

Table 1: Comparison of Key Characteristics of Students in the Program Group and of Students in the Comparison Group (Including FY2006 FCAT Reading Scores)

Key Characteristics	Program Group	Number of Students	Comparison Group	Number of Students	Difference between Groups
Grade 3	2.9%	1	0.4%	8	2.4%
Grade 4	51.4%	18	49.4%	881	2.1%
Grade 5	17.1%	6	18.8%	336	-1.7%
Grade 6	14.3%	5	15.7%	280	-1.4%
Grade 7	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Grade 8	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Grade 9	2.9%	1	3.1%	56	-0.3%
Grade 10	11.4%	4	12.5%	224	-1.1%
Retention	2.9%	1	0.4%	8	2.4%
Black	97.1%	34	96.9%	1729	0.3%
White	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hispanic	2.9%	1	3.1%	56	-0.3%
Other ethnicity	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
LEP	17.1%	6	17.0%	303	0.2%
ESE	5.7%	2	6.3%	112	-0.6%
Free/reduced lunch	65.7%	23	68.8%	1228	-3.1%
Prior Level 1 Reading	31.4%	11	28.5%	508	3.0%
Prior Level 2 Reading	22.9%	8	24.6%	439	-1.7%
Prior Level 3 Reading	45.7%	16	46.9%	838	-1.2%
Prior Level 4 Reading	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Prior Mean DS Score	1318.4	35	1364.9	1785	-46.5
Total Number of Students	100.0%	35	100.0%	1785	-1750

Table 2: Comparison of Gain from FY2006 to FY2007 between Students in the Program Group and the Comparison Group

Program Group Means: Reading					Comparison Group Means: Reading					Relative Program Value Means		
2006 DSS	2007 DSS	DSS Gain	Portion of Year's Growth ²	Years Needed Basic to Proficient ³	2006 DSS	2007 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
1318.4	1481.1	162.7	1.00	Not attainable	1364.9	1500.5	135.6	1.12	Not attainable	27.2 ^{NS}	NR	NR

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

Table 2 indicates that, from FY2006 to FY2007, 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 FY2007 in the Program Group and the Comparison Group

Program Group: Reading		Comparison Group: Reading		Relative Program Value	
2006 Percent Proficient	2007 Percent Proficient	2006 Percent Proficient	2007 Percent Proficient	Percent of Students Proficient	FY2007 Educational Effect Size ⁴
45.7%	31.4%	46.9%	39.4%	-8.0% ^{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 FY2006 FCAT Mathematics Scores)

Key Characteristics	Program Group	Number of Students	Comparison Group	Number of Students	Difference between Groups
Grade 3	2.9%	1	0.1%	2	2.7%
Grade 4	51.4%	18	52.0%	695	-0.6%
Grade 5	17.1%	6	18.0%	240	-0.8%
Grade 6	14.3%	5	15.0%	200	-0.7%
Grade 7	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Grade 8	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Grade 9	2.9%	1	3.0%	40	-0.1%
Grade 10	11.4%	4	12.0%	160	-0.5%
Retention	2.9%	1	0.1%	2	2.7%
Black	97.1%	34	97.0%	1297	0.1%
White	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hispanic	2.9%	1	3.0%	40	-0.1%
Other ethnicity	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
LEP	17.1%	6	16.6%	222	0.5%
ESE	5.7%	2	6.0%	80	-0.3%
Free/reduced lunch	65.7%	23	68.8%	920	-3.1%
Prior Level 1 Mathematics	8.6%	3	9.0%	120	-0.4%
Prior Level 2 Mathematics	31.4%	11	32.9%	440	-1.5%
Prior Level 3 Mathematics	48.6%	17	46.7%	624	1.9%
Prior Level 4 Mathematics	8.6%	3	9.0%	120	-0.4%
Prior Mean DS Score	1466.6	35	1481.8	1337	-15.2
Total Number of Students	100.0%	35	100.0%	1337	-1302

⁴ Effect size is reported only when there is statistical significance. Effect sizes are reported as *Inconsequential*, *Slight*, *Moderate*, *Substantial*, *Extensive*, or *Exceptional*.

Table 5: Comparison of Gain from FY2006 to FY2007 between Students in the Program Group and the Comparison Group

Program Group Means: Mathematics					Comparison Group Means: Mathematics					Relative Program Value Means		
2006 DSS	2007 DSS	DSS Gain	Portion of Year's Growth	Years Needed Basic to Proficient	2006 DSS	2007 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
1466.6	1558.1	91.5	0.63	Not attainable	1481.8	1590.8	109.0	0.95	Not attainable	-17.5 NS	NR	NR

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

Table 5 indicates that, from FY2006 to FY2007, 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 FY2007 in the Program Group and the Comparison Group

Program Group: Mathematics		Comparison Group: Mathematics		Relative Program Value	
2006 Percent Proficient	2007 Percent Proficient	2006 Percent Proficient	2007 Percent Proficient	Percent of Students Proficient	FY2007 Educational Effect Size ⁵
60.0%	54.3%	58.1%	53.6%	0.6% 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 size is reported only when there is statistical significance. Effect sizes are reported as *Inconsequential*, *Slight*, *Moderate*, *Substantial*, *Extensive*, or *Exceptional*.

Table 7: The Number and Percent of Proficient Students in FY2007 in the Program Group and the Comparison Group

Grade Levels	Program Group: Reading			Comparison Group: Reading		
	Number Tested	Number Proficient	Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Number Proficient	Percent Proficient
Grade 3	1	0	0.0%	8	5	62.5%
Grade 4	18	7	38.9%	881	385	43.7%
Grade 5	6	2	33.3%	336	161	47.9%
Grade 6	5	1	20.0%	280	106	37.9%
Grade 7	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Grade 8	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Grade 9	1	0	0.0%	56	11	19.6%
Grade 10	4	1	25.0%	224	36	16.1%

Table 8: The Number and Percent of Proficient Students in FY2007 in the Program Group and the Comparison Group

Grade Levels	Program Group: Mathematics			Comparison Group: Mathematics		
	Number Tested	Number Proficient	Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Number Proficient	Percent Proficient
Grade 3	1	1	100.0%	2	2	100.0%
Grade 4	18	13	72.2%	695	485	69.8%
Grade 5	6	2	33.3%	240	72	30.0%
Grade 6	5	0	0.0%	200	47	23.5%
Grade 7	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Grade 8	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Grade 9	1	1	100.0%	40	8	20.0%
Grade 10	4	2	50.0%	160	103	64.4%