California	62%	82%	20%
Colorado	69%	82%	13%
Connecticut	58%	79%	21%
Delaware	61%	76%	15%
District of Columbia	48%	66%	18%
Florida	56%	69%	13%
Georgia	55%	71%	16%
Hawaii	73%	70%	-3%
Idaho	80%	81%	1%
Illinois	59%	85%	26%
Indiana	51%	75%	24%
Iowa	63%	86%	23%
Kansas	64%	84%	20%
Kentucky	67%	76%	9%
Louisiana	53%	69%	16%
Maine	90%	81%	-9%
Maryland	66%	84%	18%
Massachusetts	68%	84%	16%
Michigan	54%	80%	26%
Minnesota	67%	90%	23%
Mississippi	51%	63%	12%
Missouri	66%	85%	19%

State	2012-13 Cohort		
	Graduation Rates		Gap
	Black Male	White Male	Black/ White
Montana	73%	83%	10%
Nebraska	50%	86%	36%
Nevada	40%	62%	22%
New Hampshire	71%	83%	12%
New Jersey	76%	92%	16%
New Mexico	59%	68%	9%
New York	57%	85%	28%
North Carolina	61%	77%	16%
North Dakota	*	90%	*
Ohio	54%	84%	30%
Oklahoma	65%	78%	13%
Oregon	64%	76%	12%
Pennsylvania	61%	85%	24%
Rhode Island	68%	76%	8%
South Carolina	51%	68%	17%
South Dakota	77%	83%	6%
Tennessee	70%	81%	11%
Texas	65%	81%	16%
Utah	63%	79%	16%
Vermont	*	89%	*
Virginia	62%	80%	18%
Washington	57%	73%	16%
West Virginia	68%	75%	7%
Wisconsin	59%	94%	35%
Wyoming	57%	77%	20%
National	59%	80%	21%

* *Insufficient data for analysis*





State Graduation Data: Latino Male Graduation Rates

The estimated national 2012-13 graduation rate for Latino males was 65% compared to 80% for White, non-Latino males.

The Latino/White male graduation gap decreased from 20 percentage points in 2009-10 to 15 percentage points in 2012-13. As Table 4 indicates, Latino males graduated at the highest rates in Alaska, Maine, West Virginia, New Jersey, Missouri, Kentucky, Tennessee, Idaho, Iowa and Wisconsin — all states with low Latino enrollment. The states with the lowest graduation rates for Latino males are Colorado, Michigan, New Mexico, Washington, Georgia, New York, District of Columbia, Utah, Connecticut and Nevada — as shown in Table 5.

With over a 21-percentage point gap respectively, Colorado, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Pennsylvania and Utah have some of the largest gaps between the Latino male graduation rate and the White male graduation rates in the nation.

TABLE 4.

Highest Ranked States for Latino Males

Rank	State	2012-13 Cohort				
		Graduation Rates			Gap	
		Latino Male	Black Male	White Male	Latino/White	Black/White
1	Alaska	82%	56%	74%	-8%	18%
2	Maine	81%	90%	81%	0%	-9%
3	West Virginia	79%	68%	75%	-4%	7%
4	New Jersey	77%	76%	92%	15%	16%
5	Missouri	76%	66%	85%	9%	19%
6	Kentucky	74%	67%	76%	2%	9%
6	Tennessee	74%	70%	81%	7%	11%
8	Idaho	73%	80%	81%	8%	1%
8	Iowa	73%	63%	86%	13%	23%
8	Wisconsin	73%	59%	94%	21%	35%


TABLE 5.

Lowest Ranked States for Latino Males

Rank	State	2012-13 Cohort				
		Graduation Rates			Gap	
		Latino Male	Black Male	White Male	Latino/White	Black/White
41	Colorado	59%	69%	82%	23%	13%
41	Michigan	59%	54%	80%	21%	26%
41	New Mexico	59%	59%	68%	9%	9%
44	Washington	58%	57%	73%	15%	16%
45	Georgia	57%	55%	71%	14%	16%
45	New York	57%	57%	85%	28%	28%
47	District of Columbia	57%	48%	66%	12%	12%
48	Utah	55%	63%	79%	24%	16%
49	Connecticut	52%	58%	79%	27%	21%
50	Nevada	44%	40%	62%	18%	22%

States of Emergency

State-by-State Graduation Rates for Latino Male Students



- Graduation Rates Below 50%
- Graduation Rates Between 50% and 59%
- Graduation Rates Between 60% and 69%
- Graduation Rates 70% and Above
- Inadequate Data for Analysis

TABLE 6.

State Latino/White Male Graduation Rates

SORTED BY STATE

State	2012-13 Cohort		
	Graduation Rates		Gap
	Latino Male	White Male	Latino/White
Alabama	61%	72%	11%
Alaska	82%	74%	-8%
Arizona	65%	73%	8%
Arkansas	72%	74%	2%
California	67%	82%	15%
Colorado	59%	82%	23%
Connecticut	52%	79%	27%
Delaware	61%	76%	15%
District of Columbia	57%	66%	9%
Florida	64%	69%	5%
Georgia	57%	71%	14%
Hawaii	71%	70%	-1%
Idaho	73%	81%	8%
Illinois	68%	85%	17%
Indiana	64%	75%	11%
Iowa	73%	86%	13%
Kansas	68%	84%	16%
Kentucky	74%	76%	2%
Louisiana	70%	69%	-1%
Maine	81%	81%	0%
Maryland	72%	84%	12%
Massachusetts	61%	84%	23%
Michigan	59%	80%	21%
Minnesota	62%	90%	28%
Mississippi	61%	63%	2%
Missouri	76%	85%	9%

State	2012-13 Cohort		
	Graduation Rates		Gap
	Latino Male	White Male	Latino/White
Montana	72%	83%	11%
Nebraska	64%	86%	22%
Nevada	44%	62%	18%
New Hampshire	61%	83%	22%
New Jersey	77%	92%	15%
New Mexico	59%	68%	9%
New York	57%	85%	28%
North Carolina	63%	77%	14%
North Dakota	63%	90%	27%
Ohio	62%	84%	22%
Oklahoma	68%	78%	10%
Oregon	68%	76%	8%
Pennsylvania	63%	85%	22%
Rhode Island	62%	76%	14%
South Carolina	62%	68%	6%
South Dakota	66%	83%	17%
Tennessee	74%	81%	7%
Texas	70%	81%	11%
Utah	55%	79%	24%
Vermont	*	89%	*
Virginia	68%	80%	12%
Washington	58%	73%	15%
West Virginia	79%	75%	-4%
Wisconsin	73%	94%	21%
Wyoming	66%	77%	11%
National	65%	80%	15%

* Insufficient data for analysis

Combined Black and Latino State Rankings

The states that rank in the top 10 in graduation rates for both Black and Latino males all have sufficiently low enrollments for each group that these students are not likely to be segregated into low-resourced schools. How these states achieve equitable resources to close opportunity — and thus, achievement — gaps deserves special attention. Conversely, a spotlight should be shone on those several states that have very poor graduation outcomes for both Black and Latino males. The District of Columbia, Georgia, Michigan and Nevada all rank in the bottom ten in graduation rates for both groups. These bottom-ranking states should be a priority to investigate and monitor reform agendas.

States in the Top Ten for Both Black and Latino Male Graduation Rates

Idaho



Maine



New Jersey



Tennessee



States in the Bottom Ten for Both Black and Latino Male Graduation Rates

District of
Columbia



Georgia



Michigan



Nevada





Invisible Men:

The Nation's Effort to "Keep Our Brothers" While Failing to Keep Positive Outcome Data on Them

by Michael Holzman and John H. Jackson

Across the nation, states, localities, non-profit and corporate organizational partners have rightfully come together to build on the White House's 2014 launch of the My Brother's Keeper (MBK) initiative. The MBK effort seeks to encourage all communities to implement a coherent cradle-to-college-and-career strategy for improving the life outcomes of all young people, specifically males of color, to ensure that they reach their full potential. Schott applauds this goal and continues to engage in a number of efforts focused on achieving the outcomes.

For more than a decade, the Schott Foundation has led the efforts to collect, disaggregate and publish data on high school graduation outcomes for Black males. Most astonishing has been the fact that year after year, and still true in 2015, most districts and states have failed to adopt a uniform way of counting and making publicly available the graduation rates for Black males and other sub-group populations. It is widely known — from budgets to boardrooms — that you measure what matters. Thus, the failure of states and localities to take these actions renders Black males and other sub-group populations invisible in the critical arena of educational attainment and other positive outcomes that are vital to their success, our communities' growth and to our country's future.

In most states it is easier for the public to track the number of Black and Latino males who are incarcerated than the number who graduate from high school in any given year. Nationwide, there are three major data challenges that must be addressed if we are truly going to be our brothers' keepers:

1. INVISIBLE STUDENTS

Many jurisdictions still over-report the number of students enrolled in their school or district when the students have either been long since pushed out or have dropped out. Some report students who they have not seen for years as enrolled in 12th grade as long as they have not officially informed their school or district that they have dropped out. Schools and districts continue this practice year after year until the student reaches that jurisdiction's maximum age for schooling. This artificially inflates grade 12 enrollment in those districts, their states and nationally, as compared to districts that count grade 12 enrollments as students actually in grade 12 classrooms.

Equally problematic, enrollment data collected and made available by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) for students with Limited English Proficiency/English Language Learners, students enrolled in Individualized Education Programs, students who are eligible for free lunch and those eligible for reduced-price lunch are not disaggregated by grade, gender or race/ethnicity. It is, therefore, impossible to calculate progress through elementary and secondary school from national data for such categories as Black Hispanic students, students of Cuban or Central American origin, Japanese American students, students eligible for free lunch, English Language Learners, etc.

In addition to these problems, until 2011 there was no single accepted method of calculating graduation rates. Two that have come into common use include:

- **Averaged Freshman Graduation Rate (AFGR)**—NCES reports AFGR data only for districts that report both graduates and enrollment. This rate is calculated from the average enrollment in successive years of grade 8, 9 and 10, with students in ungraded classrooms prorated among those grades. The averaged grade 9 enrollment is then divided into the number of students graduating four years after enrolling in grade 9.
- **Cohort Graduation Rate**—Used by many states, this is the percentage of first-time ninth graders (the “cohort”) receiving diplomas four, five or six years later.

Schott has long advocated that states and districts count only the students who are actually in the classrooms, and that the Federal government lead an effort to establish a national standard for calculating graduation rates. There is a need to establish a vertically consistent procedure for calculating the denominator — the student group — that could be disaggregated by gender within race and ethnicity, as well as for special programs, and is nationally and historically comparable. To complete the task there is also a need to develop a similarly vertically consistent procedure for calculating the numerator — the number of diplomas awarded to the members of that group. Until this happens, Black males and too many of their underrepresented partners will continue to be invisible students.

2. INVISIBLE DIPLOMAS

From the point of view of the U.S. Department of Education (DOE), a high school graduate is whoever is deemed as such by the state agency reporting the data to DOE. Until there are national standards in this matter, conducting a comparative analysis of school effectiveness requires looking more closely at the very disparate individual state standards to be met by high school graduates for what may be multiple types of diplomas.

Currently, while some states offer two types of diplomas — Regular and Special Education — others con-

tinue to offer a wider variety of documents, which may include, but are not limited to, Advanced, Regular and Local diplomas and special diplomas for students with disabilities.

For example, for many years NCES accepted New York State “Local Diplomas” as fully equivalent to the state’s own Regents’ Diplomas and the diplomas of other states, even though “Local Diplomas” were not accepted by the state’s own colleges and universities. “Local Diplomas,” which were recently abolished, were disproportionately awarded to Black, and especially Black male, students, artificially inflating New York’s graduation rate for that group.

Another example: Louisiana provides “College and Career” and “Career” Diplomas, both of which are counted as diplomas, without qualification, although the latter are not comparable to diplomas from other states. In some states, GEDs, which were rarely aligned to career or college standards or supports, were counted as part of graduation rates.

Despite these disparities and the wide variety of diploma types, all are reported to the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) and counted as diplomas for graduation rate calculation purposes.

The Schott Foundation advocates a standard that counts only those diplomas usually accepted by the state’s own postsecondary institutions without remedial requirements, and not factoring into the graduation calculations high school diploma equivalents, “career,” “local” or similar special diplomas.

3. INVISIBLE POSITIVE DATA

For the past decade Schott has pleaded with individual states, districts and localities to obtain and publish education data specific to Black males. Simply stated, you cannot be the “keeper” of a population in your nation, state or community when you are unwilling to keep up with that population’s opportunities and challenges. In most states, these data were not widely made avail-



able to the public. Some states provide graduation data that is timely and in great detail; Maryland and California, for example, post on their websites the number of graduates by district for gender within race/ethnicity. Other states do not provide similar comprehensive and publicly available information. In the latter circumstance, state and/or district officials were contacted, sometimes repeatedly. When this effort has not provided the actual number of diplomas for the state or district, historical records and grade-to-grade attrition data serve as the basis for the graduation estimates. Although at each stage estimates are tested with alternative methods and by historical comparisons and by comparison with similar jurisdictions, projecting a number still remains less reliable than reporting to the public the actual graduation rate.

So that they can be held accountable for results, states and large districts should be required to annually publish online graduation data for all of its districts and high schools, disaggregated by race, ethnicity and gender as well as for students in special programs.

FROM DARKNESS TO LIGHT

During the launch of the MBK initiative, President Obama noted that MBK is simply about “Helping more of our young people stay on track.” Those who accept this challenge must commit to building the infrastructure to track where young people, specifically Black males, are going—not just the negative places, but the positive as well. If we are indeed going to be our brothers’ keepers, we must start by ensuring that their assets are just as visible as their deficits. We must ensure that the nation is aware of the true contributions and progress that they are making as much as they are aware of the problems they face. Our nation’s charge is not to keep our brothers invisible, but to be the keepers of the flame that exists in each of them, and through it allow them to operate and be seen as the positive lights that they are in our communities, states and country.

Large District Data for Black Males

In an effort to better understand the outcomes for Black males at the local level, the Schott Foundation analyzed 2011-12 four-year graduation estimate data primarily for districts that enroll 10,000 or more Black male students.

Most Black males in the U.S. are enrolled in large urban districts. Tables 7 and 8 highlight districts' graduation rates for Black and White male students, sorted by highest and lowest Black male graduation rates. Among the large urban districts, Montgomery County, MD (69%) has the largest 2011-12 estimated Black male graduation rate in the country, followed by Baltimore County, MD (67%,), Fort Bend, TX (64%), Cumberland County, NC (61%), and Guilford County, NC (57%).

Inversely, among the large urban districts, Detroit, MI (23%) has the lowest Black male graduation rate in the country (in Detroit only 13% of White males graduate from high school within a four year period), followed by Philadelphia, PA (26%), Clark County, NV (27%), Pinellas County, FL (28%), Cleveland, OH (28%), New York, NY (28%), Chatham County, GA (28%), Richmond County, GA (29%), Duvall County, FL (29%), and Norfolk, VA (31%).

With a 21 percentage point or more gap, the following large urban districts have some of the largest gaps between the White male graduation rate and the Black male graduation rate: Atlanta, GA; Charleston County, SC; Charlotte-Mecklenburg, NC; Chicago, IL; Cobb County, GA; Dekalb County, GA; District of Columbia; Fulton County, GA; Guilford County, NC; Hillsborough County, FL; Houston, TX; Los Angeles, CA; Miami-Dade, FL; New York City, NY; Orange County, CA; Palm Beach, FL; Pittsburgh, PA; Wake County, NC.

TABLE 7.

Highest-Ranked Districts for Black Males

with enrollments of 10,000 of more Black Males

Rank	School District	Black Male Enrollment	2011-12 Cohort		
			Graduation Rates		Gap
			Black Male	White Male	Black/White
1	Montgomery County (MD)	16,023	69%	89%	20%
2	Baltimore County (MD)	20,836	67%	76%	9%
3	Fort Bend (TX)	10,559	64%	82%	18%
4	Cumberland County (NC)	12,119	61%	67%	6%
5	Guilford County (NC)	15,246	57%	80%	23%
6	Prince George's County (MD)	44,774	55%	58%	3%
7	Cobb County (GA)	17,112	51%	75%	24%
7	Wake County (NC)	18,570	51%	82%	31%
9	Gwinnett County (GA)	24,603	50%	63%	13%
10	Nashville-Davidson (TN)	18,254	47%	57%	10%

TABLE 8.

Lowest-Ranked Districts for Black Males

with enrollments of 10,000 of more Black Males

Rank	School District	Black Male Enrollment	2011-12 Cohort		
			Graduation Rates		Gap
			Black Male	White Male	Black/White
41	Norfolk (VA)	10,578	31%	50%	19%
42	Duval County (FL)	28,116	29%	47%	18%
42	Richmond County (GA)	11,985	29%	34%	5%
44	Chatham County (GA)	10,992	28%	44%	16%
44	New York City (NY)	143,972	28%	54%	26%
44	Cleveland (OH)	14,783	28%	34%	6%
44	Pinellas County (FL)	10,251	28%	54%	26%
48	Clark County (NV)	20,185	27%	45%	18%
49	Philadelphia (PA)	41,620	26%	36%	10%
50	Detroit (MI)	31,323	23%	13%	-10%

TABLE 9.

56 Highest Black Male Enrollment Districts

SORTED BY DISTRICT

School District	Black Male Enrollment	2011-12 Cohort		
		Graduation Rates		Gap
		Black Male	White Male	Black/White
Atlanta (GA)	23,530	38%	71%	33%
Baltimore City (MD)	36,473	38%	41%	3%
Baltimore County (MD)	20,836	67%	76%	9%
Birmingham (AL)	11,854	41%	46%	5%
Boston (MA)	9,697	49%	64%	15%
Broward County (FL)	51,656	46%	61%	15%
Caddo Parish (LA)	13,396	38%	57%	19%
Charleston County (SC)	9,947	30%	59%	30%
Charlotte-Mecklenburg (NC)	30,035	41%	71%	29%
Chatham County (GA)	10,992	28%	44%	16%
Chicago (IL)	82,060	41%	64%	23%
Cincinnati (OH)	10,596	33%	51%	18%
Clark County (NV)	20,185	27%	45%	18%
Clayton County (GA)	18,448	36%	24%	-12%
Cleveland (OH)	14,783	28%	34%	6%
Cobb County (GA)	17,112	51%	75%	24%
Columbus (OH)	14,784	38%	44%	6%
Cumberland County (NC)	12,119	61%	67%	6%
Dallas (TX)	19,667	37%	51%	14%
Dekalb County (GA)	34,339	46%	69%	23%
Detroit (MI)	31,323	23%	13%	-10%
District of Columbia	16,554	40%	73%	33%
Duval County (FL)	28,116	29%	47%	18%
East Baton Rouge Parish (LA)	17,481	46%	46%	0%
Fort Bend (TX)	10,559	64%	82%	18%
Fulton County (GA)	19,502	46%	81%	35%
Guilford County (NC)	15,246	57%	80%	23%
Gwinnett County (GA)	24,603	50%	63%	13%

School District	Black Male Enrollment	2011-12 Cohort		
		Graduation Rates		Gap
		Black Male	White Male	Black/White
Hillsborough County (FL)	21,678	41%	65%	24%
Houston (TX)	25,936	42%	69%	27%
Jackson (MS)	14,599	35%	34%	-1%
Jefferson County (KY)	18,958	43%	48%	5%
Jefferson Parish (LA)	10,616	39%	50%	11%
Los Angeles (CA)	27,108	41%	63%	22%
Memphis (TN)	44,631	43%	60%	17%
Miami-Dade (FL)	42,577	38%	63%	25%
Milwaukee (WI)	23,069	43%	55%	12%
Mobile County (AL)	15,243	40%	51%	11%
Montgomery County (AL)	11,675	38%	49%	11%
Montgomery County (MD)	16,023	69%	89%	20%
Nashville-Davidson (TN)	18,254	47%	57%	10%
New York City (NY)	143,972	28%	54%	26%
Newark (NJ)	9,697	75%	64%	-11%
Norfolk (VA)	10,578	31%	50%	19%
Orange County (FL)	25,074	41%	63%	22%
Palm Beach County (FL)	25,703	38%	61%	23%
Philadelphia (PA)	41,620	26%	36%	10%
Pinellas County (FL)	10,251	28%	54%	26%
Pittsburgh (PA)	7,400	44%	68%	24%
Polk County (FL)	10,518	38%	54%	16%
Prince George's County (MD)	44,774	55%	58%	3%
Richmond County (GA)	11,985	29%	34%	5%
Rochester (NY)	9,843	21%	38%	17%
St. Louis (MO)	9,354	35%	44%	9%
Virginia Beach (VA)	8,931	51%	68%	17%
Wake County (NC)	18,570	51%	82%	31%



Creating Healthy Living and Learning Districts Matters

It's not enough for us to review the data and acknowledge how it reflects systemic failures. States and localities must also create ecosystems that make it more likely that all students will have an opportunity to learn. Each and every child deserves and needs positive, supportive, safe, challenging and equitable learning environments.

As the only mandatory and largest network of institutions in communities across the country, public school districts and their schools provide one of the few community platforms to address these learning, social and cultural issues — and collectively, the impact of poverty on each. Education is a public good and as such, the public education system is a valuable platform that can be used to create a healthy living and learning ecosystem where all students have an opportunity to learn and their families an opportunity to succeed.

To create healthy learning and living systems that meet the needs of the whole child, school-community partnerships need more holistic ways of assessing whether the appropriate mix of student academic, health, civic and climate supports are present. To create a culture that supports all young people to meet high academic standards, we need a school and community environment that prioritizes opportunity over oppression. To meet this goal our approach must be two-fold:

1. Address the Systemic Climate Matters

2. Address the Systemic Quality Matters

SUSPENSION

Time 850

Date 6/7/04

*Tia
Rivera*

Sanchez

Climate Matters: America's Push-out Crisis

Simply put, you can't teach students who are not in school.

It should be an obvious corollary for education policymakers that use of suspensions in school discipline results in reduced instructional time for those students suspended, which negatively impacts their academic achievement. Furthermore, suspensions and expulsions have additional consequences that may further impact students and their academic achievement; studies show that students who have been suspended or expelled often have less social bonds to schools, are less likely to feel that they belong at school and are at increased risk of dropping out.

Research on school suspensions reveals that they are relatively ineffective at improving student safety, student behavior and serve to further alienate students and advance them along what is commonly known as the school-to-prison pipeline. Suspensions reinforce negative student behavior, increase the likelihood of disengaging from school and dropping out, and effectively alienates students from the schooling process^{1, 2, 3, 4}.

DISPARATE RACE AND GENDER IMPACTS

Evidence persists of disproportionality in school disciplinary practices by race, economic status, gender and disability category. The recently released book, *Closing the Discipline Gap* by Daniel Losen, highlights how students of color have higher rates of office referrals,

suspensions and expulsions from school; moreover, low income Black males receiving special education services have the highest suspension rates of any subgroup^{5, 6}. This is not a recent phenomenon. In 1975, the Children's Defense Fund reported the overuse of suspensions with Black children based on their representation in school districts across the United States⁷. Over thirty years of research, Black students' disproportionate numbers in school suspensions and expulsions has remained constant⁸.

Although Black students are consistently disciplined at a higher rate than their White peers, there is no evidence that such discrepancies are due to higher rates of school misbehavior by Black students. On the contrary, studies have shown that Black students are punished more severely for less serious or more subjective infractions⁹.

Racial and gender disproportionality in school suspensions is egregious not only because it has been shown to involve prejudice and unfairness, but also for the heavy toll it takes on the suspended students and their families — and, it is important to note, on their larger community. Suspensions do not contribute to healthy living and learning communities. Black boys who are pushed out of school have greatly diminished chances to realize their full personal or economic potential and their communities, as well as our country, are robbed of their leadership and contributions.

Nationally, 15% of Black males received out-of-school suspensions, compared to 7% of Latino males and 5% of White males. The average expulsion rate for Black

males nationally was 0.61%, compared to 0.29% for Latino males and 0.21% for White males. These suspension and expulsion data indicate that Black students across the country were suspended at least twice as often as their peers, and were more likely to be expelled from school.

Florida ranked first in the nation in the rate of out-of-school suspension for both Black (23%) and White males (9%), and ranked third in the rate for Latino males (10%). Even though the state suspended Latino and White males at relatively high rates, Black males were still suspended at more than double the rate of both groups. Rhode Island had the highest out-of-school suspension rate for Latino males (12%). North Dakota had the lowest out-of-school suspension rate for Black males (4%), while New York had the lowest rate for Latino males (3%). One percent of White males in the District of Columbia received an out-of-school suspension, the lowest rate nationally.

Oklahoma expelled Black males (3.7%), Latino males (1.3%) and White males (0.7%) at the highest rates nationwide. Despite the high rates of out-of-school suspensions in Florida, the state expelled Black males at the lowest rate nationwide, just 0.07%. North Carolina, New Jersey and New York each reported the lowest rate of expulsion for Latino students, 0.05%. Rhode Island expelled White students at the lowest rate, 0.01%.

In Polk County, FL and St. Louis, MO, 40% of the Black male populations received an out-of-school suspension, a rate higher than any other selected urban district. Palm Beach, Pinellas and Orange County — all in Florida — also had relatively high rates of out-of-school suspensions for Black males.

Thirty-nine of the 50 urban districts reported data on expulsions by race and gender. Among these districts, Memphis and Chatham County expelled Black males at the highest rate (5%) followed by East Baton Rouge (4%). In contrast, East Baton Rouge expelled 1.3% of Latino males and 1.4% of White males – the highest rates for each of those two groups among the selected urban districts.

States of Emergency

State-by-State Suspension Rates for Black Male Students




TABLE 10.

State Out-of-School Suspension Rates

SORTED BY STATE

State	2012-13 Cohort				
	Suspension Rate			Gap	
	Black Male	Latino Male	White Male	Black/White	Latino/White
Alabama	18.9%	5.7%	6.3%	12.6%	0.7%
Alaska	9.0%	5.4%	4.4%	4.6%	1.0%
Arizona	14.1%	7.4%	5.2%	8.9%	2.2%
Arkansas	20.0%	6.6%	5.8%	14.2%	0.9%
California	15.1%	6.7%	5.6%	9.5%	1.1%
Colorado	12.4%	7.6%	4.0%	8.3%	3.5%
Connecticut	11.4%	7.2%	2.1%	9.3%	5.1%
Delaware	16.5%	8.9%	5.9%	10.6%	3.0%
District of Columbia	14.3%	6.3%	1.5%	12.8%	4.8%
Florida	23.3%	9.8%	9.3%	13.9%	0.5%
Georgia	17.4%	6.9%	5.1%	12.2%	1.8%
Hawaii	*	*	*	*	*
Idaho	9.3%	6.1%	3.8%	5.5%	2.3%
Illinois	13.9%	5.4%	3.6%	10.3%	1.8%
Indiana	20.0%	8.7%	5.2%	14.8%	3.5%
Iowa	13.2%	5.6%	2.9%	10.4%	2.7%
Kansas	13.1%	6.3%	3.2%	9.9%	3.1%
Kentucky	12.4%	5.0%	4.8%	7.6%	0.2%
Louisiana	12.9%	7.8%	6.3%	6.6%	1.5%
Maine	10.0%	5.7%	3.6%	6.5%	2.2%
Maryland	8.3%	4.2%	4.7%	3.6%	0.6%
Massachusetts	9.8%	7.2%	3.2%	6.7%	4.0%
Michigan	20.5%	9.3%	5.8%	14.7%	3.5%
Minnesota	10.8%	4.8%	2.1%	8.7%	2.7%
Mississippi	16.6%	7.0%	6.5%	10.1%	0.5%
Missouri	21.0%	7.8%	4.9%	16.2%	3.0%

*Insufficient data for analysis

State	2012-13 Cohort				
	Suspension Rate			Gap	
	Black Male	Latino Male	White Male	Black/White	Latino/White
Montana	8.9%	6.6%	3.8%	5.1%	2.8%
Nebraska	15.9%	5.5%	3.2%	12.7%	2.2%
Nevada	9.3%	5.8%	4.3%	5.0%	1.5%
New Hampshire	13.8%	7.1%	4.8%	9.0%	2.3%
New Jersey	10.3%	5.7%	2.7%	7.5%	3.0%
New Mexico	12.7%	8.4%	5.6%	7.1%	2.8%
New York	6.2%	2.5%	3.0%	3.2%	0.5%
North Carolina	17.5%	8.2%	5.8%	11.7%	2.4%
North Dakota	4.4%	3.6%	1.7%	2.7%	1.9%
Ohio	16.9%	8.3%	4.4%	12.5%	3.8%
Oklahoma	15.0%	8.5%	5.1%	9.8%	3.3%
Oregon	13.1%	6.8%	5.1%	7.9%	1.7%
Pennsylvania	16.6%	10.1%	3.4%	13.1%	6.7%
Rhode Island	15.7%	11.5%	6.5%	9.2%	5.0%
South Carolina	17.0%	8.4%	7.0%	9.9%	1.3%
South Dakota	8.8%	5.7%	2.5%	6.4%	3.3%
Tennessee	19.0%	6.9%	4.9%	14.1%	2.0%
Texas	13.6%	6.1%	3.3%	10.3%	2.8%
Utah	9.7%	4.9%	2.3%	7.4%	2.6%
Vermont	9.3%	6.5%	4.2%	5.1%	2.3%
Virginia	13.9%	5.2%	4.9%	8.9%	0.2%
Washington	12.0%	7.4%	5.0%	7.0%	2.4%
West Virginia	19.1%	9.7%	8.5%	10.6%	1.2%
Wisconsin	18.9%	6.4%	2.6%	16.3%	3.8%
Wyoming	10.3%	5.8%	3.8%	6.5%	2.0%
National	15%	7%	5%	10%	2%

Suspension rates above the national averages and gaps above the national averages are shown in red.

Quality Matters

Postsecondary Attainment

As highlighted earlier in this report, Schott urges a national standard for high school graduation diplomas that indicate students' readiness for postsecondary schooling, rather than varied diplomas, including lesser quality diplomas that are often granted disproportionately to children of color, especially to Black males. New York may have recently ended its scandalous protocol of Local and Regents' diplomas, but too many states continue similar disparities.


Measuring what matters requires a national focus on readying students for postsecondary achievement — because postsecondary education and training matter more now than ever before. In the competitive global economy, whether a student has meaningful access to postsecondary education and training is a strong determinant of his or her future chances for achievement and economic security.

Creating the healthy living and learning environments that promote postsecondary attainment is also a matter of our nation's security. As the Lumina Foundation documents in its recent report *A Stronger Nation Through Higher Education*, closing the gaps in college attainment is essential to meeting our nation's unprecedented and increasing need for talent. And it should be clear to all that we will not meet these national imperatives without closing the opportunity

gaps that deny access to postsecondary achievement to children of color, who are increasingly becoming the majority in school districts across the country.


American Council on Education data illustrates the alarming gap that outlines the challenge before us:

Percentage of All Adults Holding a Bachelor's Degree or Higher



Source: *Minorities in Higher Education, Twenty-Fourth Status Report, 2011 Supplement* by Young M. Kim. American Council on Education.
http://diversity.ucsc.edu/resources/images/ace_report.pdf

Grade 8 NAEP (2013), National Proficiency Rates



Reading and Math Proficiency

The rates for high school graduation and postsecondary attainment present an important snapshot of the inequities in America's education systems. However, it is important to emphasize that the opportunity gaps resulting in the graduation gaps for children of color start in their early years. Reviewing data from the National Association of Educational Progress (NAEP) for Grades 3 and 8 reading and mathematics outcomes underscores the gaps in access to high quality education resources that are consistent with students' achieving proficiency in core subjects essential to their educational success.

However, a review of NAEP data makes it clear that in too many states narrow gaps are hardly indicative of progress, but rather the dramatically low scores for all their students — Black, Latino and White — indicate that all are being denied vital education resources. The worst states in this “lose-lose” category for Grade 8 reading include Alabama, Louisiana, Michigan, Mississippi and Oklahoma.

Grade 8 NAEP data show that Black males trail both their White and Latino peers. White males outperform Black males in reading by 26 percentage points and 32 percentage points in mathematics.

READING

Nationally, 38% of White males scored at or above proficient on the NAEP assessment in reading, as did 17% of Latino males and 12% of Black males.

Among 36 states reporting reading data for Black males, New Jersey ranked first in the percentage of Black males achieving proficiency (20%), though the disparity between Black and White males in the state was 28 percentage points. Mississippi had the lowest percentage of Black males performing at or above proficient in reading (5%). The gap between White and Black males within Mississippi was 21 percentage points. The District of Columbia had the largest gap between Black and White male proficiency rates in reading, 62 percentage points. Only 7% of Black males performed at or above proficient in reading as compared to 69% of White males.

MATHEMATICS

Nationwide, 13% of Black males scored at or above proficient on the 2013 NAEP Grade 8 math assessment, as did 21% of Latino males and 45% of White males.

New Jersey ranked first in the percentages of Black males (29%) and White males (63%) performing at or above proficient in Grade 8 mathematics. Importantly, not only did New Jersey hold the highest percentages in Black and White male performance on the NAEP for Grade 8 math, it also had one of the largest gaps — 34 percentage points — between Black and White males.

Alaska, Mississippi, Wisconsin and Arkansas had the lowest percentages of Black males performing at or above proficient in Grade 8 math, all below 8%. This rate is seven percentage points below the median for Black males (13%), and 24 points below the performance of Black males in New Jersey, the top-ranked

state. The gap between Black and White male proficiency rates in Grade 8 math in Arkansas was 27 percentage points. This means around four times as many White males performed at or above proficient in Grade 8 math than their Black male peers. Furthermore, roughly 93% of Black males scored at the basic or below basic level in Grade 8 mathematics in Arkansas, compared to roughly 66% of White males.

Mississippi had the largest gap between Black and White proficiency rates in Grade 8 math with a difference of 42 percentage points. This means that roughly seven times more White males performed at or above proficient in Grade 8 math than their Black male peers. The smallest difference between White male and Black male proficiency rates was again in Connecticut with an eight-percentage point gap. In Connecticut, the proficiency rate for Black males was above the national average; the relatively small disparity between the scores of Black and White males was driven by low performance among White males in the state.

TABLE 11.

NAEP 2013, Grade 8 Reading, Percentages at or Above Proficient SORTED BY BLACK MALE PROFICIENCY

State	2012-13 Cohort				
	Percent at or Above Proficient			Gap	
	Black Male	Latino Male	White Male	Black/White	Latino/White
New Jersey	19.6%	30.9%	47.5%	27.9%	16.6%
West Virginia	18.7%	‡	19.7%	1.0%	‡
Maryland	17.8%	27.9%	48.5%	30.7%	20.6%
Massachusetts	17.0%	16.6%	51.9%	34.9%	35.3%
Connecticut	15.5%	21.1%	47.9%	32.4%	26.8%
Delaware	15.3%	22.1%	35.8%	20.5%	13.7%
Nevada	13.9%	14.6%	35.2%	21.3%	20.6%
Ohio	13.8%	22.2%	38.0%	24.2%	15.8%
Minnesota	13.7%	18.4%	38.4%	24.7%	20.0%
Texas	13.5%	16.7%	42.6%	29.1%	25.9%
New York	13.3%	14.4%	40.2%	26.9%	25.8%
Georgia	13.2%	22.8%	34.5%	21.3%	11.7%
Pennsylvania	12.8%	17.4%	45.2%	32.4%	27.8%
Tennessee	12.7%	30.7%	34.4%	21.7%	3.7%

State	2012-13 Cohort				
	Percent at or Above Proficient			Gap	
	Black Male	Latino Male	White Male	Black/White	Latino/White
Florida	12.0%	22.1%	35.8%	23.8%	13.7%
Kentucky	11.3%	35.9%	37.0%	25.7%	1.1%
Illinois	11.3%	21.9%	40.4%	29.1%	18.5%
North Carolina	11.1%	21.0%	33.8%	22.7%	12.8%
Nebraska	11.1%	15.5%	37.1%	26.0%	21.6%
Kansas	11.1%	16.0%	37.3%	26.2%	21.3%
Rhode Island	11.1%	13.6%	37.7%	26.6%	24.1%
Virginia	10.9%	21.8%	39.4%	28.5%	17.6%
Missouri	10.4%	‡	35.1%	24.7%	‡
Oklahoma	10.2%	16.3%	29.8%	19.6%	13.5%
Iowa	10.0%	21.8%	33.3%	23.3%	11.5%
California	9.9%	14.7%	40.4%	30.5%	25.7%
Louisiana	9.3%	‡	29.2%	19.9%	‡
Arizona	9.3%	13.3%	37.8%	28.5%	24.5%
Alabama	9.2%	‡	26.6%	17.4%	‡
Indiana	8.8%	18.2%	33.5%	24.7%	15.3%
South Carolina	8.1%	20.4%	31.6%	23.5%	11.2%
Michigan	7.7%	18.4%	31.6%	23.9%	13.2%
District of Columbia	7.4%	15.0%	69.1%	61.7%	54.1%
Arkansas	7.3%	22.0%	31.5%	24.2%	9.5%
Wisconsin	6.7%	20.5%	32.3%	25.6%	11.8%
Mississippi	5.1%	‡	26.2%	21.1%	‡
Alaska	‡	21.5%	35.6%	‡	14.1%
Colorado	‡	18.1%	43.2%	‡	25.1%
Hawaii	‡	19.0%	38.2%	‡	19.2%
Idaho	‡	13.4%	36.6%	‡	23.2%
Maine	‡	‡	31.2%	‡	‡
Montana	‡	‡	38.6%	‡	‡
New Hampshire	‡	‡	38.3%	‡	‡
New Mexico	‡	14.7%	34.2%	‡	19.5%
North Dakota	‡	‡	30.1%	‡	‡
Oregon	‡	15.6%	36.2%	‡	20.6%
South Dakota	‡	‡	32.0%	‡	‡
Utah	‡	21.1%	38.0%	‡	16.9%
Vermont	‡	‡	38.7%	‡	‡
Washington	‡	18.8%	43.5%	‡	24.7%
Wyoming	‡	20.0%	32.4%	‡	12.4%
National	12%	17%	38%	26%	21%

‡ Reporting standards not met

TABLE 12.

NAEP 2013, Grade 8 Mathematics, Percentages at or Above Proficient

SORTED BY BLACK MALE PROFICIENCY

State	2012-13 Cohort				
	Percent at or Above Proficient			Gap	
	Black Male	Latino Male	White Male	Black/White	Latino/White
New Jersey	29.3%	26.2%	63.4%	34.1%	37.2%
West Virginia	22.8%	28.3%	54.9%	32.1%	26.6%
Maryland	20.8%	33.3%	57.3%	36.5%	24.0%
Massachusetts	18.6%	20.2%	46.1%	27.6%	25.9%
Connecticut	17.3%	‡	24.8%	7.5%	‡
Delaware	16.8%	22.8%	54.1%	37.3%	31.3%
Nevada	16.8%	32.8%	50.8%	34.0%	18.0%
Ohio	16.6%	27.8%	46.2%	29.7%	18.4%
Minnesota	16.1%	27.1%	47.5%	31.4%	20.4%
Texas	15.0%	23.5%	49.4%	34.4%	25.9%
New York	14.5%	25.7%	44.3%	29.8%	18.6%
Georgia	14.4%	18.2%	45.7%	31.3%	27.5%
Pennsylvania	14.2%	30.8%	46.8%	32.6%	16.0%
Tennessee	14.2%	29.5%	45.0%	30.8%	15.5%
Florida	14.0%	23.5%	54.3%	40.3%	30.9%
Kentucky	13.8%	14.9%	45.7%	31.9%	30.8%
Illinois	13.6%	20.3%	50.1%	36.5%	29.8%
North Carolina	13.2%	25.3%	41.4%	28.2%	16.1%
Nebraska	12.9%	19.1%	‡	‡	‡
Kansas	11.3%	24.3%	48.4%	37.2%	24.2%
Rhode Island	11.3%	16.6%	43.2%	31.9%	26.5%
Virginia	11.2%	13.9%	43.6%	32.4%	29.7%
Missouri	11.0%	17.6%	33.3%	22.3%	15.7%
Oklahoma	10.9%	27.9%	44.8%	33.9%	16.9%
Iowa	10.6%	27.5%	43.8%	33.2%	16.2%
California	10.0%	12.0%	48.5%	38.5%	36.5%

State	2012-13 Cohort				
	Percent at or Above Proficient			Gap	
	Black Male	Latino Male	White Male	Black/White	Latino/White
Louisiana	9.8%	16.5%	29.0%	19.2%	12.5%
Arizona	9.7%	18.8%	33.3%	23.6%	14.6%
Alabama	9.4%	‡	38.4%	29.0%	‡
Indiana	8.9%	23.2%	34.5%	25.5%	11.3%
South Carolina	8.3%	11.3%	41.2%	32.9%	29.9%
Michigan	8.0%	21.2%	30.8%	22.8%	9.7%
District of Columbia	7.6%	19.0%	41.1%	33.5%	22.1%
Arkansas	7.3%	‡	34.1%	26.8%	‡
Wisconsin	5.7%	11.3%	36.6%	31.0%	25.3%
Mississippi	5.7%	21.1%	47.6%	41.9%	26.4%
Alaska	5.6%	2.8%	29.3%	23.7%	26.5%
Colorado	‡	24.6%	46.9%	‡	22.3%
Hawaii	‡	30.9%	37.2%	‡	6.3%
Idaho	‡	17.3%	42.4%	‡	25.1%
Maine	‡	‡	42.3%	‡	‡
Montana	‡	‡	45.6%	‡	‡
New Hampshire	‡	‡	47.4%	‡	‡
New Mexico	‡	17.9%	42.8%	‡	24.9%
North Dakota	‡	‡	45.0%	‡	‡
Oregon	‡	17.5%	42.8%	‡	25.3%
South Dakota	‡	‡	44.6%	‡	‡
Utah	‡	12.6%	44.3%	‡	31.7%
Vermont	‡	‡	47.1%	‡	‡
Washington	‡	24.2%	48.1%	‡	23.9%
Wyoming	‡	28.4%	41.7%	‡	13.3%
National	13%	21%	45%	32%	24%

Advanced Placement Opportunities

Access to and participation in rigorous and high-level course work in secondary school is a critical component of improving the educational outcomes of Black and Latino students and providing a key opportunity for postsecondary success. Enrollment in Advanced Placement courses and passing Advanced Placement exams are related to improved SAT scores, college admission and receiving college scholarships, and college completion^{1, 2}.


Nevertheless, such opportunities are not equally distributed. Black and Latino students are less likely to attend schools that offer Advanced Placement courses and other high-level course offerings^{3, 4, 5, 6, 7}. Despite College Board's equity policy, Black and Latino students are still significantly underrepresented in Advanced Placement courses^{8, 9}. Schools serving students from low-income and minority families have fewer opportunities to learn advanced content and participate in Advanced Place-

ment courses, thus contributing to disparities in educational outcomes both in high school and beyond^{10, 11, 12, 13, 14}.

In Maryland, 15% of Black males enrolled in at least one AP course — the highest rate nationwide, though still less than the national average test-taking rate for White males. In Louisiana and South Carolina, Black males took AP exams at a rate of 3%, the lowest rate nationwide.

Black males in Montgomery County (MD) enrolled in AP courses at the highest rate nationwide (6%). This was similar to the rate for Latino males, but ten percentage points lower than White male participation, 16%. Black males in Caddo Parish (LA), Jefferson Parish (LA) and Chatham County (GA) enrolled in AP courses at rates of less than one-half of one percent. In Caddo Parish, 4% of White males enrolled in AP courses, a rate nine times higher than that of Black males.

State-Level AP Enrollment, Top 5 and Bottom 5 States for Black Male Student Enrollment in at Least One AP Course, 2011-12





Multi-Sector Action Steps for Building Healthy Living and Learning Districts

Across the country, nonprofit, philanthropic and corporate partners have launched various initiatives designed to create networks of support to address the challenges Black males face. In an effort to position policymakers and advocates to institutionalize these initiatives, Schott highlights several positive efforts, not as stand alone programs, but as components of a comprehensive system offered, guaranteed and sustained in state and local budgets. Working in concert, these supports begin to build a healthier living and learning district by addressing highly interrelated student needs. These needs, however, can be addressed through actions by many different sectors and on multiple levels, including:

- Schools
- Communities
- Federal, State & Local Governments
- Philanthropy
- Private Sector

Meeting Student-Centered Learning Needs

Unlike ineffective “one size fits all” approaches, the Schott Foundation calls for states and districts to adopt tailored approaches adapted to personal educational needs, social contexts and students’ learning styles. The current standard approach

does not serve high or low achievers well — it only allows the necessary supports for teachers to guide students towards an inconsistent medium. Students need a more student-centered learning approach to reach their full potential.

STATE, DISTRICT AND SCHOOL SYSTEMIC ACTION

Personal Opportunity Plans

Personal Opportunity Plans are a highly targeted system of accountability to ensure that all students have the resources they need to have a fair and substantive opportunity to learn. The policy model was introduced by the Opportunity to Learn Campaign in 2011 — and provides a framework to align academic, social and health supports to enable students who have been left behind to catch up and excel as high achievers.

Every student who is a grade level or more behind in math or reading should be given a Personal Opportunity Plan that provides the student access to supports in three areas:

- Academic (tutoring, extended day learning, English language instruction, etc.)
- Social (mentoring, parents’ training)
- Health (vision, dental, mental health)

In any school where more than one-third of the students are eligible for Personal Opportunity Plans, the district must create a plan to intentionally connect service providers of these supports to the school. The steps involved for these schools are:

- A comprehensive needs assessment done in partnership with parents, educators, students and community members, so that local solutions are tailored to local problems.
- Implementation of research based on instructional and educational reforms.
- A plan to address essential social, emotional and physical needs of students.
- Coordination of resources to support service providers’ efforts to provide supports to students in the school.
- Recognition that parent, student and community leadership is critical to sustainable student success.



Learn more: www.otlcampaign.org

FEDERAL, STATE AND LOCAL SYSTEMIC ACTION

Collecting and Reporting Quality Data

As the earlier section “Invisible Men” makes clear, the goal of equity and opportunity for students is critically hampered by our lack of key data about them. Data disaggregated by race and gender is scarce and it is difficult to interpret the different kinds of diplomas districts may offer.

While Federal guidelines are crucial to establishing consistent and comparable sets of data across the country, states and districts need not wait — they should annually release quality disaggregated data immediately so that parents, educators, advocates and policymakers can create solutions that fit their specific needs.

PRIVATE SECTOR ACTION

JPMorgan Chase & Co. — The Fellowship Initiative

Even when they successfully complete high school, young men in low-income communities often lack the role models, support and tools they need to envision and prepare for careers and be successful in a challenging global economy. The Fellowship Initiative (TFI) is a multi-discipline approach to expanding opportunity and career horizons for Black, Latino and other young men of color. The three-year TFI fellowship is a collaborative effort founded by JPMorgan Chase & Co. (JPMC) to help young men acquire the skills, knowledge and experience needed to succeed academically, achieve their personal and professional potential, and establish themselves as the next generation of global leaders.

Along with its partners, JPMC broadens access to educational support and expands professional

THE FELLOWSHIP INITIATIVE

pathways — utilizing hands-on mentoring from professionals in diverse career fields; pre-college and intern support programs, and international learning opportunities. The investment in these young men expands their personal and economic potential for success, and as General Colin Powell says, “TFI is an excellent example of the commitment our country needs to preserve the long-term success of our nation.” The initiative was recently expanded to Chicago and Los Angeles, in addition to enrolling a larger class of fellows in New York.

Learn more: www.jpmorganchase.com/corporate/tfi/the-fellowship-initiative.htm

Meeting School Climate Needs

More than three million students — from early grades to high school — are suspended from school every year. These suspensions disproportionately target Black and Latino students, causing them to miss critical learning time as well as other school services and opportunities, contributing to the achievement gap and the pushout and dropout rates for these students.

As educators and policymakers seek to create healthy learning environments for all students, a moratorium

on out-of-school suspensions should be a high priority. Despite compelling research that reveals that suspensions reinforce rather than lessen negative student behavior, too many schools continue to use them as a default disciplinary tool. Contrast this to the positive climate in schools that use restorative justice practices to foster safe learning environments through community building and constructive conflict resolution.

STATE, LOCAL AND SCHOOL BASED SYSTEMIC ACTION

Solutions Not Suspensions

A nationwide movement for a moratorium on out-of-school suspensions.

Solutions Not Suspensions promotes proven programs that equip teachers and school administrators with effective alternatives to suspensions. The Dignity in Schools Campaign and the Opportunity to Learn Campaign — which partnered with allies to launch the national campaign — provide tools to help districts and schools implement the moratorium and phase in positive alternatives. These include model school discipline policies and guidelines for school boards and other policymakers.

One exciting example of momentum in the local campaigns is Racial Justice Now's success in achieving a moratorium on out-of-school suspensions for Dayton, Ohio students in pre-K through third grade —

and the expansion of restorative justice programs in Dayton schools. And

they are shining a public spotlight on the unconscionable statistics as they push for a statewide moratorium. In October 2014 during the DSC National Week of Action Against School Pushout, Racial Justice Now! released the first ever statewide School Discipline Report Card for Ohio, evaluating 1067 different school entities (including public districts, charter and Joint Vocational Schools) for overly punitive discipline practices and high rates of pushout. Over 90% of Ohio schools received failing grades based on the formula of looking at exclusions, subjective discipline and racial disparity.



Learn more: www.stopsuspensions.org
www.otlcampaign.org/resources/partnerships-not-pushouts
www.otlcampaign.org/resources/restorative-practices-toolkit

Meeting Positive Support Needs

COMMUNITY ACTION

BMe Community

BMe (pronounced “be me”) is a dynamic, growing national network of inspired Black men and thousands of other community-builders, of all races and genders, who connect to share, inspire and empower communities.

Black men and boys are assets to their communities, and have long been engaged in addressing the issues, challenges and opportunities affecting their neighborhoods. BMe recognizes and celebrates



these all too often unsung heroes who are the tip of the iceberg of the extensive assets in communities of color. Each year BMe identifies 30-50 inspired Black men who are deeply committed to the well-being of others—and funds them, promotes their stories, and networks them with others, increasing the impact of their community-building efforts.

You can join BMe and take their pledge:

1. We believe that Black men and boys are assets to society and important members of the human family;
2. We know that valuing all members of the human family is the most prosperous way forward for our diverse nation;
3. We reject any narratives that denigrate people and prejudices one against another;
4. So we are committed to working with others—in asset-oriented ways—to bring about a more caring and prosperous America.

Learn more: www.bmecomunity.org

PHILANTHROPIC ACTION AND RESOURCES

National Opportunity to Learn Campaign

The Opportunity to Learn (OTL) Campaign unites a growing coalition of advocates and organizers from across the country working to ensure that all students have access to a high quality public education. The Campaign includes local, state and national organizations, grassroots community leaders, policy-makers, youth organizers, business leaders and philanthropic partners.

The OTL Campaign advocates for a supports-based reform agenda that provides students with the resources and opportunities they need to succeed.



These include:

- High quality early education
- Equitable funding and resources
- Wraparound academic, social, emotional and health supports for students
- Highly prepared and effective teachers
- Effective school discipline
- Meaningful engagement with parents and the community

Learn more: www.otlcampaign.org

PHILANTHROPIC ACTION AND RESOURCES

Campaign for Black Male Achievement

The Campaign for Black Male Achievement (CBMA) is a national membership network that seeks to ensure the growth, sustainability and impact of leaders and organizations committed to improving the life outcomes of Black men and boys. The CBMA member network currently includes more than 3,000 representing nearly 2,000 organizations across the country.



CBMA will focus on ensuring that there is a strengthened "ground game" of local leaders and organizations devoted to improving the life outcomes of Black men and boys, while working with and supporting the broader "air game" efforts like the My Brother's Keeper initiative.

Learn more: www.blackmaleachievement.org

PHILANTHROPIC ACTION AND RESOURCES

Black Male Funders Learning and Action Network

The Black Male Funders Learning & Action Network (LAN) is a network of funders that are currently directing resources to initiatives to improve life outcomes for Black males. ABFE maintains the network to: connect foundations focused on the ongoing investments in Black male initiatives; lay the groundwork for a for-

mal learning network to discuss strategies, lessons learned, and to gain access to research in the field; document the changes in grantmaking strategies and investments in Black male initiatives.



ABFE

A Philanthropic Partnership for Black Communities

Learn more: www.abfe.org/programs/networking-and-convening/learning-action-network

PHILANTHROPIC ACTION AND RESOURCES

Black Male Achievement Social Innovation Accelerator

The Black Male Achievement Social Innovation Accelerator (the “Accelerator”) is a key strategy of the CBMA to showcase and spread what works in the field of Black male achievement — by selecting and supporting a cohort of Black Male Achievement (BMA) Innovators.

A Black Male Achievement Innovator is a leader whose organization exemplifies the pursuit of high performance that leads to tangible results in improving the

life outcomes of Black men and boys and who has the passion and potential to increase his/her local and national leadership.

The Accelerator provides a unique opportunity for organizations with demonstrable outcomes to receive one-on-one consulting to articulate their goals, strengthen their communications for fundraising and sustainability, and have opportunities to be showcased to funders.



Learn more:

www.blackmaleachievement.org/ParticipateInNetwork/StrengthenCapacity/SocialInnovationAccelerator

PHILANTHROPIC ACTION AND RESOURCES

Sons & Brothers

California's young people are increasingly of color, with record growth among Latino and Asian American young men. The California Endowment is investing \$50 million to make sure that boys and young men of color – and California – will be successful. In seven years, they pledge to deliver on these critical goals:

- Support development of 1,000 youth leaders throughout California.
- Improve school attendance by 30% in targeted schools to improve reading proficiency.



- Cut in half the number of students suspended, using proven common-sense discipline strategies that keep kids in school and accountable.
- Train all California school police officers on youth development and trauma.
- Start 10 prosecutor programs that keep young people accountable and divert them out of the justice system by addressing the underlying need.
- Enroll all eligible children in health coverage to support their physical and mental health.

Learn more: www.calendow.org/sonsandbrothers.aspx

PHILANTHROPIC ACTION AND RESOURCES

African American Men and Boys Initiative

The African American Men and Boys Initiative was created in 2007 to identify and increase educational, economic, social and leadership opportunities for African American men and boys in the Pittsburgh region. This mission uses an asset-based approach in working with the African American community to create improved life outcomes for this population.



Based on community conversations and advisory board input, the current priority areas that guide grant making are: access to economic opportunity; educational opportunity; identity, gender and character development; communications; and evaluation.

Learn more: www.heinz.org/Interior.aspx?id=373

PHILANTHROPIC ACTION AND RESOURCES

Racial Equity Resource Guide



W.K.
KELLOGG
FOUNDATION™

In 2010, the Kellogg Foundation launched America Healing, a strategy for racial healing toward racial equity designed to raise awareness of unconscious biases and inequities to help communities heal. In support of America Healing, Kellogg created a comprehensive and interactive racial equity resource guide that includes practical resources including articles, organizations, research, books, media strat-

egies and training curricula aimed at helping organizations and individuals working to achieve racial healing and equity in their communities. Visitors can create their own custom resource guides that can be downloaded as a PDF or shared via social media.

Learn more: www.wkkf.org/what-we-do/racial-equity

PHILANTHROPIC ACTION AND RESOURCES

The Executives' Alliance



The Executives' Alliance to Expand Opportunities for Boys and Men of Color, launched in April 2013, is a growing network of national, regional and community foundations. The 30 member institutions engage in a broad array of initiatives and activities to support boys and men of color, including the recently announced White House public-private partnership My Brother's Keeper.

The Executives' Alliance is committed to:

- Using their collective and individual voices to affirm the value and contributions of boys and men of color as indispensable to our nation's success
- Focusing the attention of policymakers to address and dismantle structural barriers to opportunity for boys and men of color
- Increasing, leveraging and coordinating investments such that the whole is greater than the sum of its parts

Learn more: www.boysandmenofcolor.org

Afterword

by Pedro A. Noguera

In issuing biennial reports on the educational status of African American males the Schott Foundation has done the nation a great service. Any country that consistently allows this many of its citizens to be under-educated will most assuredly suffer significant consequences.

Of course, the consequences to America have been apparent for some time. They've been manifest in America's over-populated prisons that are literally bursting at the seams with under-educated African American males.

The consequences have also been evident in the high rates of unemployment in economically depressed, socially marginalized neighborhoods, cities and towns where desperation festers and crime and violence are rampant.

The consequences have also been felt by families and communities where fatherless children fall prey to a vicious cycle of failure in part because they lack access to fathers because they are incarcerated, or don't have the skills to obtain a job to support their family.

It seems that America has tolerated and grown accustomed to the under-education of African American males largely because it has written this off as a "black problem." Rather than being embraced as an American problem and challenge, our leaders in politics, business and education, have implored the Black community to do something, while washing their hands of responsibility for the failure of the public institutions that should serve them.


This is undoubtedly the reason why we have not raised alarm over the abysmally low set of indicators associat-



Pedro A. Noguera
Professor of Education
Executive Director, Metropolitan Center
New York University

ed with academic success — the miniscule enrollment of Black males in honors, gifted classes and advanced placement courses, and the shrinking number of Black males who matriculate to college and earn degrees. Nor have we rallied resources to respond to the vast array of indicators associated with academic hardship and distress such as: the high rates of suspension and expulsion, the high rates of special education placement, the low reading and math scores, and the perilously high dropout rates.

Of course, President Obama recently led the charge, calling for the nation to take action by issuing the My Brothers' Keeper initiative (MBK). Though some critics charge that it came too late, that it favored the hard-



ships facing African American boys over those facing girls, and that the package of remedies are too general and vague to actually have an impact on the broad set of problems it aims to address, no one could accuse of the President of doing nothing. As the first (and perhaps only) initiative taken by the administration to explicitly address an issue associated with race, there is no doubt that MBK represented a significant risk. As has happened numerous times before, not long after the President held his press conference announcing the initiative he was accused by his critics of race favoritism, of pandering to a favored constituency, and of engaging in divisive race-based politics. Despite all of this, President Obama took on MBK and tried in his own way to address a set of problems that America had grown accustomed to living with for far too long.

As this most recent report by the Schott Foundation reminds us, we have a long way to go in turning the tide against years of neglect. Over fourteen years after the enactment of No Child Left Behind (NCLB), dropout rates for African American and Latino males remain well above 50% in most American cities. Sadly, this includes cities such as New York, Austin and Miami where graduation rates have been rising. As this report shows, the situation is just as bleak in many urban, suburban and rural school districts throughout the country. Even class and gender privilege that clearly seem to provide White males with advantages do not seem to buffer Black males from middle class families from educational hardships. Middle class Black males consistently lag behind their peers on standardized tests, and unlike their White male peers, African American males lag behind Black females in science and math, both with respect to grade point average and on standardized tests.

In the last few months we have been reminded of the vulnerability of African American males when targeted by law enforcement. The names Michael Brown, Eric Garner and Tamir Rice are now etched into the nation's consciousness along with the plea: Black Lives Matter. As we struggle with trying to find ways to insure fair treatment by law enforcement officials and the courts and prevent the killing of unarmed African American men and boys, we must also address the injustice that denies Black boys the education resources they need to succeed in life. Closing the education opportunity gap must be a part of the response to ensure that Black lives do indeed matter.

An education continues to be the best route to a decent job and quality of life. For this reason those who seek to ensure the well being, security and future of Black males in America must turn to education. Education can save and enrich the lives of Black men and boys, and it is essential that we ensure they have a fair and substantive opportunity to learn.

Methodology

ESTIMATED GRADUATION RATES

The data used to estimate graduation rates came from three sources: data published by the U.S. Department of Education's National Center for Education Statistics, and that contained in previous Schott Foundation 50 State Reports on Public Education and Black Males (published in 2004 through 2012). Moving averages were applied to these data to calculate the estimated graduation rates. Where a state or locality made the data readily available, those data points were used.

Several different forecasting methods were tested in order to calculate the most reliable estimated graduation data. "Moving averages" were ultimately used to estimate more recent graduation data as well as missing, unavailable or unreported graduation data at the state level and for specific school districts.

A "moving average" is one of the most basic forecasting techniques. A moving average uses a defined number of data points over a specific span of time or period, and averages them, creating a predicted value. It is called "moving" because the period for which the average is created moves forward. For example, in a simple moving average, if there were five data points, the first period might generate an average from the first and second data points, the second period would generate an average from the second and third data point, the third period would generate an average from the third and fourth data point, and so on. The idea behind the use of moving averages in forecasting each next period will not be much different than the past few periods. Therefore, while it is not recommended for long-term forecasting, it produces reliable short-term predictions. In the case of this report, the predictions computed using the moving average method represent estimates for past graduation rates that have not yet been published.

STATE LEVEL METHODOLOGY

At the state level, moving averages were used to create two different sets of estimated average freshman graduation rates (AFGR) for the 2012-13 school year. These different methods correspond to the data used in the estimation. In the first estimate of state-level average freshman graduation

rates for the 2012-13 school year, moving averages were applied to the published average freshman graduation rate data for Black, Latino and White males from 2002 through 2010. In the second estimate of state-level average freshman graduation rates for the 2012-13 school year, moving averages were applied to the estimated diploma counts of Black, Latino and White males from 2002 through 2010. These initial estimated diploma counts were generated using the published average freshman graduation rate data for Black, Latino and White males from 2002 through 2010, and the enrollment bases used in the calculation of the graduation rates. These enrollment bases were calculated using U.S. Department of Education enrollment data. By multiplying the enrollment bases by their corresponding graduation rates, estimated diploma counts were computed. The estimated diploma counts for the 2009-10 school year were checked against the published data for that year (the only year for which diploma counts were available by race and gender); the estimated diploma counts matched closely to the published data. Using the estimated diploma counts generated by way of the application of moving averages and the enrollment bases from the U.S. Department of Education data, the estimated state-level average freshman graduation rates for the 2012-13 school year were calculated.

LARGE URBAN DISTRICT METHODOLOGY

At the district level, moving averages were used to estimate the 2011-12 graduation rates of Black and White males. Moving averages were applied to district-level graduation data, which was compiled through previous Schott Foundation reports, covering 2001-2, 2003-4, 2007-8 and 2009-10. The data in these previous reports represent the graduation rate of Black and White males in 2001-2, 2003-4, 2007-8 and 2009-10, and may differ from locally reported data due to variations in how school districts and states calculate and report graduation data. In all of the above estimations, missing, unreported or unavailable data were all estimated. It should be noted that the number of data points used and the extent to which the data fluctuates influences the accuracy of the estimations.

Notes

Notes for National Summary

- 1 Trabian Shorters, "Commentary: A Different Dialogue on the Anniversary of Trayvon's Death." BET National News. February 26, 2014. Retrieved from: <http://www.bet.com/news/national/2014/02/26/commentary-a-different-dialogue-on-the-anniversary-of-trayvon-s-death.html>.

Notes for Climate Matters

- 1 Christine Bowditch, "Getting Rid of Troublemakers: High School Disciplinary Procedures and the Production of Drop-outs," *Social Problems* 40, no. 4 (Nov., 1993): 493-509.
- 2 Virginia Costenbader and Samia Markson, "School Suspension: A Study with Secondary School Students," *Journal of School Psychology* 36, no. 1 (1998): 59-82.
- 3 Ruth Ekstrom and others, "Who Drops Out of High School and Why? Findings from a National Study," *The Teachers College Record* 87, no. 3 (1986): 356-373.
- 4 Tary Tobin, George Sugai and Geoff Colvin, "Patterns in Middle School Discipline Records," *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders* 4, no. 2 (1996): 82-94.
- 5 Russell J. Skiba and others, "The Color of Discipline: Sources of Racial and Gender Disproportionality in School Punishment," *The Urban Review* 34, no. 4 (2002): 317-342.
- 6 RJ Skiba and others, "Consistent Removal: Contributions of School Discipline to the School-Prison Pipeline" (2003).
- 7 Children's Defense Fund, *School Suspensions: Are they Helping Children* (Cambridge, MA: Washington Research Project, [1975]).
- 8 William Drakeford, "Racial Disproportionality in School Disciplinary Practices," Denver, CO: *National Center for Culturally Responsive Educational Systems* (2004).
- 9 Skiba and others, *The Color of Discipline: Sources of Racial and Gender Disproportionality in School Punishment*, 317-342.

Notes for Quality Matters

- 1 The College Board, *The Educational Experience of Young Men of Color: A Review of Research, Pathways and Progress*. (New York, NY: The College Board, 2011)
- 2 The College Board, *College Access and Success among High School Graduates Taking the SAT: African American Students*. (New York, NY: The College Board, 2013b)
- 3 Lucy Barnard-Brak, Valerie McGaha-Garnett and Hansel Burley, "Advanced Placement Course Enrollment and School-Level Characteristics," *NASSP Bulletin* 95, no. 3 (2011): 165-174.

- 4 Chrys Dougherty, Lynn Mellor and Shuling Jian, "The Relationship between Advanced Placement and College Graduation." *2005 AP Study Series*, Report 1. (Austin, TX: National Center for Educational Accountability, [2006]).
- 5 Kristin Klopfenstein, "Advanced Placement: Do Minorities have Equal Opportunity?" *Economics of Education Review* 23, no. 2 (2004b): 115-131.
- 6 Kristin Klopfenstein, "The Advanced Placement Expansion of the 1990s: How did Traditionally Underserved Students Fare?," *Education Policy Analysis Archives* 12, no. 68 (2004a): n68.
- 7 George W. Moore and John R. Slate, "Who's Taking the Advanced Placement Courses and how are they Doing: A Statewide Two-Year Study," *The High School Journal* 92, no. 1 (2008): 56-67.
- 8 James H. VanSciver, "Closing the Diversity Gap in Advanced Placement Course Enrollment," *Multicultural Perspectives* 8, no. 3 (2006): 56-58.
- 9 Gilman W. Whiting and Donna Y. Ford, "Multicultural Issues: Black Students and Advanced Placement Classes: Summary, Concerns, and Recommendations," *Gifted Child Today* 32, no. 1 (2009): 23-26.
- 10 Dylan Conger, Mark C. Long and Patrice Iatarola, "Explaining Race, Poverty, and Gender Disparities in Advanced Course-taking," *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 28, no. 4 (2009): 555-576.
- 11 Patrice Iatarola, Dylan Conger and Mark C. Long, "Determinants of High Schools' Advanced Course Offerings," *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 33, no. 3 (2011): 340-359.
- 12 Kristin Klopfenstein and M. Kathleen Thomas, "The Link between Advanced Placement Experience and Early College Success," *Southern Economic Journal* (2009): 873-891.
- 13 Vincent J. Roscigno, Donald Tomaskovic-Devey and Martha Crowley, "Education and the Inequalities of Place," *Social Forces* 84, no. 4 (2006): 2121-2145.
- 14 William H. Schmidt and others, "Content Coverage Differences Across Districts/States: A Persisting Challenge for US Education Policy," *American Journal of Education* 117, no. 3 (2011): 399-427.

Appendix

TABLE 13.

State Black/Latino/White Male Graduation Rates SORTED BY STATE

State	2012-13 Cohort				
	Graduation Rates			Gap	
	Black Male	Latino Male	White Male	Black/White	Latino/White
Alabama	57%	61%	72%	15%	11%
Alaska	56%	82%	74%	18%	-8%
Arizona	77%	65%	73%	-4%	8%
Arkansas	62%	72%	74%	12%	2%
California	62%	67%	82%	20%	15%
Colorado	69%	59%	82%	13%	23%
Connecticut	58%	52%	79%	21%	27%
Delaware	61%	61%	76%	15%	15%
District of Columbia	48%	57%	66%	18%	9%
Florida	56%	64%	69%	13%	5%
Georgia	55%	57%	71%	16%	14%
Hawaii	73%	71%	70%	-3%	-1%
Idaho	80%	73%	81%	1%	8%
Illinois	59%	68%	85%	26%	17%
Indiana	51%	64%	75%	24%	11%
Iowa	63%	73%	86%	23%	13%
Kansas	64%	68%	84%	20%	16%
Kentucky	67%	74%	76%	9%	2%
Louisiana	53%	70%	69%	16%	-1%
Maine	90%	81%	81%	-9%	0%
Maryland	66%	72%	84%	18%	12%
Massachusetts	68%	61%	84%	16%	23%
Michigan	54%	59%	80%	26%	21%
Minnesota	67%	62%	90%	23%	28%
Mississippi	51%	61%	63%	12%	2%
Missouri	66%	76%	85%	19%	9%

State	2012-13 Cohort				
	Graduation Rates			Gap	
	Black Male	Latino Male	White Male	Black/White	Latino/White
Montana	73%	72%	83%	10%	11%
Nebraska	50%	64%	86%	36%	22%
Nevada	40%	44%	62%	22%	18%
New Hampshire	71%	61%	83%	12%	22%
New Jersey	76%	77%	92%	16%	15%
New Mexico	59%	59%	68%	9%	9%
New York	57%	57%	85%	28%	28%
North Carolina	61%	63%	77%	16%	14%
North Dakota	*	63%	90%	*	27%
Ohio	54%	62%	84%	30%	22%
Oklahoma	65%	68%	78%	13%	10%
Oregon	64%	68%	76%	12%	8%
Pennsylvania	61%	63%	85%	24%	22%
Rhode Island	68%	62%	76%	8%	14%
South Carolina	51%	62%	68%	17%	6%
South Dakota	77%	66%	83%	6%	17%
Tennessee	70%	74%	81%	11%	7%
Texas	65%	70%	81%	16%	11%
Utah	63%	55%	79%	16%	24%
Vermont	*	*	89%	*	*
Virginia	62%	68%	80%	18%	12%
Washington	57%	58%	73%	16%	15%
West Virginia	68%	79%	75%	7%	-4%
Wisconsin	59%	73%	94%	35%	21%
Wyoming	57%	66%	77%	20%	11%
National	59%	65%	80%	21%	15%

* Insufficient data for analysis

TABLE 14.

State Black/White Male Graduation Rates

SORTED BY BLACK MALE GRADUATION RATE

State	2012-13 Cohort		
	Graduation Rates		Gap
	Black Male	White Male	Black/White
Maine	90%	81%	-9%
Idaho	80%	81%	1%
Arizona	77%	73%	-4%
South Dakota	77%	83%	6%
New Jersey	76%	92%	16%
Hawaii	73%	70%	-3%
Montana	73%	83%	10%
New Hampshire	71%	83%	12%
Tennessee	70%	81%	11%
Colorado	69%	82%	13%
Massachusetts	68%	84%	16%
Rhode Island	68%	76%	8%
West Virginia	68%	75%	7%
Kentucky	67%	76%	9%
Minnesota	67%	90%	23%
Maryland	66%	84%	18%
Missouri	66%	85%	19%
Oklahoma	65%	78%	13%
Texas	65%	81%	16%
Kansas	64%	84%	20%
Oregon	64%	76%	12%
Iowa	63%	86%	23%
Utah	63%	79%	16%
Arkansas	62%	74%	12%
California	62%	82%	20%
Virginia	62%	80%	18%
Delaware	61%	76%	15%
North Carolina	61%	77%	16%
Pennsylvania	61%	85%	24%

State	2012-13 Cohort		
	Graduation Rates		Gap
	Black Male	White Male	Black/White
Illinois	59%	85%	26%
New Mexico	59%	68%	9%
Wisconsin	59%	94%	35%
Connecticut	58%	79%	21%
Alabama	57%	72%	15%
New York	57%	85%	28%
Washington	57%	73%	16%
Wyoming	57%	77%	20%
Alaska	56%	74%	18%
Florida	56%	69%	13%
Georgia	55%	71%	16%
Michigan	54%	80%	26%
Ohio	54%	84%	30%
Louisiana	53%	69%	16%
Indiana	51%	75%	24%
Mississippi	51%	63%	12%
South Carolina	51%	68%	17%
Nebraska	50%	86%	36%
District of Columbia	48%	66%	18%
Nevada	40%	62%	22%
North Dakota	*	90%	*
Vermont	*	89%	*
National	59%	80%	21%

* *Insufficient data for analysis*

TABLE 15.

State Latino/White Male Graduation Rates

SORTED BY LATINO MALE GRADUATION RATE

State	2012-13 Cohort		
	Graduation Rates		Gap
	Latino Male	White Male	Latino/White
Alaska	82%	74%	-8%
Maine	81%	81%	0%
West Virginia	79%	75%	-4%
New Jersey	77%	92%	15%
Missouri	76%	85%	9%
Kentucky	74%	76%	2%
Tennessee	74%	81%	7%
Idaho	73%	81%	8%
Iowa	73%	86%	13%
Wisconsin	73%	94%	21%
Arkansas	72%	74%	2%
Maryland	72%	84%	12%
Montana	72%	83%	11%
Hawaii	71%	70%	-1%
Louisiana	70%	69%	-1%
Texas	70%	81%	11%
Illinois	68%	85%	17%
Kansas	68%	84%	16%
Oklahoma	68%	78%	10%
Oregon	68%	76%	8%
Virginia	68%	80%	12%
California	67%	82%	15%
South Dakota	66%	83%	17%
Wyoming	66%	77%	11%
Arizona	65%	73%	8%
Florida	64%	69%	5%

State	2012-13 Cohort		
	Graduation Rates		Gap
	Latino Male	White Male	Latino/White
Indiana	64%	75%	11%
Nebraska	64%	86%	22%
North Carolina	63%	77%	14%
North Dakota	63%	90%	27%
Pennsylvania	63%	85%	22%
Minnesota	62%	90%	28%
Ohio	62%	84%	22%
Rhode Island	62%	76%	14%
South Carolina	62%	68%	6%
Alabama	61%	72%	11%
Delaware	61%	76%	15%
Massachusetts	61%	84%	23%
Mississippi	61%	63%	2%
New Hampshire	61%	83%	22%
Colorado	59%	82%	23%
Michigan	59%	80%	21%
New Mexico	59%	68%	9%
Washington	58%	73%	15%
District of Columbia	57%	66%	9%
Georgia	57%	71%	14%
New York	57%	85%	28%
Utah	55%	79%	24%
Connecticut	52%	79%	27%
Nevada	44%	62%	18%
Vermont	*	89%	*
National	65%	80%	15%

* *Insufficient data for analysis*

TABLE 16.

56 Highest Black Male Enrollment Districts

SORTED BY BLACK MALE GRADUATION RATE

School District	Black Male Enrollment	2011-12 Cohort		
		Graduation Rates		Gap
		Black Male	White Male	Black/White
Newark (NJ)	9,697	75%	64%	-11%
Montgomery County (MD)	16,023	69%	89%	20%
Baltimore County (MD)	20,836	67%	76%	9%
Fort Bend (TX)	10,559	64%	82%	18%
Cumberland County (NC)	12,119	61%	67%	6%
Guilford County (NC)	15,246	57%	80%	23%
Prince George's County (MD)	44,774	55%	58%	3%
Cobb County (GA)	17,112	51%	75%	24%
Virginia Beach (VA)	8,931	51%	68%	17%
Wake County (NC)	18,570	51%	82%	31%
Gwinnett County (GA)	24,603	50%	63%	13%
Boston (MA)	9,697	49%	64%	15%
Nashville-Davidson (TN)	18,254	47%	57%	10%
Broward County (FL)	51,656	46%	61%	15%
Dekalb County (GA)	34,339	46%	69%	23%
East Baton Rouge Parish (LA)	17,481	46%	46%	0%
Fulton County (GA)	19,502	46%	81%	35%
Pittsburgh (PA)	7,400	44%	68%	24%
Jefferson County (KY)	18,958	43%	48%	5%
Memphis (TN)	44,631	43%	60%	17%
Milwaukee (WI)	23,069	43%	55%	12%
Houston (TX)	25,936	42%	69%	27%
Birmingham (AL)	11,854	41%	46%	5%
Charlotte-Mecklenburg (NC)	30,035	41%	71%	29%
Chicago (IL)	82,060	41%	64%	23%
Hillsborough County (FL)	21,678	41%	65%	24%
Los Angeles (CA)	27,108	41%	63%	22%
Orange County (FL)	25,074	41%	63%	22%
District of Columbia	16,554	40%	73%	33%

School District	Black Male Enrollment	2011-12 Cohort		
		Graduation Rates		Gap
		Black Male	White Male	Black/White
Mobile County (AL)	15,243	40%	51%	11%
Jefferson Parish (LA)	10,616	39%	50%	11%
Atlanta (GA)	23,530	38%	71%	33%
Baltimore City (MD)	36,473	38%	41%	3%
Caddo Parish (LA)	13,396	38%	57%	19%
Columbus (OH)	14,784	38%	44%	6%
Miami-Dade (FL)	42,577	38%	63%	25%
Montgomery County (AL)	11,675	38%	49%	11%
Palm Beach County (FL)	25,703	38%	61%	23%
Polk County (FL)	10,518	38%	54%	16%
Dallas (TX)	19,667	37%	51%	14%
Clayton County (GA)	18,448	36%	24%	-12%
Jackson (MS)	14,599	35%	34%	-1%
St. Louis (MO)	9,354	35%	44%	9%
Cincinnati (OH)	10,596	33%	51%	18%
Norfolk (VA)	10,578	31%	50%	19%
Charleston County (SC)	9,947	30%	59%	30%
Duval County (FL)	28,116	29%	47%	18%
Richmond County (GA)	11,985	29%	34%	5%
Chatham County (GA)	10,992	28%	44%	16%
Cleveland (OH)	14,783	28%	34%	6%
New York City (NY)	143,972	28%	54%	26%
Pinellas County (FL)	10,251	28%	54%	26%
Clark County (NV)	20,185	27%	45%	18%
Philadelphia (PA)	41,620	26%	36%	10%
Detroit (MI)	31,323	23%	13%	-10%
Rochester (NY)	9,843	21%	38%	17%

**Due to an error by the research contractor made in the execution of the methodology as applied to the Large Urban Districts, a revised version of this report was issued on 3-4-15. The error did not impact any other sections of the report nor substantively impact the Large Urban District rankings.*

TABLE 17.

Other Reported Black Male 2011-2012 Graduation Rates

Because of difference in how the report calculates estimates, the report estimates may not be comparable to the graduation rates listed in this table by the various sources. This disparity in data highlights the needs for states and districts to annually release and publish the actual graduation rates disaggregated by race and gender.

School District	2011-2012	Data Source
Baltimore City (MD)	59.8%	http://mdreportcard.org
Baltimore County (MD)	75.1%	http://mdreportcard.org
Boston (MA) ^a	62.1%	http://www.ccebos.org/Executive%20Summary_final_pages.pdf
Chicago (IL) ^{**}	44.5%	http://cps.edu/SchoolData/Pages/SchoolData.aspx
Montgomery County (MD)	76.9%	http://mdreportcard.org
Norfolk (VA) ^b	51.6%	http://bi.vita.virginia.gov/doe_bi/rdPage.aspx?rdReport=-Main&subRptName=Graduation
Prince George's County (MD)	69.0%	http://mdreportcard.org
Virginia Beach (VA) ^c	78.4%	http://www.vbschools.com/accountability/assessment_briefs/2014-15/AB46.pdf

Unless otherwise noted, these graduation rates are 4-year adjusted cohort graduation rates (ACGR).

^{**} 5-year adjusted cohort

a. Graduates are counted as students “likely to graduate” (see CCEBOS report)

b. AFGR calculated from available data (Fall Membership data and Total Diploma Gradates)

c. The on-time graduation rate is calculated by adding the number of students who earned a VDOE-approved diploma within four years of entering high school for the first time and dividing by the total number of students who enrolled in high school for the first time four years prior. These graduation rates reported are as of the publication of this brief and may change as VDOE updates the cohort to reconcile students who may have transferred to other divisions across the state or earned a diploma that has not yet been reported to VDOE

www.blackboysreport.org

www.schottfoundation.org