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## A Project of the Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee July 2008

## Introduction

The Connecticut Consortium on School Attendance (the Consortium) is a collaborative effort of local school districts and statewide agencies concerned with improving school attendance in Connecticut through better use of data. The Consortium is a project of the Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee (JJAC) which provides direct grants to member school districts and funds Consortium activities.

The purpose of this report is to summarize key findings from the collection and analysis of student attendance data from member school districts and provide aggregated results for the Consortium as a whole. Participating school districts receive district-level reports for their own district and for other member districts. For information on joining the Connecticut Consortium on school attendance, please visit www.ct.gov/opm/JJYDprograms.

This document summarizes attendance data collected for the 2006/2007 school year for 25 participating school districts. Although they represent about $26 \%$ of Connecticut's public school students from urban, suburban, and rural communities, Consortium data are skewed toward lower-income and urban districts and therefore are not statistically representative of the state as a whole. However, Consortium results provide clues as to what statewide data might reveal. See Figure 1 for information on participating school districts.

Figure 1: Consortium School Districts

|  | Population | Student Enrollment 2006/2007 | \# Public <br> Schools ${ }^{2}$ | Per Capita Income ${ }^{1}$ | DRG ${ }^{3}$ | Expenditures Per Student ${ }^{4}$ | Average Daily Attendance 2006/2007 ${ }^{5}$ | \% Students With Less Than 90\% Attendance 2006/2007 ${ }^{5}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ansonia | 18,554 | 2,883 | 4 | \$20,504 | H | \$9,087 | 94.1\% | 15\% |
| Bethel | 18,067 | 3,175 | 5 | \$28,927 | D | \$11,247 | 95.3\% | 8.7\% |
| Canterbury | 4,692 | 506 | 2 | \$22,317 | F | \$11,941 | 95.7\% | 6.7\% |
| Danbury | 74,848 | 10,736 | 18 | \$24,500 | H | \$10,707 | 94.3\% | 16.1\% |
| East Windsor | 9,818 | 1,581 | 3 | \$24,899 | F | \$9,912 | 95.2\% | 10.4\% |
| Fairfield | 57,340 | 9,568 | 16 | \$43,670 | B | \$13,576 | 96.0\% | 5.7\% |
| Hamden | 56,913 | 6,619 | 10 | \$26,039 | G | \$12,403 | 95.8\% | 7.7\% |
| Hartford | 121,578 | 25,921 | 39 | \$13,428 | I | \$14,590 | 90.9\% | 31.9\% |
| Killingly | 16,472 | 2,917 | 4 | \$19,779 | G | \$11,268 | 93.1\% | 20.4\% |
| Middletown | 43,167 | 5,386 | 11 | \$25,720 | G | \$12,060 | 94.9\% | 13.4\% |
| New Britain | 71,538 | 11,533 | 15 | \$18,404 | I | \$11,263 | 89.4\% | 32.9\% |
| New Haven | 123,626 | 19,504 | 42 | \$16,393 | I | \$13,883 | 91.5\% | 25.5\% |
| New Milford | 27,121 | 5,133 | 6 | \$29,630 | D | \$10,180 | 94.1\% | 15.0\% |
| Norwich | 36,117 | 3,906 | 11 | \$20,742 | H | \$11,964 | 95.6\% | 12.8\% |
| Plainfield | 14,619 | 2,641 | 6 | \$18,706 | G | \$11,711 | 94.3\% | 13.4\% |
| Region 10 | 16,473 | 2,796 | 4 | \$34,144 | C | \$10,108 | 96.9\% | 2.7\% |
| Region 13 | 10,830 | 2,123 | 6 | \$27,911 | C | \$11,915 | 96.3\% | 5.7\% |
| Region 19 | 30,777 | 1,245 | 1 | \$20,897 | C | \$12,215 | 92.2\% | 22.7\% |
| Stonington | 17,906 | 2,621 | 6 | \$29,653 | D | \$10,975 | 95.0\% | 9.4\% |
| Thompson | 8,878 | 1.466 | 3 | \$21,003 | F | \$9,759 | 94.5\% | 11.5\% |
| Vernon | 28,063 | 3,445 | 7 | \$25,150 | G | \$11,320 | 95.4\% | 10.3\% |
| Waterbury | 107,271 | 16,859 | 28 | \$17,701 | I | \$11,355 | 93.4\% | 18.7\% |
| Waterford | 19,152 | 3,095 | 6 | \$26,807 | D | \$11,471 | 95.9\% | 6.5\% |
| Winchester | 10,664 | 1,046 | 4 | \$22,589 | G | \$12,121 | 93.6\% | 14.1\% |
| Windham | 22,857 | 3,249 | 6 | \$16,978 | I | \$12,236 | 94.2\% | 17.3\% |
| Consortium Total/ Avg. | 967,341 | 149,954 | 263 | \$23,860 | - | \$11,571 | 93.3\% | 19.3\% |
| State Total/ Avg. | 3,405,584 | 561,091 | 1,020 | \$28,766 | - | \$12,012 | Comparable Data Not Available | Comparable Data Not Available |

## Notes:

1. Population and per capita income figures are based on 2000 U.S. Census data.
2. Data on district enrollment and numbers of public schools are based on 2006/2007 data submitted to the Consortium by member school districts. State figures are 2006/2007 data published by the Connecticut State Department of Education (SDE).
3. District Reference Groups (DRGs) are categories used by the SDE to group similar districts based on enrollment and indicators of socioeconomic status and need. Districts are classified into DRGs A through I, with DRG A being the most affluent.
4. District and State expenditures per student are based on 2006/2007 data on the SDE web site and in the Strategic School Profiles.
5. Average daily attendance (ADA) and the percentage of students with less than $90 \%$ attendance are calculated using Consortium data for the 2006/2007 school year. ADA is the number of days in attendance for all students divided by the possible days in attendance based on all students' enrollment. The percentage of students with less than $90 \%$ attendance identifies chronic non-attenders.

As shown in Figure 1 above, the Consortium tracks two key measures of attendance: average daily attendance (ADA) and the percentage of students attending less than $90 \%$ of the school year, also referred to as chronic non-attenders. Figure 2 below defines each of these measures. When calculating attendance, the Consortium counts the number of days each student spends in a school environment during the year. Consortium data does not differentiate between locallydefined designations of "excused" and "unexcused" absence. Students assigned to in-school suspension are counted as being present, while out-of-school suspension days are counted as absences.

Figure 2: Key Attendance Measures

Average Daily Attendance (ADA)

The number of days in attendance for all students divided by the number of days enrolled (possible days in attendance).

$$
\text { ADA }=\frac{\text { \# Days in Attendance }}{\# \text { Days Enrolled }}
$$

## Attending Less Than 90\% (Chronic Non-Attenders)

The percentage of students attending less than $90 \%$ of possible school days.

Measures the extent of extreme levels of absenteeism ( $18+$ days per year). This measure is important because a relatively small number of chronic non-attenders may have a significant impact on ADA.

## Key Findings

This section contains key findings from the Consortium's collection of 2006/2007 attendance data. Charts illustrate the findings and are accompanied by explanatory bullet points. The charts are based on more detailed data tables which are provided for reference in the appendix.

## A. Average Daily Attendance

Chart 1 displays average daily attendance for the Consortium as a whole and by the elementary, middle, and high school levels. Note that levels of schooling are identified by each district and are not associated with specific grade levels. For example, one district may define middle school to be Grades 6-8 and another may define it as Grades 7-8. As shown in Chart 1:

- Average daily attendance for the Consortium as a whole was $93.3 \%$.
- Overall, students were absent about 12 days or more than 2 weeks.
- At the high school level, students missed an average of 17 days during the year, which is about $31 / 2$ weeks of school.
- Average daily attendance ranged from a minimum of $89.4 \%$ to a maximum of $96.9 \%$ overall. The ranges in ADA by level of school were: $93.0 \%$ to $96.7 \%$ for elementary school, $88.2 \%$ to $97.3 \%$ for middle school, and $60.8 \%$ to $97.5 \%$ for high school (from Table 1 in the appendix).

Chart 1. Average Daily Attendance by Level of School All Consortium Districts: 2006-2007

Source: Appendix, Table 1


Note: For all charts, the levels of schooling (elementary, middle and high) are identified by each district and are not associated with specific grade levels across Consortium districts.

## B. Students Attending Less Than $\mathbf{9 0 \%}$

Chart 2 illustrates another key attendance measure: those students who attend school less than $90 \%$ of the time. Students in this category exhibit extreme levels of absenteeism and are likely to fall behind academically. It is important to review this measure in conjunction with average daily attendance because a relatively small number of chronic non-attenders may have a significant impact on ADA. As shown in Chart 2:

- Overall, $19.3 \%$ of all students attend school less than $90 \%$ of the time.
- These chronic non-attenders miss nearly a month of school each year on average.
- These results are particularly concerning at the high school level, where nearly $30 \%$ of students are chronic non-attenders (attend less than $90 \%$ of the time).
- The percentage of students attending less than $90 \%$ of the time ranged from a minimum of $2.7 \%$ to a maximum of $32.9 \%$ overall. The ranges by level of school were: $2.1 \%$ to $26.1 \%$ for elementary school, $3.0 \%$ to $42.3 \%$ for middle school, and $3.5 \%$ to $61.9 \%$ for high school (from Table 2 in the appendix).

Chart 2. Percent of Students Attending Less than $\mathbf{9 0 \%}$ by Level of School All Consortium Districts: 2006-2007

Source: Appendix, Table 2


## C. Attendance by Grade Level

Analysis by grade level reveals a similar pattern of attendance across school districts both for ADA and for students attending less than $90 \%$. As shown in Charts 3 and 4:

- Average daily attendance tends to be somewhat low in Kindergarten and grade 1.
- Attendance is highest in grades 3-5 and then falls through the middle school years. ADA is dramatically lower in grade 9 than in any other grade.
- Attendance tends to decline when students transition between school buildings, e.g. from elementary school to middle school and from middle school to high school.
- Attendance is somewhat higher in grades 10-12 relative to $9^{\text {th }}$ grade attendance, which may be due to changes in student enrollment (see Chart 4a).
- Student enrollment increases between the $8^{\text {th }}$ and $9^{\text {th }}$ grades, and then decreases significantly between grades 9 and 10 .
- This may reflect students being retained in the $9^{\text {th }}$ grade or students dropping out.
- Changes in enrollment in grades 8-12 may also reflect student drop-out rates.
- Chart 4 shows the percentage of students attending less than $90 \%$ of the time by grade level, and it closely mirrors the results for ADA.
- Chronic non-attendance is particularly acute in grade 9 , with over $30 \%$ of students attending school less than $90 \%$ of the time.


## Chart 3: Average Daily Attendance by Grade Level

All Consortium Districts: 2006-2007
Source: Appendix, Table 3


Chart 4: Percent Students Attending Less Than 90\% by Grade Level All Consortium Districts: 2006-2007

Source: Appendix, Table 4


## Chart 4a: Student Enrollment by Grade Level for Grades 8-12 <br> All Consortium Districts: 2006-2007

Source: Appendix, Table 3


## D. Attendance Patterns by District Reference Group

One of the benefits of collecting student-level daily attendance data is that it can be disaggregated by student, school, and district characteristics. Such analytical techniques may reveal patterns of attendance that are not evident when looking at aggregate numbers.

Charts 5 and 6 show Consortium data disaggregated by District Reference Group (DRG). DRG is a term used by the Connecticut State Department of Education to group districts with similar characteristics based on student enrollment and indicators of socioeconomic status. There are nine DRG classifications labeled "A" through "I" with DRG A being the most affluent. Consortium data represents most of the DRGs, although less affluent DRGs are more heavily represented. Figure 4 shows the DRG designations for Consortium districts.

Figure 4: Consortium Districts by DRG Designation

| DRG* | District | DRG* | District |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B | Fairfield | G | Hamden |
| C | Region 10 |  | Killingly |
|  | Region 13 |  | Middletown |
|  | Region 19 |  | Plainfield |
| D | Bethel |  | Vernon |
|  | New Milford |  | Winchester |
|  | Stonington | H | Ansonia |
|  | Waterford |  | Danbury |
| F | Canterbury |  | Norwich |
|  | East Windsor | 1 | Hartford |
|  | Thompson |  | New Britain |
|  |  |  | New Haven |
| * DRG = District Reference Group |  |  | Waterbury |

Note: DRG analysis is done only if there are at least two DRGs represented in the member school districts.

Charts 5 and 6 show ADA and students attending less than $90 \%$ of the school year disaggregated by DRG. The charts reveal that:

- Average daily attendance declines somewhat by DRG, with the most pronounced drop occurring in the least affluent district (DRG I).
- Similarly, the percentage of students attending less than $90 \%$ of the time generally increases by DRG and spikes sharply for districts in DRG I.
- These results suggest that factors related to a community's size, socioeconomic status, and population demographics may contribute to student absenteeism.


## Chart 5: Average Daily Attendance by District Reference Group

 All Consortium Districts: 2006-2007Source: Appendix, Table 5


## Chart 6: Percent Students Attending Less Than 90\% by DRG

 All Consortium Districts: 2006-2007Source: Appendix, Table 6


## E. Attendance Patterns by Participation in Special Programs

Charts 7 and 8 show rates of attendance for special education students, English language learners, and students receiving free/reduced lunch. The charts show that:

- Special education students, English language learners, and students receiving free/reduced lunch have relatively higher rates of absenteeism as measured by ADA.
- These students are somewhat more likely to be chronic non-attenders, with over $25 \%$ of students participating in these programs attending less than $90 \%$ of the time.
- High school students in these programs are highly likely to become chronic nonattenders, with about $42 \%$ of them attending less than $90 \%$ of the school year.
- It is important to note that rates of student participation in special programs varies considerably across districts and DRGs.

Chart 7: Average Daily Attendance by Participation in Special Programs All Consortium Districts: 2006-2007


## Chart 8: Percent Students Attending Less Than 90\% by Participation in Special Programs - All Consortium Districts: 2006-2007

Source : Appendix, Tables $8 a-8 b$


## F. Attendance Patterns by Race/Ethnicity and Economic Status

Charts 5 and 6, which show attendance by DRG, indicate that students from less affluent districts have lower attendance rates. In Connecticut, less affluent districts typically have large minority populations, so these results raise the question of whether poor attendance is related to race/ethnicity, poverty, or both. Consortium data analysis uses student participation in free/reduced lunch programs as a rough indicator of economic status (i.e., poverty). Charts 9 and 10 show ADA and students attending less than $90 \%$ by race/ethnicity for students who do and do not receive free/reduced lunch. The charts reveal that:

- There are differences in ADA and rates of chronic non-attendance across racial/ethnic groups, with minority students having more absences in general.
- Taking into account students with low economic status reduces some but not all difference in attendance rates across racial/ethnic groups.
- Hispanic students have the lowest rates of ADA and their rate of chronic nonattendance remains above 25\% for Hispanic students even after controlling for participation in school lunch programs.

Chart 9: Average Daily Attendance by Race/Ethnicity and Economic Status All Consortium Districts: 2006-2007

Source: Appendix, Table 9


Note: In the above chart, economic status is measured by whether students participate in Free/Reduced School Lunch programs (FRSL).

Chart 10: Percent Students Attending Less Than 90\% by Race/Ethnicity and Economic Status - All Consortium Districts: 2006-2007

Source: Appendix, Table 10


Note: In the above chart, economic status is measured by whether students participate in Free/Reduced School Lunch programs (FRSL).

## Summary of Key Findings

Analysis of 2006/2007 Consortium data reveals the following about student attendance:

- Average daily attendance for all students in the Consortium is $93.3 \%$, which means that the average student misses more than 2 weeks of school each year.
- About 19\% of students are chronic non-attenders, which means that they attend school less than $90 \%$ of the time. Such students miss 18 or more days of school each year, or nearly a month on average.
- Attendance is particularly concerning at the high school level where students miss 17 days of school on average and nearly $30 \%$ of students are chronic non-attenders
- Patterns of attendance tend to vary by grade level, by DRG, and by other student factors such as students' race/ethnicity and their participation in special education, English language learning, and free/reduced lunch programs.
- Rates of attendance decline somewhat by DRG, with a pronounced drop occurring in the least affluent district (DRG I). This suggests that student absenteeism is related to community size, socioeconomics, and population demographics.


## APPENDIX

## Consortium Attendance Data Tables All Consortium School Districts: 2006-2007

| Table 1. | Average Daily Attendance, Percentage and Number of Students, and Minimum and Maximum Percentage, by Level of School—All Districts |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2006-07 |  | 2006-07 |  |
|  | Percent | Number | Minimum | Maximum |
| Total | 93.3 | 149,954 | 89.4 | 96.9 |
| School level |  |  |  |  |
| Elementary | 94.7 | 76,540 | 93.0 | 96.7 |
| Middle | 93.8 | 28,236 | 88.2 | 97.3 |
| High | 90.6 | 42,477 | 60.8 | 97.5 |


| Table 2. | Percentage and Number of Students, and Minimum and Maximum Percentage, Attending Less Than $90 \%$, by Level of School—All Districts |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2006-07 |  | 2006-07 |  |
|  | Percent | Number | Minimum | Maximum |
| Total | 19.3 | 28,964 | 2.7 | 32.9 |
| School level |  |  |  |  |
| Elementary | 14.4 | 11,050 | 2.1 | 26.1 |
| Middle | 18.2 | 5,139 | 3.0 | 42.3 |
| High | 28.7 | 12,175 | 3.5 | 61.9 |


| Table 3. | Average Daily Attendance, Percentage and <br> Number of Students, by Grade Level-All <br> Districts |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2006-07 |  |
| Total | Percent | Number |
| Grade level | 93.3 |  |
| Kindergarten |  | 149,954 |
| Grade 1 | 93.5 |  |
| Grade 2 | 94.5 | 12,310 |
| Grade 3 | 94.8 | 12,696 |
| Grade 4 | 95.2 | 12,400 |
| Grade 5 | 95.1 | 12,116 |
| Grade 6 | 95.3 | 11,697 |
| Grade 7 | 94.6 | 11,420 |
| Grade 8 | 93.6 | 11,396 |
| Grade 9 | 92.8 | 11,700 |
| Grade 10 | 89.6 | 11,644 |
| Grade 11 | 91.0 | 13,247 |
| Grade 12 | 90.6 | 10,715 |
|  | 91.1 | 10,014 |



|  |  | 2006-07 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total |  | Number |  |
| Grade level |  |  |  |
| Kindergarten | 19.3 | 28,964 |  |
| Grade 1 |  |  |  |
| Grade 2 | 20.7 | 2,552 |  |
| Grade 3 | 15.5 | 1,965 |  |
| Grade 4 | 11.2 | 1,636 |  |
| Grade 5 | 11.7 | 1,413 |  |
| Grade 6 | 10.9 | 1,371 |  |
| Grade 7 | 15.1 | 1,241 |  |
| Grade 8 | 19.7 | 1,724 |  |
| Grade 9 | 21.6 | 2,302 |  |
| Grade 10 | 31.0 | 2,520 |  |
| Grade 11 | 27.6 | 4,112 |  |
| Grade 12 | 28.1 | 2,959 |  |


| Table 5. | Average Daily Attendance, by District Reference Group (DRG)-All Districts |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Consortium Total | DRG C | DRG D | DRG F | DRG G | DRG H | DRG I |
| Total | 93.3 | 95.8 | 94.9 | 95.0 | 94.8 | 94.6 | 91.5 |
| School level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Elementary | 94.7 | 96.5 | 95.4 | 95.0 | 95.8 | 95.4 | 93.6 |
| Middle | 93.8 | 96.7 | 95.1 | 95.5 | 95.0 | 95.4 | 91.3 |
| High | 90.6 | 94.6 | 94.0 | 94.3 | 93.0 | 91.8 | 87.4 |
| Gender |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 93.2 | 96.0 | 94.8 | 95.1 | 94.8 | 94.3 | 91.3 |
| Female | 93.4 | 95.5 | 95.0 | 94.9 | 94.9 | 94.9 | 91.7 |
| Special Education | 90.9 | 94.7 | 93.0 | 93.8 | 93.5 | 93.6 | 88.6 |
| Bilingual/ESL | 92.1 | 96.6 | 95.4 | 94.4 | 95.3 | 94.8 | 91.2 |
| Free/Reduced School Lunch | 91.8 | 93.8 | 93.0 | 94.0 | 93.8 | 94.2 | 91.1 |
| Grade level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kindergarten | 93.5 | 96.7 | 94.9 | 94.4 | 95.1 | 93.8 | 92.4 |
| Grade 1 | 94.5 | 95.9 | 95.4 | 94.8 | 95.7 | 95.1 | 93.5 |
| Grade 2 | 94.8 | 96.3 | 95.2 | 95.2 | 95.9 | 95.6 | 94.0 |
| Grade 3 | 95.2 | 96.7 | 95.8 | 95.6 | 96.0 | 95.9 | 94.3 |
| Grade 4 | 95.1 | 96.8 | 95.8 | 95.1 | 95.8 | 95.9 | 94.3 |
| Grade 5 | 95.3 | 96.7 | 95.5 | 95.7 | 96.2 | 96.2 | 94.5 |
| Grade 6 | 94.6 | 96.6 | 95.6 | 95.5 | 95.7 | 96.0 | 93.3 |
| Grade 7 | 93.6 | 96.7 | 95.3 | 95.5 | 95.2 | 95.6 | 91.6 |
| Grade 8 | 92.8 | 96.8 | 94.7 | 95.3 | 94.8 | 94.7 | 90.6 |
| Grade 9 | 89.6 | 95.9 | 94.6 | 94.4 | 93.0 | 91.3 | 85.7 |
| Grade 10 | 91.0 | 94.8 | 94.6 | 94.2 | 93.2 | 92.7 | 87.9 |
| Grade 11 | 90.6 | 93.7 | 93.7 | 94.5 | 92.9 | 92.4 | 87.2 |
| Grade 12 | 91.1 | 94.1 | 93.1 | 93.8 | 93.2 | 91.0 | 88.5 |


| Table 6. | Percentage of Students Attending Less Than 90\%, by District Reference Group (DRG)— All Districts |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Consortium Total | DRG C | DRG D | DRG F | DRG G | DRG H | DRG I |
| Total | 19.3 | 7.8 | 10.7 | 10.3 | 12.1 | 15.2 | 26.9 |
| School level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Elementary | 14.4 | 3.5 | 7.6 | 10.0 | 7.6 | 10.5 | 20.3 |
| Middle | 18.2 | 3.1 | 9.0 | 7.9 | 12.6 | 13.2 | 29.0 |
| High | 28.7 | 13.9 | 16.0 | 14.1 | 19.7 | 27.5 | 39.2 |
| Gender |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 19.9 | 6.4 | 11.3 | 9.4 | 12.4 | 16.3 | 27.8 |
| Female | 18.7 | 9.1 | 10.0 | 11.3 | 11.9 | 14.0 | 26.0 |
| Special Education | 28.0 | 13.3 | 19.8 | 15.0 | 18.3 | 19.2 | 36.8 |
| Bilingual/ESL | 25.8 | 6.7 | 14.0 | 10.5 | 14.7 | 14.1 | 29.2 |
| Free/Reduced School Lunch | 26.1 | 17.3 | 21.1 | 16.3 | 17.5 | 17.4 | 28.9 |
| Grade level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kindergarten | 20.7 | 1.1 | 9.7 | 13.7 | 10.8 | 19.3 | 27.9 |
| Grade 1 | 15.5 | 4.8 | 7.9 | 10.4 | 8.9 | 11.7 | 21.5 |
| Grade 2 | 13.2 | 4.0 | 8.3 | 8.6 | 6.8 | 8.7 | 18.8 |
| Grade 3 | 11.7 | 3.1 | 5.7 | 7.1 | 7.1 | 7.8 | 16.7 |
| Grade 4 | 11.7 | 2.3 | 5.9 | 10.1 | 7.3 | 7.6 | 16.7 |
| Grade 5 | 10.9 | 4.6 | 6.2 | 7.1 | 5.6 | 7.1 | 15.7 |
| Grade 6 | 15.1 | 4.5 | 7.7 | 6.3 | 9.2 | 10.1 | 21.8 |
| Grade 7 | 19.7 | 2.1 | 9.1 | 7.3 | 12.0 | 13.5 | 28.9 |
| Grade 8 | 21.6 | 3.6 | 11.9 | 11.2 | 13.2 | 15.9 | 30.9 |
| Grade 9 | 31.0 | 7.9 | 13.7 | 13.3 | 19.2 | 29.1 | 42.8 |
| Grade 10 | 27.6 | 14.0 | 14.4 | 16.7 | 20.8 | 22.8 | 37.9 |
| Grade 11 | 28.1 | 18.8 | 17.4 | 12.9 | 20.0 | 24.9 | 38.7 |
| Grade 12 | 27.4 | 15.1 | 19.1 | 13.4 | 17.3 | 32.9 | 37.8 |



|  | 2006-07 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent | Number |
| Total | 93.3 |  |
|  |  | 149,954 |
| Gender <br> Male | 93.2 |  |
| Female | 93.4 | 76,570 |

Race/ethnicity

| White | 94.8 | 64,593 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Black | 92.6 | 34,909 |
| Hispanic | 91.2 | 44,500 |
| Asian | 95.4 | 5,368 |
| American Indian | 93.4 | 543 |
| Other | 92.7 | 41 |
|  | 92.0 | 85,361 |
| All minorities | 90.9 | 18,203 |
|  |  |  |
| Special Education | 92.1 | 15,079 |
| Bilingual/ESL | 91.8 | 72,745 |
| Free/Reduced School Lunch |  |  |

**Denominator is smaller than 10 students.


|  | 2006-07 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent | Number |
| Total |  |  |


| Gender |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Male | 90.4 | 21,097 |
| Female | 90.8 | 21,380 |


| Race/ethnicity |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| White | 93.3 |
| Black | 89.4 |
| Hispanic | 85.5 |
| Asian | 93.4 |
| American Indian | 90.7 |
| Other | ** |
|  | 87.9 |
| All minorities | 86.3 |
| Special Education | 86.8 |
| Bilingual/ESL |  |
|  | 20,494 |
| Free/Reduced School Lunch | 87.3 |

**Denominator is smaller than 10 students.

| Table 8a. | Percentage and Number of Students Attending Less Than 90\%, by Selected Student Characteristics-All Schools-All Districts |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2006-07 |  |
|  | Percent | Number |
| Total | 19.3 | 28,964 |
| Gender |  |  |
| Male | 19.9 | 15,227 |
| Female | 18.7 | 13,737 |
| Race/ethnicity |  |  |
| White | 11.3 | 7,330 |
| Black | 23.1 | 8,057 |
| Hispanic | 28.9 | 12,868 |
| Asian | 11.1 | 597 |
| American Indian | 18.6 | 101 |
| Other | 26.8 | 11 |
| All minorities | 25.3 | 21,634 |
| Special Education | 28.0 | 5,099 |
| Bilingual/ESL | 25.8 | 3,895 |
| Free/Reduced School Lunch | 26.1 | 19,019 |

[^0]| Table 8b. | Percentage and Number of Students <br> Attending Less Than 90\%, by Selected <br> Student Characteristics-High Schools-All <br> Districts |
| :--- | :--- |


|  | 2006-07 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent | Number |
| Total | 28.7 |  |
|  |  | 12,175 |
| Gender |  |  |
| Male | 29.1 | 6,146 |
| Female | 28.2 | 6,029 |

Race/ethnicity

| White | 17.9 | 3,595 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Black | 33.8 | 3,456 |
| Hispanic | 45.3 | 4,798 |
| Asian | 19.3 | 288 |
| American Indian | 31.5 | 34 |
| Other | $* *$ | $* *$ |
| All minorities | 38.2 | 8,580 |
|  | 41.9 | 2,173 |
| Special Education | 42.3 | 1,197 |
| Bilingual/ESL |  |  |
| Free/Reduced School Lunch | 41.0 | 6,982 |

**Denominator is smaller than 10 students.

| Table 9. | Average Daily A (FRSL)—All Dis | dance, by | Ethnicity and | cipation in | /Reduced Sch | Lunch |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | FRSL Pa | cipants | FRSL Non- | ticipants | FRSL Partici participant | ts and Nonombined |
|  | Average daily attendance | Number of students | Average daily attendance | Number of students | Average daily attendance | Number of students |
| Race/Ethnicity | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N |
| White | 93.1 | 13017 | 95.3 | 51576 | 94.8 | 64593 |
| Black | 92.1 | 23860 | 93.7 | 11049 | 92.6 | 34909 |
| Hispanic | 91.0 | 33871 | 91.8 | 10629 | 91.2 | 44500 |
| Asian | 95.0 | 1723 | 95.7 | 3645 | 95.4 | 5368 |
| Am Indian | 92.7 | 267 | 94.1 | 276 | 93.4 | 543 |
| Other | ** | 7 | 92.1 | 34 | 92.7 | 41 |

**Denominator is smaller than 10 students.

| Table 10. | centage Free/Redu | umber of Stu chool Lunch | Attending <br> --All Dis | Than 90\%, by | ce/Ethnicity | Participation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | FRSL | cipants | FRSL N | ticipants | FRSL Parti particip | ts and Nonombined |
|  | Percent | Number of students | Percent | Number of students | Percent | Number of students |
| Race/Ethnicity | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N |
| White | 20.3 | 2637 | 9.1 | 4693 | 11.3 | 7330 |
| Black | 25.1 | 5995 | 18.7 | 2062 | 23.1 | 8057 |
| Hispanic | 29.8 | 10098 | 26.1 | 2770 | 28.9 | 12868 |
| Asian | 13.2 | 227 | 10.2 | 370 | 11.1 | 597 |
| Am Indian | 23.2 | 62 | 14.1 | 39 | 18.6 | 101 |
| Other | ** | 0 | 32.4 | 11 | 26.8 | 11 |

[^1]
[^0]:    **Denominator is smaller than 10 students.

[^1]:    **Denominator is smaller than 10 students.

