

Table 1: Comparison of Key Characteristics of Students in the Program Group and of Students in the Comparison Group (Including FY2005 FCAT Reading Scores)

Key Characteristics	Program Group	Number of Students	Comparison Group	Number of Students	Difference between Groups
Grade 3	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Grade 4	31.3%	5	32.6%	395	-1.3%
Grade 5	31.3%	5	28.3%	343	3.0%
Grade 6	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Grade 7	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Grade 8	6.3%	1	6.5%	79	-0.2%
Grade 9	25.0%	4	26.1%	316	-1.1%
Grade 10	6.3%	1	6.5%	79	-0.2%
Retention	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Black	100.0%	16	100.0%	1212	0.0%
White	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hispanic	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Other ethnicity	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
LEP	6.3%	1	6.5%	79	-0.2%
ESE	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Free/reduced lunch	56.3%	9	58.7%	711	-2.4%
Prior Level 1 Reading	12.5%	2	10.1%	122	2.4%
Prior Level 2 Reading	37.5%	6	37.8%	458	-0.3%
Prior Level 3 Reading	50.0%	8	52.1%	632	-2.1%
Prior Level 4 Reading	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Prior Mean DS Score	1522.4	16	1521.5	1212	0.9
Total Number of Students	100.0%	16	100.0%	1212	-1196

Table 2: Comparison of Gain from FY2005 to FY2006 between Students in the Program Group and the Comparison Group

Program Group Means: Reading					Comparison Group Means: Reading					Relative Program Value Means		
2005 DSS	2006 DSS	DSS Gain	Portion of Year's Growth ²	Years Needed Basic to Proficient ³	2005 DSS	2006 DSS	DSS Gain	Portion of Year's Growth	Years Needed Basic to Proficient	DSS Gain	Portion of Year's Growth	Years Needed Basic to Proficient
1522.4	1539.4	17.0	0.56	Not attainable	1521.5	1619.0	97.5	0.88	Not attainable	-80.5 NS	NR	NR

S = Statistical Significance NS = No Statistical Significance NR = Not Reported (difference not statistically significant)

Table 2 indicates that, from FY2005 to FY2006, there was no statistically significant difference in the mean DSS gain in reading between the Program group and the comparison group.

² A portion of a year's growth of 1.5 would indicate that approximately one and a half year's growth took place in one year.

³ The years needed to move a student from basic to proficient assumes that the reported portion of a year's growth will remain constant during each year needed to move students to proficiency. *Not attainable* was entered when students could not move from a basic to proficient level in reading by the year of their graduation.

Table 3: Comparison of the Percent of Proficient Students in FY2006 In the Program Group and the Comparison Group

Program Group: Reading		Comparison Group: Reading		Relative Program Value	
2005 Percent Proficient	2006 Percent Proficient	2005 Percent Proficient	2006 Percent Proficient	Percent of Students Proficient	FY2006 Educational Effect Size ⁴
50.0%	31.3%	52.1%	38.9%	-7.6% ^{NS}	NR

S = Statistical Significance NS = No Statistical Significance NR = Not Reported

Table 3 indicates that the percent of proficient students in the Program group was not statistically different from that of its comparison group.

Table 4: Comparison of Key Characteristics of Students in the Program Group and of Students in the Comparison Group (Including FY2005 FCAT Mathematics Scores)

Key Characteristics	Program Group	Number of Students	Comparison Group	Number of Students	Difference between Groups
Grade 3	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Grade 4	31.3%	5	32.1%	717	-0.8%
Grade 5	31.3%	5	28.3%	632	3.0%
Grade 6	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Grade 7	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Grade 8	6.3%	1	6.7%	150	-0.4%
Grade 9	25.0%	4	26.3%	587	-1.3%
Grade 10	6.3%	1	6.7%	150	-0.4%
Retention	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Black	100.0%	16	100.0%	2236	0.0%
White	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hispanic	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Other ethnicity	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
LEP	6.3%	1	5.2%	117	1.1%
ESE	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Free/reduced lunch	56.3%	9	58.9%	1317	-2.6%
Prior Level 1 Mathematics	12.5%	2	13.4%	300	-0.9%
Prior Level 2 Mathematics	50.0%	8	49.5%	1106	0.5%
Prior Level 3 Mathematics	25.0%	4	26.8%	600	-1.8%
Prior Level 4 Mathematics	12.5%	2	10.3%	230	2.2%
Prior Mean DS Score	1480.3	16	1526.0	2236	-45.7
Total Number of Students	100.0%	16	100.0%	2236	-2220

⁴ Effect sizes are reported as *Inconsequential, Slight, Moderate, Substantial, Extensive, or Exceptional.*

Table 5: Comparison of Gain from FY2005 to FY2006 between Students In the Program Group and the Comparison Group

Program Group Means: Mathematics					Comparison Group Means: Mathematics					Relative Program Value Means		
2005 DSS	2006 DSS	DSS Gain	Portion of Year's Growth	Years Needed Basic to Proficient	2005 DSS	2006 DSS	DSS Gain	Portion of Year's Growth	Years Needed Basic to Proficient	DSS Gain	Portion of Year's Growth	Years Needed Basic to Proficient
1480.3	1645.9	165.6	0.93	Not attainable	1526.0	1645.2	119.3	1.05	Not attainable	46.4 ^{NS}	NR	NR

S = Statistical Significance NS = No Statistical Significance NR = Not Reported (difference not statistically significant)

Table 5 indicates that, from FY2005 to FY2006, there was no statistically significant difference in the mean DSS gain in mathematics between the Program group and the comparison group.

Table 6: Comparison of the Percent of Proficient Students In FY2006 In the Program Group and the Comparison Group

Program Group: Mathematics		Comparison Group: Mathematics		Relative Program Value	
2005 Percent Proficient	2006 Percent Proficient	2005 Percent Proficient	2006 Percent Proficient	Percent of Students Proficient	FY2006 Educational Effect Size ⁵
37.5%	43.8%	37.1%	41.9%	1.8% ^{NS}	NR

S = Statistical Significance NS = No Statistical Significance NR = Not Reported

Table 6 indicates that the percent of proficient students in the Program group was not statistically different from that of its comparison group.

⁵ Effect sizes are reported as *Inconsequential, Slight, Moderate, Substantial, Extensive, or Exceptional.*