



Reading Achievement of Students in Reading First Schools and K-3 Reading Coach Schools: Status Report for 2003-2004

Prepared by:

Grace L. Albritton, Ph.D.
Supervisor of Evaluation
September 2004

John A. Hilderbrand, Ph.D., Director
Grace L. Albritton, Ph.D., Supervisor of Evaluation
Department of Assessment and Accountability
Division of Information and Technology
School District of Hillsborough County
Tampa, Florida

The School Board of Hillsborough County, Florida

Glenn Barrington, Chair
Candy Olson, Vice Chair
Carolyn Bricklemyer
Jennifer Faliero
Carol W. Kurdell
Jack R. Lamb, Ed.D.
Doris Ross Reddick

Earl J. Lennard, Ph.D.
Superintendent of Schools

James Hamilton, Ph.D.
Chief of Staff

Jack Davis
Chief Information and Technology Officer

Executive Summary

In 2003-2004, the Reading First grant was implemented in 43 elementary schools in the district. Members of the School Board requested comparative reading achievement data for students in Reading First schools and in K-3 Reading Coach schools. Eighteen Reading First schools were matched with eighteen K-3 Reading Coaches schools. Highlights and recommendations based on the status report follow.

Conclusions

After one year of implementation of the Reading First grant, students in grades 1 and 2 at Reading First schools and at matched K-3 Reading Coach schools demonstrated comparable reading achievement on the *Stanford-9*. Students in grade 3 at Reading First schools and at matched K-3 Reading Coach schools demonstrated comparable achievement on the *FCAT Sunshine State Standards* and on the *FCAT NRT*.

The substantial funds obtained through the Reading First grant did not increase the reading achievement of students in Reading First schools above the level of achievement in matched K-3 Reading Coach schools. Nor did the reading achievement of grade 1-3 students in Reading First schools decline in comparison to the reading achievement of students in matched K-3 Reading Coach schools. At every grade level and on each test and subtest available, students in Reading First Schools and in K-3 Reading Coach schools performed comparably. A review of the summary data at the bottom of tables 3-12 reveals the similarity in reading achievement of the two groups. Tables are ordered by grade level. At grades 2 and 3 pre-posttest data are provided.

Recommendations

1. Continue participation in the Reading First grant but continue to advocate for changes for purposes of program improvement.
2. Monitor performance for another year or longer to determine whether reading achievement, particularly reading comprehension, continues to be comparable over time for students in Reading First schools and in K-3 Reading Coach schools.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	i
Table of Contents	ii
Introduction	1
Context	2
No Child Left Behind (NCLB)	2
Title I: Reading First (I-R-1)	2
The K-2 Reading Coaches Initiative	3
The Dilemma Posed by the State's Just Read, Florida Grant	3
Program Description	5
Table 1. Comparison of Reading First and Non-Reading First Schools	5
Questions of Interest and Method	7
Questions of Interest	7
Sample of Schools	7
Table 2. K-2 Reading Coach and Reading First Matched Schools	8
Instruments and Analysis	8
Comparative Data	9
Grade 1 Reading Achievement	9
Table 3. 2003 and 2004 <i>Stanford-9</i> Reading Grade 1 Total Reading for Matched Schools: Status Scores	9
Table 4. 2004 <i>Stanford-9</i> Reading Scores at Grade 1 for Matched Schools	10
Table 5. Percent of Grade 1 Students Meeting <i>Stanford-9</i> Total Reading in 2003 and 2004	11
Grade 2 Reading Achievement	12
Table 6. 2003 and 2004 <i>Stanford-9</i> Reading Grade 2 Total Reading for Matched Schools: Status Scores	12
Table 7. <i>Stanford-9</i> Total Reading Mean NCE Scores at Grade 2: Pre-Post (2003 and 2004)	13
Table 8. 2004 <i>Stanford-9</i> Reading Scores at Grade 2 for Matched Schools	14
Table 9. Percent of Grade 2 Students Meeting <i>Stanford-9</i> Total Reading Criteria in 2003 and 2004	15
Grade 3 Reading Achievement	15
Table 10. <i>Stanford-9</i> and <i>FCAT</i> NRT (Grade 3) Reading Comprehension Mean NCE Scores: Pre-Post 2003 (Grade 2) and 2004 (Grade 3)	16
Table 11. Percent of Grade 3 Students Meeting <i>Stanford-9</i> Comprehension Criteria in 2003 and 2004: Status Scores	17
Table 12. Grade 3 2004 <i>FCAT</i> SSS Reading Mean Scale Scores and Achievement Level Percentages: Status Scores	18
Conclusions and Recommendations	19

Introduction

At the request of the School Board, reading achievement data for students in schools served by the K-3 reading coaches versus those in schools served by Reading First coaches have been compiled to gauge the impact of implementing the Reading First model.

A comprehensive evaluation was not carried out comparing the model developed in our district with the Reading First model. Reading coaches, teachers and students at Reading First schools had all been participating in the district's K-3 Reading Coaches initiative prior to implementation of Reading First. A clean comparison of one model versus another was not possible. This report provides status data so that decision makers are able to monitor the reading achievement at each group of schools subsequent to the shift of some schools to the Reading First model.

Stanford Achievement Test - 9th Edition (Stanford-9) data at grades 1 and 2 and both *Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)* NRT scores and *FCAT Sunshine State Standards (SSS)* Reading scores for grade 3 students are provided.

Context

A brief description of the sequence of events leading to the district's implementation of Reading First is provided for those unfamiliar with this history. This information provides contextual background to understand the reading achievement data provided in this report for students in schools that converted to the Reading First model versus those that continued to implement the district-developed model.

No Child Left Behind (NCLB)

In January 2002, President George W. Bush signed the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, that is, the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001. A 245-page draft of *Proposed Regulations* was released in August 2002; the 180 page *No Child Left Behind: A Desktop Reference, 2002* was made available in September 2002; and the *Rules and Regulations* were finalized in December 2002. In the *Desktop Reference* NCLB is described as a *sweeping overhaul of federal efforts to support elementary and secondary education in the United States* (p.9). Identified in that document are four key principles: 1) stronger accountability for results; 2) greater flexibility for states, school districts and schools in the use of federal funds; 3) more choices for parents of children from disadvantaged backgrounds; and 4) an emphasis on teaching methods that have been demonstrated to work (p.9).

The accountability system incorporates annual assessments based on challenging state standards, disaggregation of data, annual school report cards to be used for comparison of quality, and the requirement that districts and schools make "Adequate Progress." With respect to the principle of flexibility and local control, the *Desktop Reference* provides the following description:

Another hallmark of the new law is that, in exchange for greater accountability for results, states and school districts will have unprecedented flexibility in how they can use federal education funds. The intent is to put greater decision-making power at the local and state levels where educators are most in touch with students' needs (p.10).

With respect to the principle of choice, parents of students in Title I schools that are designated low-performing (for a specified number of years) must be provided options, including the choice of transferring to a better-performing public school or charter school and access to supplemental educational services (i.e., tutoring, after-school services, summer school). In regard to the final principle, schools must use those educational programs and practices demonstrated by rigorous scientific research to be effective. For example, the document states, the NCLB Act will support scientifically-based instructional programs in reading under the new Reading First program.

Title I: Reading First (I-R-1)

A brief summary of Reading First, based on the U.S. Department of Education's *Desktop Reference*, follows. Reading First, a major component of Title I (*Improving the Academic Achievement of the Disadvantaged*), is designed

. . .to ensure that every child can read at grade level or above by the end of third grade through the implementation of instructional programs and materials, assessments, and professional development grounded in scientifically based reading research (p.23).

States were to submit to the Department of Education an application for Reading First, a formulaic program based on the number of children of school age whose families are below poverty level. State Education Agencies (SEAs), in turn, would make competitive grants available to eligible school districts based on their prior share of the state's Title I, Part A funds as well as the percentage of K-3 students reading below grade

level. In addition, states were to submit a plan to assist districts in using “scientifically based reading research” on essential components of reading instruction (i.e., phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency, and reading comprehension). Further, states were required to provide technical assistance to districts in identifying assessment programs and materials. States were also required to develop strategies both to improve instructional practices in K-2 reading through professional development and to evaluate Reading First. According to the DOE publication, *School districts and schools will select instructional programs and materials that support the essential components of reading, leading to a comprehensive reading program* (p.24).

The K-2 Reading Coaches Initiative

Prior to enactment of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) legislation, district personnel had committed considerable resources to develop and to implement a sound instructional program in reading. Reading was well established as a priority in the District Plan. Prior to the enactment of NCLB and Reading First, the Reading/Language Arts Team and district teachers had studied the literature on effective practice in reading instruction and the *Sunshine State Standards (SSS)*; developed the Reading/Language Arts Frameworks and Expectations regarding what a child should know and be able to do at each grade level; identified and purchased appropriate instructional materials and classroom assessments; identified effective classroom practices; provided inservice to teachers in grades K-2; contracted with local, national and international experts in the field of reading and adult learning to provide on-going staff development (1999-2000) to some of the district’s most skilled teachers so that they, in turn, might mentor and coach primary teachers on-site. The district’s commitment to improving instructional practice in reading was clearly demonstrated by the \$11,000 expenditure per coach for on-going staff development that exceeded 100 content hours.

By the time the NCLB legislation was on the President’s desk in January 2002, the district’s commitment of resources to improving instructional practice was coming to fruition. During 2000-2001, Reading Coaches had served K-2 teachers in 66 schools with the lowest levels of achievement in reading based on state assessments. By 2001-2002, a second school cadre of reading coaches had participated in staff development and been hired, increasing the number of sites involved to 83 schools. A comprehensive evaluation underway demonstrated widespread support for the on-site staff development and follow-up provided by the reading coaches. Student achievement data were positive for all ethnic groups, for both boys and girls, and for LEP students. District personnel reviewed the legislation and considered that the district’s efforts were in line with the requirements of NCLB Reading First.

The Dilemma Posed by the State’s Just Read, Florida Grant

In the 2002-2003 school year, by which time additional cadres of reading coaches had extended the district’s initiative to 95 schools with more than 30,000 K-2 students, the state made available to districts the Reading Coaches Model Grant. Initially, a small number of district schools (10 at the elementary school level) were involved. At those schools, reading coaches and teachers continued to implement the district’s Balanced Literacy program; the model implemented in Hillsborough was an enhancement of the K-2 Reading Coaches initiative.

In preparing the district application for Reading First in 2003-2004, however, constraints on decision making at the district level were very apparent. The “unprecedented flexibility” cited above from the *No Child Left Behind: A Desktop Reference (2002)* was in large measure reserved for the state.

The state had submitted its own Reading First application to the U.S. Department of Education and districts desirous of Reading First funding would be expected to adhere to certain conditions. For example, the district was not free to use the instructional materials in reading that had recently been purchased; instead, district personnel had to choose one of a limited “core reading programs” approved at the state level. Moreover, screening, diagnostic and classroom assessments would also be selected by personnel outside the district and be administered on schedule. A theme that emerged in discussion was the perception that a single approach was being advocated as “the solution.” Also concerns surfaced about what was perceived to be an overemphasis on assessment and drills in phonemic awareness and phonics at the expense of vocabulary development, reading comprehension and fluency.

The requirements of Reading First as implemented in Florida posed a serious dilemma for district decision makers. The millions of dollars that would be available to the district through a Reading First grant were much needed. Was the district to put on hold its own reading initiative, put aside the instructional materials and assessments recently purchased and begin again with staff development to implement Reading First? Ultimately, the decision was made to offer principals and faculties in eligible schools the opportunity to participate in Reading First. The funds were an important consideration. School Board members were also mindful that many children were struggling to learn to read in the primary grades and stated that these additional resources might make a difference. A total of 43 schools made the decision to participate in Reading First. The School Board requested that comparative data be provided to monitor performance in Reading First schools versus schools that continued with the district reading initiative.

Program Description

With respect to the instructional program in reading, what are the features that distinguish Reading First schools from non-Reading First schools? Table 1 provides a brief summary that reveals some of the commonalities as well as distinctive features.

Table 1. Comparison of Reading First and Non-Reading First Schools

Component	Reading First	Non-Reading First
Staff Development for Reading Coaches	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The district has provided Reading First Coaches with 172 hours of staff development by experts in the fields of reading instruction and adult learning (in 2003-2004). ○ The state has provided an additional 10 hours of staff development pertaining to the role and responsibilities as well as reading content. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The district has provided K-3 Reading Coaches with more than 100 hours of staff development by experts in reading instruction and adult learning. ○ K-2 Reading Coaches do not attend state training.
Staff Development for Teachers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reading First Coaches provide on-site mentoring, training, modeling and coaching. Teachers also participate in district-level offerings. In addition, Reading First teachers attend a four-day reading academy focused on Reading First requirements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ K-2 Reading Coaches provide on-site mentoring, training, modeling and coaching. Teachers also participate in district-level offerings.
Support for School Personnel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ State provides technical support through coordinators who work directly with schools. District-level personnel also support schools. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Schools are supported by district-level personnel.
Data-Based Instructional Planning (Screening and Progress Monitoring)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Instructional grouping and planning must reflect information gained from assessment. ○ Assessment reviews (DIBELS) are <u>required</u> to screen students and monitor their progress. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Assessment driven instruction is a district emphasis in training and coach support. ○ Assessment reviews are <u>recommended</u> to screen students and monitor their progress. ○ Instruments are selected based on needs.
Screening and Monitoring Instruments in Reading	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS)</i> is administered four times a year (screening and monitoring progress). The test measures fluency in five areas: letter naming, initial sounds, phoneme segmentation, nonsense words, oral reading. (Measures of vocabulary and comprehension are not included.) In addition to the <i>DIBELS</i>, Reading First Coaches utilize the district menu of classroom assessments. Their use has been reduced at some schools, according to the Reading/Language Arts Team, because of the time required for <i>DIBELS</i> testing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>DIBELS</i> will be administered to non-Reading First kindergartners in 2004-05. ○ K-3 Reading Coaches choose from a "menu" of classroom assessments including the <i>Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA)</i>, the District <i>Comprehensive Assessment in Reading (CAR)</i>, running records, kindergarten assessments.
Responsibility for Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reading First Coaches spend the majority of their time coordinating and administering tests during testing windows. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ K-3 Reading Coaches are not unduly impeded in their instructional focus by having to coordinate or administer testing; teachers generally administer their own tests.
Data Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>DIBELS</i> raw scores are input online at the school site to the Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN) and school personnel receive reports in a timely manner. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Teachers have student-level data because they administer assessments. Teachers compile data for their class to group students and plan instruction and to monitor progress.

Table 1. (cont.)

Component	Reading First	Non-Reading First
Foundation for Instruction	C Instruction is based on the Florida NCLB formula: 5 (reading components) + 3 (assessments) + ii (initial instruction) + iii (immediate intensive intervention) and draws from the <i>Florida Sunshine State Standards</i> and District Language Arts Frameworks.	C Instruction is based on the <i>Florida Sunshine State Standards</i> and District Language Arts Frameworks. Intensive Guided Reading is to be provided to students who meet criteria; teachers work with smaller groups and/or work with those groups more frequently.
Core Reading Program	C Houghton Mifflin	C Scholastic
Schedule for Reading	C Daily reading instruction is mandated to contain a 90-minute uninterrupted block of time during which students are not permitted to leave the classroom.	C the 90-minute uninterrupted block is recommended but not required. Students are allowed to leave or be pulled during reading instruction.
Instructional Model	C Reader's Workshop	C Reader's Workshop
Needs of ESE and LEP Students	C A collaborative service model is <u>required</u> for ESE and LEP students.	C A collaborative service model is <u>recommended</u> for ESE and LEP students.
Record of Implementation	C Electronic logs of daily work are maintained; tables are easily generated.	C Coaches maintain logs (on computer or hand-written).
Evaluation: Outcome Measures	C In addition to state, district and school-level tests, Reading First schools are required to administer the final <i>DIBELS</i> , the <i>Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test</i> , the <i>Gates MacGinitie Reading Test</i> and the <i>Stanford-10</i> .	C State (<i>FCAT SSS</i> and <i>NRT</i>), district assessments (<i>Stanford-9</i> for students grades 1-2; <i>Stanford-9</i> for grade 3 students who do not meet passing criterion; Grade 3 Student Portfolio), and school-level assessments (menu of options).
Evaluation: Program Implementation	C In addition to maintaining electronic logs and administering assessments, Reading First personnel participate in surveys and site visits regarding implementation and receive feedback based on the visit.	C A multi-year evaluation of the K-3 Reading Coaches initiative has been conducted by the Department of Assessment and Accountability and reports disseminated to stakeholders at all levels.

Many commonalities are observed in Reading First and the SDHC's own Reading Coaches initiative in the early grades. The most pronounced changes that have occurred as a result of implementing Reading First are in the core reading program; the many additional assessments required for Reading First schools; the increased focus in the first year of implementation on phonemic awareness, phonics, and fluency generated by the repetitive *DIBELS* assessments; and increased demands on Reading First coaches in managing and participating in these assessments. Reading Coaches and teachers in the district's K-3 Reading Coach schools also have greater freedom to make choices about what measures to use and when based on perceived needs; Reading First school personnel must follow the prescribed assessment schedule and must repeat the *DIBELS* assessment even when satisfactory achievement has been documented.

Questions of Interest and Method

When the decision was made to participate in Reading First, members of the School Board requested that comparative data be reported for schools participating in Reading First versus schools participating in SDHC's own Reading Coaches initiative, which has been extended to third graders from the original focus on grades K-2.

Questions of Interest

In 2003-2004, how did the reading achievement of students in grades 1-3 at schools participating in Reading First compare with the reading achievement of students in grades 1-3 at schools served by the district K-3 Reading Coaches?

Of interest is whether students in Reading First schools achieve in reading at a higher level, the same level, or a lower level than their peers in schools served by K-2 Reading Coaches. The question can be formulated in a number of ways. Did the additional dollars provided by NCLB's Reading First yield a higher level of reading achievement than obtained by comparable students in non-Reading First schools? Alternatively, did the reading achievement of students in Reading First schools decline in comparison to students in comparable schools served by K-3 Reading Coaches?

A traditional program evaluation comparing the two alternative reading instruction models with coaching was not possible. The study would not be a clean one for several reasons. Prior to the 2003-2004 school year, Reading First coaches had extensive staff development and experience in the district's Reading Coaches initiative. Moreover, much "cross fertilization" is occurring between the two models because each group of coaches is part of a larger whole; they meet regularly together to discuss ideas to improve practice.

Several examples will suffice to illustrate how the programs impact each other. Perhaps influenced by opinions expressed by district personnel as well as their own research and that of others, personnel at the Florida Center for Reading Research (Reading First) are placing more emphasis on reading vocabulary and comprehension, which will impact how the Reading First model is implemented locally. On the other hand, K-2 Reading Coaches have a renewed interest in the fluency component of reading based on the experiences of their peer coaches involved with Reading First. The two models appear to be moving closer together, according to program supervisors, although differences remain.

This document constitutes a status report so that stakeholders at various levels have data to monitor the consequences of switching to the Reading First model at eligible schools that participated in the grant.

Samples of Schools

A number of factors were utilized to identify matches of Reading First schools with K-3 Reading Coach schools. The percent of children from low income families data generated by Title I personnel (February 19, 2003) were used in matching schools. Additionally, ethnicity and area of district were considered in matching schools. A matched district school was identified for each of 19 of the 43 Reading First schools. Upon review by personnel from the Department of Elementary Education, one pair was eliminated because they were not perceived to be as good a match as the others. Table 2 displays the percentage of students from low income families, their ethnicity, and the district area in which the schools are located. A total of 18 matched schools were identified.

Table 2. K-2 Reading Coach and Reading First Matched Schools

K-2 Reading Coach Schools							Reading First Schools						
School	Area	% Low Income	% Ethnicity				School	Area	% Low Income	% Ethnicity			
			W	B	H	M				W	B	H	M
Sulphur Springs (4201)	4	96%	4	80	12	4	Edison (1361)	4	93%	4	79	13	4
Robles (3761)	7	92%	2	83	10	3	Graham (1761)	4	92%	5	76	16	3
Dover (1201)	6	82%	25	7	66	2	Bryan (0521)	6	81%	26	8	61	4
Crestwood (1021)	2	81%	15	15	62	7	Town & Country (4441)	2	84%	19	16	56	6
Cypress Creek (1051)	5	79%	29	2	66	3	Ruskin (3841)	5	88%	24	2	72	2
Springhead (4161)	6	75%	51	10	36	3	Trapnell (4481)	6	75%	42	12	41	3
Thonotosassa (4361)	7	73%	66	13	14	5	McDonald (2871)	7	74%	73	16	8	3
Twin Lakes (4561)	4	72%	25	18	48	6	Egypt Lake (1401)	4	79%	18	18	56	5
Seminole (3921)	4	71%	38	29	24	7	Miles (3041)	3	75%	39	29	21	9
Temple Terrace (4281)	7	69%	24	44	22	8	Riverhills (3621)	7	71%	20	54	16	9
Lopez (2531)	7	63%	65	14	14	6	Mango (2721)	7	75%	62	16	16	4
Bellamy (1776)	2	62%	31	9	51	6	Dickenson (1101)	1	65%	29	16	48	4
Bay Crest (0191)	2	55%	38	10	40	8	Morgan Woods (3101)	2	50%	40	13	38	8
Cannella (0691)	2	55%	30	18	37	9	Grady (1721)	1	56%	35	21	35	6
Valrico (4581)	6	52%	54	12	26	6	Summerfield (4211)	5	57%	53	8	34	4
Cork (1001)	6	51%	70	6	24	1	Knights (2291)	6	57%	72	4	20	3
Yates (4961)	7	46%	58	16	19	6	Kingswood (2261)	5	56%	52	17	20	7
Apollo Beach (0141)	5	43%	63	6	25	5	Riverview (3641)	5	43%	68	13	13	5

Instruments and Analysis

State and district administered tests were utilized for the status report. These included the *Stanford-9* scores at grades 1-2 and *FCAT* scores (*FCAT-SSS* and *FCAT NRT*) at grade 3. At grade 1, year-to-year status scores were compared. At grade 2, both year-to-year status scores and pre-post (*Stanford-9* Total Reading) scores were compared. At grade 3 pre-post data (*Stanford-9* Reading Comprehension scores at grade 2 versus *FCAT NRT* Reading Comprehension scores at grade 3) were examined. Additionally, at grade 3 *FCAT Sunshine State Standards* from year to year (status scores) are presented in the report, including both mean scale scores for 2003 and 2004 and percentage of students at each *FCAT* Reading Achievement Level for the 2004 assessment.

Still another set of tables displays the percentages of students meeting three different performance criteria: 1) the percentage of students in Stanines 4-9 on the norm-referenced reading test; 2) the percentage of students who achieved at stanines 5-9 on the NRT reading test; and 3) the percentage of students who achieved at the 50th national percentile or higher on the NRT in reading. These three criteria correspond, respectively, to the criterion used in the Grade 3 Reading Portfolio; the criterion used in the state and district grant applications, and the criterion for promotion to grade 4 without use of the portfolio. These data may be useful to program personnel for planning purposes.

Descriptive statistics were used to display the status of Reading First schools versus K-3 Reading Coach schools with respect to the various reading achievement scores. An analysis of variance was utilized to examine posttest mean scores for Reading First schools versus K-3 Reading Coach schools at grade 2 and at grade 3.

Comparative Data

The tables below, which present data for 18 Reading First schools and 18 matched K-3 Reading Coach schools, are organized by grade level.

Grade 1 Reading Achievement

Tables 3, 4, and 5 present *Stanford-9* reading achievement scores for first graders in 18 Reading First schools and in 18 K-3 Reading Coach schools. Table 3 displays *Stanford-9* Total Reading status scores for first graders in 2003 and in 2004 for each group of schools. The 2003 mean NCE score for Reading First students (53.8) was remarkably similar to the 2003 mean NCE score for K-3 Reading Coach students (54.7) in view of the fact that prior achievement was not used in the initial matching process. The 2004 mean NCE scores (54.6 and 55.3) were also very similar. Each group of students demonstrated a similar gain (0.8 versus 0.6). Corresponding national percentile scores are included because they may be more familiar to practitioners.

Table 3. 2003 and 2004 *Stanford-9* Reading Grade 1 Total Reading for Matched Schools: Status Scores

School	Program	Stanford-9 Total Reading Mean NCE			Stanford-9 Total Reading Corresponding NP	
		2003	2004	Difference	2003	2004
Sulphur Springs	RC	44.4	46.3	+1.9	39	43
Edison	RFC	46.3	47.0	+0.7	43	44
Robles	RC	47.7	49.6	+1.9	46	49
Graham	RFC	54.3	49.7	-4.6	58	49
Dover	RC	49.3	52.5	+3.2	49	55
Bryan	RFC	51.9	55.9	+4.0	54	61
Crestwood	RC	50.5	48.7	-1.8	51	47
Town & Country	RFC	59.0	53.6	-5.4	66	57
Cypress Creek	RC	50.3	49.9	-0.4	50	50
Ruskin	RFC	54.9	58.3	+3.4	59	65
Springhead	RC	53.7	49.0	-4.7	57	48
Trapnell	RFC	59.5	58.3	-1.2	67	65
Thonotosassa	RC	55.1	55.3	+0.2	59	60
McDonald	RFC	46.1	42.4	-3.7	43	36
Twin Lakes	RC	53.6	49.3	-4.3	57	49
Egypt Lake	RFC	54.3	56.9	+2.6	58	63
Seminole	RC	53.9	51.2	-2.7	57	52
Miles	RFC	49.2	60.4	+11.2	48	69
Temple Terrace	RC	52.2	54.6	+2.4	54	59
Riverhills	RFC	45.7	54.9	+9.2	42	59
Lopez	RC	57.5	56.7	-0.8	64	62
Mango	RFC	54.5	57.1	+2.6	58	63
Bellamy	RC	58.2	60.5	+2.3	65	69
Dickenson	RFC	52.0	51.8	-0.2	54	53
Bay Crest	RC	61.4	66.3	+4.9	71	78
Morgan Woods	RFC	57.4	60.1	+2.7	64	68
Cannella	RC	63.7	65.1	+1.4	74	76
Grady	RFC	69.4	61.4	-8.0	82	71
Valrico	RC	56.9	61.2	+4.3	63	70
Summerfield	RFC	55.8	58.6	+2.8	61	66
Cork	RC	56.2	60.1	+3.9	61	68
Knights	RFC	57.2	55.3	-1.9	63	60
Yates	RC	57.4	56.8	-0.6	64	63
Kingswood	RFC	55.3	55.9	+2.6	60	61
Apollo Beach	RC	56.7	58.6	+0.9	62	66
Riverview	RFC	54.0	53.9	-0.1	57	57
Students in RC Schools		54.7	55.3	+0.6	59	60
Students in RFC Schools		53.8	54.6	+0.8	57	59

Table 4 breaks down the scores by reading subtest. Summary data are presented at the bottom of the table. On all subtests, first grade students in Reading First schools performed comparably to students in schools served by K-2 Reading Coaches.

Table 4. 2004 Stanford-9 Reading Scores at Grade 1 for Matched Schools

School	Program	N	Stanford-9 Mean NCE Scores				Stanford-9 Corresponding NP Scores			
			Total Reading	Word Study Skills	Word Reading	Reading Comprehension	Total Reading	Word Study Skills	Word Reading	Reading Comprehension
Sulphur Springs	RC	110	46.3	44.3	46.8	47.3	43	39	44	45
Edison	RFC	115	47.0	46.6	47.5	48.7	44	44	45	47
Robles	RC	95	49.6	47.6	51.0	50.8	49	45	52	51
Graham	RFC	56	49.7	49.8	48.4	50.6	49	50	47	51
Dover	RC	81	52.5	50.5	52.8	54.3	55	51	55	58
Bryan	RFC	99	55.9	55.0	56.2	55.7	61	59	61	61
Crestwood	RC	147	48.7	47.1	48.3	51.3	47	44	47	52
Town & Country	RFC	62	53.6	52.1	54.2	54.9	57	54	58	59
Cypress Creek	RC	129	49.9	50.8	49.4	50.0	50	51	49	50
Ruskin	RFC	101	58.3	56.3	56.4	61.1	65	62	62	70
Springhead	RC	147	49.0	48.2	49.4	49.9	48	47	49	50
Trapnell	RFC	66	58.3	58.1	57.5	59.5	65	65	64	67
Thonotosassa	RC	72	55.3	55.0	54.2	55.4	60	59	58	60
McDonald	RFC	119	42.4	40.9	44.7	44.1	36	33	40	39
Twin Lakes	RC	136	49.3	47.0	51.9	49.6	49	44	54	49
Egypt Lake	RFC	72	56.9	52.8	57.1	60.1	63	55	63	68
Seminole	RC	84	51.2	49.0	54.0	51.7	52	48	57	53
Miles	RFC	79	60.4	61.4	58.9	60.8	69	71	66	70
Temple Terrace	RC	133	54.6	51.1	55.1	57.1	59	52	59	63
Riverhills	RFC	82	54.9	50.5	57.2	57.2	59	51	63	63
Lopez	RC	131	56.7	54.3	57.0	59.4	62	58	63	67
Mango	RFC	92	57.1	57.1	55.5	57.8	63	63	60	64
Bellamy	RC	120	60.5	59.8	60.1	61.5	69	68	68	71
Dickenson	RFC	115	51.8	49.9	51.5	53.4	53	50	53	56
Bay Crest	RC	119	66.3	63.4	66.5	66.8	78	74	78	79
Morgan Woods	RFC	86	60.1	58.5	60.4	60.6	68	66	69	69
Cannella	RC	148	65.1	63.1	63.3	65.9	76	73	74	77
Grady	RFC	52	61.4	60.3	65.2	58.9	71	69	76	66
Valrico	RC	117	61.2	60.2	59.5	61.5	70	69	67	71
Summerfield	RFC	100	58.6	54.6	59.7	62.0	66	59	68	71
Cork	RC	128	60.1	58.2	59.8	61.9	68	65	68	71
Knights	RFC	126	55.3	55.0	54.5	56.6	60	59	58	62
Yates	RC	128	56.8	52.4	58.9	59.3	63	54	66	67
Kingswood	RFC	95	55.9	51.9	55.5	59.7	61	54	60	68
Apollo Beach	RC	133	58.6	57.5	58.5	58.4	66	64	66	65
Riverview	RFC	103	53.9	48.3	57.3	57.6	57	47	63	64
Students in RC Schools		2158	55.3	53.5	55.5	56.4	60	57	60	62
Students in RFC Schools		1620	54.6	52.7	54.9	56.3	59	55	59	62

Table 5 displays the percentages of students at grade 1 who met three different performance criteria: *Stanford-9* Total Reading NP scores at Stanine 4 or higher; *Stanford-9* Total Reading NP at Stanine 5 or higher; and *Stanford-9* NP scores at the 50th NP or higher. These data may be useful to program personnel for planning purposes.

Table 5. Percent of Grade 1 Students Meeting *Stanford-9* Total Reading Criteria in 2003 and 2004

School	Program	% Low Income 2004	% Stanines 4-9 (Norms = 78%)		% Stanines 5-9 (Norms = 61%)		% ≥ 50 th NP	
			2003	2004	2003	2004	2003	2004
Sulphur Springs	RC	96%	66%	78%	47%	55%	38%	42%
Edison	RFC	93%	75%	72%	50%	46%	36%	38%
Robles	RC	92%	77%	80%	54%	54%	44%	47%
Graham	RFC	92%	86%	79%	61%	52%	51%	46%
Dover	RC	82%	79%	88%	65%	52%	48%	52%
Bryan	RFC	81%	84%	94%	62%	72%	52%	61%
Crestwood	RC	81%	81%	78%	54%	54%	48%	46%
Town & Country	RFC	84%	92%	89%	72%	64%	67%	52%
Cypress Creek	RC	79%	76%	79%	52%	54%	45%	47%
Ruskin	RFC	88%	89%	91%	72%	74%	64%	68%
Springhead	RC	75%	90%	73%	69%	52%	52%	41%
Trapnell	RFC	75%	89%	89%	77%	76%	70%	68%
Thonotosassa	RC	73%	84%	90%	67%	65%	60%	56%
McDonald	RFC	74%	73%	62%	53%	36%	45%	29%
Twin Lakes	RC	72%	84%	75%	65%	55%	59%	44%
Egypt Lake	RFC	79%	86%	97%	69%	72%	59%	65%
Seminole	RC	71%	80%	78%	61%	60%	56%	52%
Miles	RFC	75%	73%	91%	46%	77%	39%	68%
Temple Terrace	RC	69%	82%	80%	63%	65%	53%	59%
Riverhills	RFC	71%	75%	87%	49%	70%	34%	60%
Lopez	RC	63%	93%	82%	76%	70%	68%	63%
Mango	RFC	75%	87%	88%	73%	73%	59%	70%
Bellamy	RC	62%	89%	93%	72%	80%	64%	68%
Dickenson	RFC	65%	83%	82%	60%	60%	49%	48%
Bay Crest	RC	55%	75%	96%	81%	87%	75%	81%
Morgan Woods	RFC	50%	87%	93%	69%	74%	59%	69%
Cannella	RC	55%	95%	94%	83%	86%	73%	78%
Grady	RFC	56%	95%	96%	90%	86%	85%	78%
Valrico	RC	52%	88%	92%	74%	80%	62%	72%
Summerfield	RFC	57%	90%	94%	71%	69%	59%	69%
Cork	RC	51%	92%	85%	69%	71%	60%	66%
Knights	RFC	57%	87%	80%	70%	64%	62%	54%
Yates	RC	46%	91%	87%	70%	70%	67%	63%
Kingswood	RFC	56%	88%	87%	68%	69%	64%	58%
Apollo Beach	RC	43%	85%	87%	66%	72%	59%	66%
Riverview	RFC	43%	82%	90%	69%	70%	62%	60%
Students in RC Schools		66.6%	85%	84%	67%	67%	58%	58%
Students in RFC Schools		69.7%	84%	86%	65%	66%	56%	58%

Grade 2 Reading Achievement

Tables 6-9 present *Stanford-9* reading achievement scores for second graders in 18 Reading First schools and in 18 matched K-3 Reading Coach schools. Table 6 displays *Stanford-9* Total Reading status scores for second graders in 2003 and in 2004 for each group of schools. The 2003 mean NCE score for Reading First students (51.3) was very similar to the 2003 mean NCE scores for K-3 Reading Coach students (52.7). The 2004 mean NCE scores, 51.7 and 52.4, respectively, were also very similar and scores for each group did not change markedly from year to year. Corresponding national percentile scores are included in the table.

Table 6. 2003 and 2004 *Stanford-9* Reading Grade 2 Total Reading for Matched Schools: Status Scores

School	Program	Stanford-9 Total Reading Mean NCE			Stanford-9 Total Reading Corresponding NP	
		2003	2004	Difference	2003	2004
Sulphur Springs	RC	40.8	39.3	-1.5	33	30
Edison	RFC	42.1	40.7	-1.4	35	33
Robles	RC	41.7	41.1	-0.6	35	34
Graham	RFC	45.0	47.1	+2.1	41	44
Dover	RC	50.2	51.7	+1.5	50	53
Bryan	RFC	44.8	51.2	+6.4	40	52
Crestwood	RC	52.8	54.1	+1.3	55	58
Town & Country	RFC	47.4	49.9	+2.5	45	50
Cypress Creek	RC	48.8	48.5	-0.3	48	47
Ruskin	RFC	49.2	51.7	+2.5	48	53
Springhead	RC	52.1	52.1	0.0	54	54
Trapnell	RFC	54.0	56.3	+2.3	57	62
Thonotosassa	RC	47.3	49.7	+2.4	45	49
McDonald	RFC	47.2	49.9	+2.7	45	50
Twin Lakes	RC	45.5	51.4	+5.9	41	53
Egypt Lake	RFC	46.0	52.0	+6.0	42	54
Seminole	RC	52.4	54.4	+2.0	54	58
Miles	RFC	51.1	52.7	+1.6	52	55
Temple Terrace	RC	50.6	51.4	+0.8	51	53
Riverhills	RFC	45.5	43.0	-2.5	41	37
Lopez	RC	51.2	53.3	+2.1	52	56
Mango	RFC	51.1	51.7	+0.6	52	53
Bellamy	RC	57.8	57.9	+0.1	64	65
Dickenson	RFC	55.1	51.3	-3.8	59	54
Bay Crest	RC	62.4	60.2	-2.2	72	69
Morgan Woods	RFC	58.8	55.9	-2.9	66	61
Cannella	RC	61.6	57.2	-4.4	71	63
Grady	RFC	62.7	63.0	+0.3	73	73
Valrico	RC	51.5	51.7	+0.2	53	53
Summerfield	RFC	53.9	54.4	+0.5	57	58
Cork	RC	55.3	53.4	-1.9	60	56
Knights	RFC	55.3	55.4	+0.1	60	60
Yates	RC	61.9	55.7	-6.2	71	61
Kingswood	RFC	55.8	56.7	+0.9	61	62
Apollo Beach	RC	60.2	52.7	-7.5	69	55
Riverview	RFC	51.8	53.9	+2.1	53	57
Students in RC Schools		52.7	52.4	-0.3	55	54
Students in RFC Schools		51.3	51.7	+0.4	52	53

Table 7 displays pre-posttest *Stanford-9* Total Reading scores for the same students from 2003 (first grade) to 2004 (second grade) for both Reading First schools and for K-3 Reading Coach schools. The mean NCE in 2003 for the 18 Reading First schools (57.72) was virtually identical to the mean NCE for K-3 Reading Coach schools (57.68) as were the 2004 mean NCE scores of 52.93 and 53.28, respectively. Pre-post scores from 2003 to 2004 declined in a similar way; such a decline is common from first to second grade at most schools and may represent an artifact of the test itself. Posttest means for the two groups of schools were not significantly different, $F(1,d.f)=.001$, $p=.98$. One does not need a statistical test to see that 52.93 and 53.28 are comparable.

Table 7. *Stanford-9* Total Reading Mean NCE Scores at Grade 2: Pre-Post (2003 and 2004)

School	Program	N	Stanford-9 Total Reading Mean NCE (SD)			Stanford-9 Total Reading Corresponding NP	
			2003	2004	Difference	2003	2004
Sulphur Springs	RC	77	52.3 (16.2)	41.1 (15.9)	-11.2	54	34
Edison	RFC	91	49.5 (14.9)	40.8 (15.6)	-8.7	49	33
Robles	RC	57	50.7 (16.3)	42.4 (14.6)	-8.3	51	36
Graham	RFC	39	54.9 (17.5)	48.4 (19.3)	-6.5	59	47
Dover	RC	50	51.7 (14.4)	52.1 (15.9)	+0.4	53	54
Bryan	RFC	62	56.5 (15.9)	52.2 (15.6)	-4.3	62	54
Crestwood	RC	92	53.6 (18.6)	56.5 (15.9)	+2.9	57	62
Town & Country	RFC	66	63.0 (18.1)	50.0 (15.4)	-13.0	73	50
Cypress Creek	RC	74	53.3 (20.7)	49.5 (19.7)	-3.8	56	49
Ruskin	RFC	76	57.8 (15.8)	52.2 (13.8)	-5.6	64	54
Springhead	RC	81	57.5 (17.5)	52.3 (16.2)	-5.2	64	54
Trapnell	RFC	59	63.8 (17.0)	57.4 (16.9)	-6.4	74	64
Thonotosassa	RC	34	55.6 (13.5)	51.6 (15.2)	-4.0	60	53
McDonald	RFC	68	53.6 (18.0)	49.6 (16.0)	-4.0	57	49
Twin Lakes	RC	100	56.1 (18.4)	52.6 (17.1)	-3.5	61	55
Egypt Lake	RFC	54	55.9 (14.8)	51.2 (14.5)	-4.7	61	52
Seminole	RC	54	60.3 (19.5)	57.0 (20.5)	-3.3	69	63
Miles	RFC	55	55.5 (18.7)	54.3 (17.9)	-1.2	60	58
Temple Terrace	RC	94	55.2 (17.5)	52.4 (16.2)	-2.8	60	54
Riverhills	RFC	58	49.4 (13.3)	44.6 (13.3)	-4.8	49	40
Lopez	RC	69	62.4 (15.8)	54.5 (15.5)	-7.9	72	58
Mango	RFC	67	55.0 (15.2)	52.2 (17.5)	-2.8	59	54
Bellamy	RC	96	62.1 (15.6)	60.2 (15.2)	-1.9	72	69
Dickenson	RFC	71	53.7 (15.6)	50.7 (14.4)	-3.0	57	51
Bay Crest	RC	88	64.7 (16.0)	61.2 (13.7)	-3.5	76	70
Morgan Woods	RFC	55	59.3 (17.7)	55.7 (14.9)	-3.6	67	61
Cannella	RC	110	66.2 (17.9)	59.1 (13.8)	-7.1	78	67
Grady	RFC	32	71.0 (18.9)	66.9 (18.8)	-4.1	84	79
Valrico	RC	82	59.3 (16.3)	51.3 (14.7)	-8.0	67	52
Summerfield	RFC	73	58.6 (14.2)	56.2 (14.9)	-2.4	66	61
Cork	RC	101	58.1 (17.4)	53.8 (17.1)	-4.3	65	57
Knights	RFC	78	62.1 (18.6)	57.4 (16.8)	-4.7	72	64
Yates	RC	87	59.2 (14.9)	57.4 (15.5)	-1.8	67	64
Kingswood	RFC	70	60.3 (17.7)	57.5 (16.5)	-2.8	69	64
Apollo Beach	RC	110	59.7 (19.4)	53.8 (18.7)	-5.9	68	57
Riverview	RFC	67	58.9 (17.2)	55.5 (17.8)	-3.4	66	60
RC Schools		18	57.68	53.28	-4.40	64	56
RFC Schools		18	57.72	52.93	-4.79	64	55

Tables 8 and 9 present NCE subtest scores and percentages of students in each program meeting three performance criteria. As was the case at grade 1, students in grade 2 from Reading First schools and from K-3 Reading Coach schools demonstrated comparable achievement.

Table 8. 2004 Stanford-9 Reading Scores at Grade 2 for Matched Schools

School	Program	N	Stanford-9 Mean NCE Scores at Grade 2 Changes				Stanford-9 Corresponding NP Scores			
			Total Reading	Word Study Skills	Reading Vocabulary	Reading Comprehension	Total Reading	Word Study Skills	Word Recognition	Reading Comprehension
Sulphur Springs	RC	112	39.3	42.0	33.2	40.9	30	35	21	33
Edison	REC	111	40.7	43.0	38.1	42.2	33	37	29	35
Robles	RC	85	41.1	41.8	37.8	44.7	34	35	28	40
Graham	RFC	48	47.1	46.4	43.7	50.9	44	43	38	52
Dover	RC	61	51.7	51.2	47.8	54.4	53	52	46	58
Bryan	RFC	86	51.2	52.8	48.7	51.8	52	55	47	53
Crestwood	RC	130	54.1	56.3	47.6	56.0	58	62	45	61
Town & Country	RFC	77	49.9	55.0	46.3	47.8	50	48	30	40
Cypress Creek	RC	104	48.5	52.3	42.8	49.4	47	54	37	49
Ruskin	RFC	88	51.7	52.6	48.5	53.3	53	55	47	56
Springhead	RC	111	52.1	51.5	49.0	53.1	54	53	48	56
Trapnell	RFC	69	56.3	56.4	52.2	57.3	62	62	54	63
Thonotosassa	RC	118	49.7	51.1	46.8	50.8	49	52	44	51
McDonald	RFC	90	49.9	53.1	45.8	50.5	50	56	42	51
Twin Lakes	RC	136	51.4	52.0	48.2	52.9	53	54	47	55
Egypt Lake	RFC	69	52.0	53.7	47.6	53.2	54	57	45	56
Seminole	RC	64	54.4	54.1	52.3	55.5	58	64	64	64
Miles	RFC	76	52.7	54.2	49.6	51.7	55	58	49	53
Temple Terrace	RC	123	51.4	50.1	48.1	54.7	53	50	46	59
Riverhills	RFC	84	43.0	45.6	38.8	44.9	37	42	30	40
Lopez	RC	89	53.3	53.5	50.0	55.5	56	57	50	60
Mango	RFC	89	51.7	53.6	46.3	53.7	53	57	43	57
Bellamy	RC	134	57.9	60.0	55.4	57.2	65	68	60	63
Dickenson	RFC	105	51.3	52.3	48.6	51.0	52	54	47	52
Bay Crest	RC	120	60.2	60.8	56.2	60.4	69	70	61	69
Morgan Woods	RFC	73	55.9	59.2	52.3	54.5	61	67	54	58
Cannella	RC	143	57.2	56.6	55.2	59.1	63	62	60	67
Grady	RFC	44	63.0	64.3	60.1	62.2	73	75	68	72
Valrico	RC	107	51.7	51.7	48.7	54.1	53	53	47	58
Summerfield	RFC	118	54.4	54.3	51.2	56.9	58	58	52	63
Cork	RC	118	53.4	54.3	51.3	54.3	56	58	52	58
Knights	RFC	98	55.4	56.0	49.8	56.8	60	61	50	63
Yates	RC	113	55.7	56.5	52.4	56.2	61	62	54	61
Kingswood	RFC	90	56.7	57.2	53.3	57.9	62	63	56	65
Apollo Beach	RC	139	52.7	54.9	47.7	53.8	55	59	46	57
Riverview	RFC	85	53.9	54.2	51.6	53.9	57	58	53	57
Students at RC Schools		2007	52.4	53.3	48.7	53.8	54	56	47	57
Students at RFC Schools		1500	51.7	53.2	48.1	52.4	53	56	46	54

Table 9. Percent of Grade 2 Students Meeting *Stanford-9* Total Reading Criteria in 2003 and 2004

School	Program	% Low Income 2004	% Stanines 4-9 (Norms -78%)		% Stanines 5-9 (Norms - 61%)		% \geq 50 th NP (Norms - 50%)	
			2003	2004	2003	2004	2003	2004
Sulphur Springs	RC	96%	66%	61%	42%	37%	32%	25%
Edison	RFC	93%	69%	64%	40%	34%	32%	25%
Robles	RC	92%	68%	64%	43%	37%	33%	29%
Graham	RFC	92%	72%	72%	46%	53%	38%	45%
Dover	RC	82%	88%	88%	63%	63%	58%	52%
Bryan	RFC	81%	73%	84%	54%	68%	34%	59%
Crestwood	RC	81%	85%	87%	69%	74%	59%	63%
Town & Country	RFC	84%	77%	78%	54%	65%	44%	50%
Cypress Creek	RC	79%	74%	73%	59%	57%	49%	46%
Ruskin	RFC	88%	86%	85%	64%	71%	53%	59%
Springhead	RC	75%	84%	87%	69%	64%	60%	53%
Trapnell	RFC	75%	88%	94%	72%	74%	64%	63%
Thonotosassa	RC	73%	73%	87%	56%	67%	42%	48%
McDonald	RFC	74%	75%	79%	53%	66%	47%	51%
Twin Lakes	RC	72%	76%	86%	51%	67%	42%	56%
Egypt Lake	RFC	79%	74%	85%	54%	71%	41%	60%
Seminole	RC	71%	81%	83%	63%	67%	52%	56%
Miles	RFC	75%	87%	85%	70%	65%	55%	54%
Temple Terrace	RC	69%	83%	84%	61%	71%	53%	59%
Riverhills	RFC	71%	69%	75%	53%	44%	42%	32%
Lopez	RC	63%	88%	89%	63%	71%	49%	60%
Mango	RFC	75%	82%	82%	62%	60%	53%	57%
Bellamy	RC	62%	90%	91%	78%	82%	72%	75%
Dickenson	RFC	65%	87%	92%	78%	66%	68%	54%
Bay Crest	RC	55%	97%	95%	90%	88%	79%	81%
Morgan Woods	RFC	50%	96%	96%	86%	78%	73%	67%
Cannella	RC	55%	93%	94%	87%	76%	80%	66%
Grady	RFC	56%	90%	95%	83%	81%	77%	79%
Valrico	RC	52%	86%	89%	63%	69%	50%	55%
Summerfield	RFC	57%	87%	87%	72%	73%	61%	64%
Cork	RC	51%	88%	88%	74%	71%	57%	59%
Knights	RFC	57%	88%	86%	78%	72%	69%	62%
Yates	RC	46%	95%	88%	88%	77%	82%	71%
Kingswood	RFC	56%	87%	91%	75%	72%	66%	64%
Apollo Beach	RC	43%	95%	82%	85%	69%	73%	56%
Riverview	RFC	43%	88%	86%	66%	68%	54%	64%
Students in RC Schools		65.6%	84%	85%	68%	68%	58%	58%
Students in RFC Schools		70.7%	83%	84%	66%	65%	55%	55%

Grade 3 Reading Achievement

Tables 10, 11 and 12 display reading achievement data for third graders. Table 10 displays pre-posttest *Stanford* Reading Comprehension scores for the same students from 2003 (second grade) to 2004 (third grade) for both 18 Reading First schools and 17 K-3 Reading Coach schools. Scores for Riverview Elementary School were not available in the database and, therefore, data from Apollo Beach and Riverview Elementary Schools were excluded from the summary data.

The mean NCE in 2003 for the 17 Reading First schools (53.7) was virtually identical to the mean NCE for the 17 K-3 Reading Coach schools (53.6). The 2004 posttest mean NCE scores for Reading First schools (54.8) and K-3 Reading Coach schools (55.7) were also similar. Both groups of schools made small gains. The posttest scores for Reading First schools and K-3 Reading First schools were not significantly different, $F(1,d.f.)=.158, p=.69$.

Table 10. *Stanford-9* and *FCAT NRT (Grade 3)* Reading Comprehension Mean NCE Scores: Pre-Post 2003 (Grade 2) and 2004 (Grade 3)

School	Program	N	Stanford-9 Reading Comprehension		Difference	Stanford-9 Reading Comprehension Corresponding NP	
			Mean NCE (SD)			2003	2004
			2003	2004			
Sulphur Springs	RC	103	45.0 (12.5)	43.5 (13.8)	-1.5	41	38
Edison	RFC	76	47.6 (16.0)	44.3 (16.4)	-3.3	45	39
Robles	RC	50	48.0 (15.3)	48.9 (13.2)	+0.9	46	48
Graham	RFC	34	48.1 (17.6)	47.4 (16.0)	-0.7	46	45
Dover	RC	67	51.9 (16.5)	53.6 (14.6)	+1.7	54	57
Bryan	RFC	70	48.9 (19.0)	48.4 (15.4)	-0.5	48	47
Crestwood	RC	95	54.8 (17.1)	55.7 (16.3)	+0.9	59	61
Town & Country	RFC	59	49.8 (17.7)	53.0 (15.4)	+3.2	50	56
Cypress Creek	RC	122	49.7 (17.7)	49.5 (15.9)	-0.2	49	49
Ruskin	RFC	84	53.3 (16.5)	55.6 (14.4)	+2.3	56	60
Springhead	RC	96	54.2 (17.6)	56.5 (17.7)	+2.3	58	62
Trapnell	RFC	57	55.1 (16.7)	59.6 (15.5)	+4.5	59	67
Thonotosassa	RC	50	49.0 (19.8)	55.6 (17.9)	+6.6	48	60
McDonald	RFC	78	51.4 (17.3)	54.2 (17.6)	+2.8	53	58
Twin Lakes	RC	100	49.4 (16.2)	51.6 (15.9)	+2.2	49	53
Egypt Lake	RFC	53	47.3 (16.8)	47.6 (14.6)	+0.3	45	45
Seminole	RC	50	55.7 (19.3)	53.1 (15.5)	-2.6	61	56
Miles	RFC	61	51.1 (16.4)	50.9 (16.6)	-0.2	52	52
Temple Terrace	RC	91	56.2 (18.1)	60.1 (18.4)	+3.9	61	68
Riverhills	RFC	64	49.0 (16.6)	47.5 (15.9)	-1.5	48	45
Lopez	RC	88	53.4 (18.2)	57.3 (18.8)	+3.9	56	63
Mango	RFC	88	54.7 (17.9)	57.4 (18.6)	+2.7	59	64
Bellamy	RC	112	54.9 (18.7)	59.2 (17.5)	+4.3	59	67
Dickenson	RFC	68	57.0 (14.5)	61.9 (16.1)	+4.9	63	71
Bay Crest	RC	83	60.6 (14.8)	64.6 (14.1)	+4.0	69	76
Morgan Woods	RFC	87	59.2 (17.4)	60.8 (14.8)	+1.6	67	70
Cannella	RC	130	61.6 (16.2)	61.6 (17.5)	0.0	71	71
Grady	RFC	41	65.3 (19.2)	64.0 (16.8)	-1.3	77	75
Valrico	RC	107	50.2 (20.4)	53.5 (18.9)	+3.3	50	57
Summerfield	RFC	79	60.8 (18.2)	61.8 (17.3)	+1.0	70	72
Cork	RC	119	57.4 (19.0)	59.9 (18.7)	+2.5	64	68
Knights	RFC	118	59.3 (18.4)	60.9 (18.1)	+1.6	67	70
Yates	RC	96	59.1 (17.1)	62.0 (17.3)	+2.9	67	71
Kingswood	RFC	87	55.8 (19.2)	57.4 (17.1)	+1.6	61	64
Apollo Beach	RC	92	60.8 (19.0)	59.1 (16.8)	-1.7	70	67
Riverview*	RFC		Not Available				
RC Schools		17	53.6	55.7	+2.1	57	61
RFC Schools		17	53.7	54.8	+1.1	57	59

*Grade 3 scores were not available for analysis; therefore Apollo Beach and Riverview (paired schools) were excluded from the school-level analysis.

Table 11 presents the percentage of students in each group of schools that met each of three different criteria: 1) stanine 4 or higher, 2) stanine 5 or higher, and 3) the 50th national percentile and higher. These data can be used by program personnel for planning purposes. The data are ordered from high to low by the percentage of low income students.

Table 11. Percent of Grade 3 Students Meeting *Stanford-9* Comprehension Criteria in 2003 and 2004: Status Scores

School	Program	% Low Income 2004	% Stanines 4-9 (Norms - 78%)		% Stanines 5-9 (Norms - 61%)		% ≥ 50 th NP (Norms - 50%)	
			2003	2004	2003	2004	2003	2004
Sulphur Springs	RC	96%	71%	72%	37%	39%	20%	26%
Edison	RFC	93%	68%	72%	35%	42%	24%	29%
Robles	RC	92%	76%	78%	46%	53%	30%	38%
Graham	RFC	92%	78%	75%	56%	54%	31%	40%
Dover	RC	82%	88%	85%	70%	65%	58%	53%
Bryan	RFC	81%	87%	84%	57%	56%	45%	41%
Crestwood	RC	81%	76%	86%	57%	67%	44%	59%
Town & Country	RFC	84%	81%	89%	57%	61%	43%	45%
Cypress Creek	RC	79%	80%	78%	58%	59%	42%	41%
Ruskin	RFC	88%	85%	94%	70%	78%	61%	54%
Springhead	RC	75%	86%	86%	74%	72%	67%	59%
Trapnell	RFC	75%	87%	94%	60%	79%	48%	68%
Thonotosassa	RC	73%	81%	81%	56%	64%	47%	46%
McDonald	RFC	74%	81%	90%	65%	67%	56%	54%
Twin Lakes	RC	72%	86%	87%	66%	68%	60%	58%
Egypt Lake	RFC	79%	94%	74%	74%	49%	61%	42%
Seminole	RC	71%	78%	84%	59%	68%	50%	51%
Miles	RFC	75%	92%	81%	63%	56%	55%	44%
Temple Terrace	RC	68%	91%	90%	80%	73%	68%	63%
Riverhills	RFC	71%	88%	83%	69%	50%	54%	35%
Lopez	RC	63%	94%	92%	76%	68%	40%	54%
Mango	RFC	75%	90%	89%	73%	67%	58%	55%
Bellamy	RC	62%	89%	91%	78%	73%	67%	66%
Dickenson	RFC	65%	89%	97%	72%	81%	62%	74%
Bay Crest	RC	55%	93%	95%	85%	83%	70%	75%
Morgan Woods	RFC	50%	83%	94%	68%	81%	55%	69%
Cannella	RC	55%	93%	93%	78%	75%	72%	67%
Grady	RFC	56%	88%	96%	80%	86%	75%	71%
Valrico	RC	52%	86%	82%	72%	65%	64%	51%
Summerfield	RFC	57%	86%	91%	65%	80%	56%	65%
Cork	RC	51%	88%	90%	71%	74%	62%	62%
Knights	RFC	57%	91%	85%	69%	69%	56%	63%
Yates	RC	46%	89%	94%	75%	76%	65%	68%
Kingswood	RFC	56%	81%	88%	68%	66%	62%	60%
Apollo Beach *	RC	43%	87%	88%	63%	65%	47%	53%
Riverview	RFC	43%	86%	N/A	76%	N/A	70%	N/A
Students in RC Schools (2244)		68%	85%	86%	67%	68%	56%	56%
Students in RFC Schools (1715)		70%	85%	87%	64%	66%	53%	54%

* Apollo Beach and Riverview scores excluded because of missing data at Riverview.

Table 12 displays the grade 3 *FCAT* SSS mean scale score for 2003 and 2004 for students in Reading First schools and in K-3 Reading Coach schools. These data are for the 2003 third graders and the 2004 third graders in each group of schools. The 2003 means for Reading First students (286) and K-3 Reading Coach students (289) were similar as were the 2004 means (294 and 295, respectively). The percentage of students who scored at each *FCAT* Reading Achievement Level were also very similar.

Table 12. Grade 3 2004 *FCAT* SSS Reading Mean Scale Scores and Achievement Level Percentages: Status Scores

School	Program	2004 N	Mean Scale Score		Percentages in Each Level in 2004					
			2003	2004	1	2	3	4	5	3-5
Sulphur Springs	RC	143	252	266	43	22	24	11	0	36
Edison	RFC	121	244	262	46	16	30	8	0	38
Robles	RC	76	262	278	32	17	43	8	0	51
Graham	RFC	52	274	268	36	14	46	2	2	50
Dover	RC	147	290	284	27	14	42	15	2	58
Bryan	RFC	111	277	279	31	12	42	14	1	58
Crestwood	RC	152	276	291	22	14	42	20	1	63
Town & Country	RFC	89	274	280	33	21	35	10	1	46
Cypress Creek	RC	185	269	275	36	19	26	15	3	45
Ruskin	RFC	130	278	293	24	15	43	16	2	61
Springhead	RC	140	293	295	25	15	29	29	2	60
Trapnell	RFC	94	287	299	19	16	30	34	1	65
Thonotosassa	RC	78	275	284	33	18	31	13	5	49
McDonald	RFC	96	285	294	23	18	38	18	3	59
Twin Lakes	RC	141	286	294	19	15	45	18	4	66
Egypt Lake	RFC	80	290	267	42	10	41	5	1	48
Seminole	RC	70	284	296	21	19	31	24	4	60
Miles	RFC	91	292	286	23	24	32	18	3	53
Temple Terrace	RC	121	302	313	17	12	36	29	6	70
Riverhills	RFC	86	298	284	28	20	37	12	4	52
Lopez	RC	108	302	309	18	13	32	29	8	68
Mango	RFC	107	296	298	24	19	25	29	3	57
Bellamy	RC	149	295	302	19	14	36	26	5	67
Dickenson	RFC	101	299	319	13	9	38	33	8	78
Bay Crest	RC	124	311	318	13	9	34	40	5	78
Morgan Woods	RFC	121	285	307	17	12	37	31	2	71
Cannella	RC	166	306	313	13	14	31	34	7	72
Grady	RFC	53	304	309	17	11	40	24	8	72
Valrico	RC	161	288	285	29	18	31	19	3	55
Summerfield	RFC	114	294	310	18	11	37	27	7	71
Cork	RC	162	299	307	18	12	35	30	6	70
Knights	RFC	157	289	301	23	8	34	28	7	69
Yates	RC	125	302	321	8	14	42	29	7	78
Kingswood	RFC	117	290	301	20	16	32	26	4	63
Apollo Beach	RC	143	295	290	29	15	29	21	6	56
Riverview	RFC	97	301	311	18	11	29	37	5	71
Students in RC Schools		2391	289	295	23.6	15.1	34.2	23.0	4.1	61
Students in RFC Schools		1817	286	294	24.9	14.5	35.5	21.6	3.5	61

Conclusions and Recommendations

Conclusions

After one year of implementation of the Reading First grant, students in grades 1 and 2 at Reading First schools and at matched K-3 Reading Coach schools demonstrated comparable reading achievement on the *Stanford-9*. Students in grade 3 at Reading First schools and at matched K-3 Reading Coach schools demonstrated comparable achievement on the *FCAT Sunshine State Standards* and on the *FCAT NRT*.

The substantial funds obtained through the Reading First grant did not increase the reading achievement of students in Reading First schools above the level of achievement in matched K-3 Reading Coach schools. Nor did the reading achievement of grade 1-3 students in Reading First schools decline in comparison to the reading achievement of students in matched K-3 Reading Coach schools. At every grade level and on each test and subtest available, students in Reading First Schools and in K-3 Reading Coach schools performed comparably.

Recommendations

1. Continue participation in the Reading First grant but also continue to advocate for changes for purposes of program improvement.
2. Monitor performance for another year or longer to determine whether the reading achievement, particularly to reading comprehension, continues to be comparable over time for students in Reading First schools and in K-3 Reading Coach schools.