

Rhode Island Reading First

Summative Evaluation: Reduction in Students Reading Below Grade Level in Cohorts 1, 2, and 3

by Stephen Brand, Anne M. Seitsinger, and Amy L. Burns



Prepared for the
Rhode Island Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
by the National Center on Public Education and Social Policy
at the University of Rhode Island

Anne M. Seitsinger, Director
Kingston, RI 02881

October 2007



RHODE ISLAND READING FIRST

Summative Evaluation: Reduction in Students Reading Below Grade Level in Cohorts 1, 2, and 3

by Stephen Brand, Anne M. Seitsinger, and Amy L. Burns



Prepared for the
Rhode Island Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
by the National Center on Public Education and Social Policy
at the University of Rhode Island

Anne M. Seitsinger, Director
Kingston, RI 02881

October 2007



Rhode Island Reading First Summative Evaluation: Reduction in Students Reading Below Grade Level in Cohorts 1, 2, and 3

This report provides a summative evaluation of the impact of the Rhode Island Reading First program on reducing the percentage of students reading below grade level. Three focal questions will be addressed by this evaluation report: (a) What is the impact of the Rhode Island Reading First program on students' acquisition of key reading skills?; (b) Does the impact of the Reading First program differ by grade level?; and (c) Does the impact of the Reading First program differ according to student characteristics (i.e., race/ethnicity, poverty, IEP, and LEP status)?

Reading Achievement

To address the questions raised above, we examined trends in students' performance on the Stanford-Reading First (SAT-RF) test between Spring 2005, Spring 2006, and Spring 2007. The SAT-RF instrument is a standardized test of students' performance in the following key reading skills: Phonemic Awareness, Phonics, Vocabulary Development, Reading Fluency, Reading Comprehension, Speaking Vocabulary, and Oral Reading Fluency. In addition, the test also provides an overall summary of students' performance: the SAT-RF Total. Of particular importance in the following analyses are the percentages of students who attain proficiency in each skill area. The impact of the Reading First program will be assessed in terms of increasing the percentage of students who are proficient in the above skills. Specifically, program impacts will be assessed in terms of the increase of students who are proficient between Spring 2005 and Spring 2007, for those schools that participated in the project in both years. In addition, program impacts will be assessed in terms of the increase of students who are proficient between Spring 2006 and Spring 2007, including schools that joined the project in 2006. The analysis of proficiency gains between 2005 to 2007, and between 2006 and 2007, will be presented in separate sections.

The samples for this report consist of the following schools. Analyses of change between 2005 and 2007 focused on schools in Cohort 1 and 2 that participated in the Rhode Island Reading First program in both years. This sample includes 8 Cohort 1 schools from Providence: Alan Shawn Feinstein on Broad Elementary School, Alfred Lima, Sr. Elementary School & Annex, Charles Fortes Academy & Annex, Laurel Hill Avenue School & Annex, Mary E. Fogarty Elementary School, Robert L. Bailey, IV Elementary School, Webster Avenue School, and Windmill Street Elementary School. Also included in this analysis is the one school in Cohort 2: AS Feinstein Elementary in Central Falls. Analyses of change between 2006 and 2007 included all of the Cohort 1 and 2 schools listed above, and the one school in Cohort 3: Curtis Elementary in Pawtucket.

Change in Reading Proficiency from 2005 to 2007

Evaluation data, including scores on the Stanford-Reading First (SAT-RF) test, were collected annually. This section of the report will focus on change in achievement from the 2004-2005 to the 2006-2007 school year. Sample sizes for specific groups of students by grade level from Spring 2007 are shown below. These percentages are similar for students who participated in Spring 2005 and Spring 2006. Please note that achievement trends for Native American and Asian students should be interpreted cautiously due to the relatively low sample sizes in these groups.

Table 1

Number of Students Tested (Spring 2007) in Cohort 1 and 2 Combined

Grade	Overall	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American	Low Income	IEP	LEP
K	441	33	50	328	21	5	394	58	130
1	488	54	79	336	14	2	434	41	151
2	462	56	73	319	11	2	426	79	159
3	641	64	86	467	18	5	603	95	230

Test scores from the SAT-RF achievement test for students in Cohort 1 and 2 schools are presented in Tables 2 through 9. In each of these tables, the numbers in the cells represent the percentage of students who exhibited grade level proficiency on the area tested. If no students attained grade level proficiency, the number 0 appears. If no students were tested, then a period appears in the cell. Data are tabled separately for Spring 2005 and the Spring 2007. At the bottom of each table are rows that show the change between 2005 and 2007 in the percentage of students who meet proficiency standards. Separate columns show the percentage of students attaining grade level proficiency overall, then by race/ethnicity. The percentage of students attaining grade level proficiency is also shown for students from low-income families, as well as for students with an Individualized Education Program (IEP) and Limited English Proficiency (LEP). By breaking the results out by this level of detail, we hope that the information provided may help to guide efforts in specific grade levels within schools.

These tables show change in grade level proficiency for each of the following key skills that are assessed by the SAT-RF: Phonemic Awareness (Table 2), Phonics (Table 3), Vocabulary Development (Table 4), Reading Fluency (Table 5), Reading Comprehension (Table 6), Speaking Vocabulary (Table 7), and Oral Reading Fluency (Table 8). Each of these skill areas represent core elements of scientifically-based reading instruction. These tables are followed by ones that provide an overall summary score across these essential skill areas. Table 9 shows the percentage of students with grade level proficiency in the SAT-RF Total. The results of the SAT-RF vary considerably by grade, race/ethnicity, poverty, IEP, and LEP status. We will consider each of these trends in turn.

Overall Trends

Overall, the results of the SAT-RF in both 2005 and the 2007 indicate that the Reading First schools are ones in which a large proportion of students are in need of additional intervention in order to

attain grade level proficiencies in critical reading skills. Illustratively, in 2007, the results for the SAT-RF Total (Table 9) indicate that grade level proficiency was attained by about 66% of the students in Kindergarten, 55% of the students in First Grade, 32% of the students in Second Grade, and 39% of the students in Third Grade. For some groups of students within the Reading First schools, proficiency levels were even lower, depending on the students' grade, race/ethnicity, income, LEP, and IEP status.

While proficiency levels are low in absolute terms, it should also be noted that levels of proficiency markedly increased between 2005 and 2007, particularly in Kindergarten and the First Grade. The percentage of Kindergarten students who were proficient on the Reading First Total increased by 16%, from 50% to 66%. The percentage of First Grade students who were proficient increased by 24%, from 31% to 55%. The proportion of students attaining proficiency increased by approximately 8% in the Second Grade and 9% in the Third Grade. These gains are statistically significant in the sense that there is less than one chance in twenty that they would have occurred due to sampling error.

Grade Level Trends

Generally higher levels of achievement were found for students at the lower grade levels compared with higher grades in both the 2005 and the 2007 testing. Students in the lower grade levels also exhibited greater gains in between years. As shown in Table 9, the percentage of students who were proficient on the SAT-RF Total increased by 15.8% in Kindergarten, 23.6% in First Grade, 7.7% in Second Grade, and 8.5% in Third Grade. These gains are statistically significant in the sense that there is less than a one chance in twenty that they would have occurred due to sampling error.

It should be noted that differences between grade levels in Spring 2007 varied somewhat according to the skill area tested. For many of the SAT-RF tests, a higher proportion of students attain grade level proficiency in Kindergarten than in the higher grade levels. Higher levels of proficiency for Kindergarten students were found on the SAT-RF tests of Phonics (Table 3) and Vocabulary Development (Table 4), as well as for the overall Reading First Total (Table 9). For other SAT-RF tests, a higher proportion of students attained grade level proficiency in the First Grade than other grade levels. This pattern characterized the scores on the SAT-RF tests of Reading Comprehension (Table 6) and Speaking Vocabulary (Table 7). For Reading Fluency (Table 5) and Oral Reading Fluency (Table 8), levels of proficiency were higher in Kindergarten and the First Grade than in the higher grades. The percentage of students who attained grade-level proficiency in Phonemic Awareness (Table 2) was particularly high in the Second Grade (90.8%).

Overall, across grade levels, performance on the SAT-RF tests consistently increased between 2005 and 2007. Particularly pronounced increases were found for students in Kindergarten and First Grade on a number of SAT-RF tests. Specifically, in these grade levels, the percentage of students who were proficient increased by 10% or more on the SAT-RF tests of Phonemic Awareness (Table 2), Reading Fluency (Table 5), Reading Comprehension (Table 6), Oral Reading Fluency (Table 8), and the Reading First Total (Table 9). Double-digit gains in proficiency were found in Vocabulary Development (Table 4) for Kindergarten, First Grade, and Second Grade. Gains of 10 percent or more were also found in all grade levels on the SAT-RF test of Phonics (Table 3). These gains are statistically significant in the sense that there is less than a one chance in twenty that they would have occurred due to sampling error.

Race/Ethnicity Trends

Performance on the SAT-RF achievement tests was related with students' race/ethnicity in both years. Black Kindergarten students exhibit levels of proficiency that equal or surpass the levels shown by White students. However, by the Third Grade, a smaller proportion of Black students attained grade level proficiency compared with White students. Across grade levels, a smaller proportion of Hispanic students exhibited grade level proficiency in most areas. The discrepancies in grade level performance for Hispanic students may be considered in the context of the trends for students with LEP discussed below, given the fact that more Hispanic students have limited proficiency in English compared with students from other racial/ethnic backgrounds. A consistently smaller proportion of students with LEP exhibited grade level proficiency at all grades.

Across years, the percentage of students who were proficient increased for students in all ethnic groups. Illustratively, on the SAT-RF Total, a larger percentage of students in all racial groups attained proficiency in 2007, compared with 2005.

Poverty Trends

Between years, the percentage of low-income students who were proficient on the SAT-RF tests increased across all grade levels. As shown in Table 9, the percentage of low-income students who were proficient on the SAT-RF Total test increased by 15.5% in Kindergarten, 22.5% in First Grade, 7.9% in Second Grade, and 7.4% in Third Grade. These gains are statistically significant in the sense that there is less than a one chance in twenty that they would have occurred due to sampling error.

Trends for Students with an IEP

Grade level proficiency was generally much lower for students with an Individualized Education Program, particularly in higher grade levels. Levels of grade level proficiency were particularly low in the First, Second and Third Grades. Across years, students with an IEP showed higher levels of proficiency. The percentage of students who were proficient on the SAT-RF Total test increased by 5.8% in Kindergarten, 6.9% in First Grade, 13.4% in Second Grade, and 13.0% in Third Grade. These gains are statistically significant in the sense that there is less than a one chance in twenty that they would have occurred due to sampling error.

Trends for Students with LEP

In both years, students with LEP exhibited lower levels of proficiency on the SAT-RF tests compared with other students. Illustratively, in 2007, only 43.3% of students with LEP in Kindergarten were proficient on the SAT-RF Total. Proficiency levels among students with LEP were even lower in the higher grade levels. Over time, proficiency levels among students with LEP have increased. As shown in Table 9, between 2005 and 2007, the percentage of students with LEP who attained proficiency on the SAT-RF Total test increased by 6.8% in Kindergarten, 11.0% in First Grade, 8.5% in Second Grade, and 6.9% in Third Grade. These gains are statistically significant in the sense that there is less than one chance in twenty that they would have occurred due to sampling error.

Table 2

Cohort 1 and 2 Combined Stanford-RF Phonemic Awareness Performance Level

	Grade	Overall	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American	Low Income	IEP	LEP
2005										
	K	60.7	57.6	75	58.7	63.6	66.7	60.5	43.2	56.4
	1	57.9	78.8	68.2	53.2	63.6	40	57.9	56.1	43.5
	2	83.9	91.5	93.5	80.5	91.3	66.7	83.6	73.9	71.4
	3	58.7	63.2	57.4	58.4	58.8	50	58.5	37.5	53.7
2007										
	K	70.9	90.9	71.4	70.3	57.1	60	71.3	63.8	51.5
	1	69.6	72.7	77.5	66.7	78.6	50	69.7	47.6	44.1
	2	90.8	96.4	90.4	89.8	100	100	91.8	82.5	81.4
	3	66.8	66.2	72.7	65.1	84.2	60	66.7	41.7	62.2
Change										
	K	10.2	33.3	-3.6	11.6	-6.5	-6.7	10.8	20.6	-4.9
	1	11.7	-6.1	9.3	13.5	15.0	10.0	11.8	-8.5	0.6
	2	6.9	4.9	-3.1	9.3	8.7	33.3	8.2	8.6	10.0
	3	8.1	3.0	15.3	6.7	25.4	10.0	8.2	4.2	8.5

Table 3

Cohort 1 and 2 Combined Stanford-RF Phonics Performance Level

	Grade	Overall	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American	Low Income	IEP	LEP
2005										
	K	67.8	64.7	80	66.5	72.7	33.3	68.6	56.8	65.4
	1	12.4	18.2	13.6	10.4	31.8	20	12.5	10.5	5.5
	2	18.2	20.7	23.1	16.5	26.1	33.3	17.3	11.4	4.9
	3	35	44.7	38.9	31.4	52.9	50	35.5	18.2	17.6
2007										
	K	81.6	90.9	80	81.6	66.7	100	81.6	69	63.4
	1	34.6	38.2	35	33.6	42.9	100	34	23.8	19.7
	2	29.2	44.6	37	24.8	36.4	0	29.1	28.8	14.3
	3	50.7	56.9	52.3	48.6	78.9	40	50.4	35.4	33.2
Change										
	K	13.8	26.2	0.0	15.1	-6.0	66.7	13.0	12.2	-2.0
	1	22.2	20.0	21.4	23.2	11.1	80.0	21.5	13.3	14.2
	2	11.0	23.9	13.9	8.3	10.3	-33.3	11.8	17.4	9.4
	3	15.7	12.2	13.4	17.2	26.0	-10.0	14.9	17.2	15.6

Table 4

Cohort 1 and 2 Combined Stanford-RF Vocabulary Development Performance Level

	Grade	Overall	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American	Low Income	IEP	LEP
2005										
	K	44.8	58.8	47.5	42.9	45.5	0	45.7	43.2	35.6
	1	24	40.9	25	20.8	31.8	40	24.6	17.5	14.2
	2	26.8	35.4	38.9	22.8	26.1	33.3	25.9	17	13
	3	24.9	32.9	21.3	24.6	23.5	50	25	5.8	17.3
2007										
	K	59.4	69.7	58	58.1	61.9	80	59.9	58.6	39.7
	1	43.2	54.5	53.8	38.1	64.3	50	41.5	19	16.4
	2	36.8	57.1	43.8	32	27.3	50	35.9	27.5	17.4
	3	28.9	38.5	30.7	26.2	47.4	40	28.9	12.5	17.4
Change										
	K	14.6	10.9	10.5	15.2	16.4	80.0	14.2	15.4	4.1
	1	19.2	13.6	28.8	17.3	32.5	10.0	16.9	1.5	2.2
	2	10.0	21.7	4.9	9.2	1.2	16.7	10.0	10.5	4.4
	3	4.0	5.6	9.4	1.6	23.9	-10.0	3.9	6.7	0.1

Table 5

Cohort 1 and 2 Combined Stanford-RF Reading Fluency Performance Level

	Grade	Overall	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American	Low Income	IEP	LEP
2005										
	K	46	47.1	52.5	45.6	45.5	0	46.7	45.9	38.7
	1	32.6	36.4	28.4	31.8	50	40	32.7	19.3	26.8
	2	28.8	40.2	38	25.2	26.1	33.3	27	14.8	16.4
	3	30.6	38.2	30.6	28.8	41.2	0	30.9	6.6	20.2
2007										
	K	61.2	75.8	66	59.3	57.1	80	60.2	51.7	40.5
	1	60.2	69.1	67.5	57.2	78.6	0	59.5	38.1	39.5
	2	37.4	53.6	41.1	33.9	45.5	0	37.8	25	22.4
	3	37.2	50.8	39.8	34.2	47.4	40	37	26	26.5
Change										
	K	15.2	28.7	13.5	13.7	11.6	80.0	13.5	5.8	1.8
	1	27.6	32.7	39.1	25.4	28.6	-40.0	26.8	18.8	12.7
	2	8.6	13.4	3.1	8.7	19.4	-33.3	10.8	10.2	6.0
	3	6.6	12.6	9.2	5.4	6.2	40.0	6.1	19.4	6.3

Table 6

Cohort 1 and 2 Combined Stanford-RF Reading Comprehension Performance Level

	Grade	Overall	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American	Low Income	IEP	LEP
2005										
	K	18.9	26.5	35	15.5	18.2	0	19.3	27	15.3
	1	50.8	66.7	54.5	47.5	63.6	40	51.1	45.6	34.8
	2	15.4	22	25	12.5	4.3	0	14.2	9.1	5.6
	3	27.5	39.5	27.8	25.3	29.4	0	27.8	10.2	16.9
2007										
	K	33	45.5	38	30.7	38.1	60	32.5	20.7	14.5
	1	72.2	80	75	69.6	85.7	100	70.8	50	46.1
	2	22.4	33.9	26	19.3	36.4	0	22.4	18.8	13
	3	30.9	43.1	37.5	27.1	47.4	40	30	19.8	19.1
Change										
	K	14.1	19.0	3.0	15.2	19.9	60.0	13.2	-6.3	-0.8
	1	21.4	13.3	20.5	22.1	22.1	60.0	19.7	4.4	11.3
	2	7.0	11.9	1.0	6.8	32.1	0.0	8.2	9.7	7.4
	3	3.4	3.6	9.7	1.8	18.0	40.0	2.2	9.6	2.2

Table 7

Cohort 1 and 2 Combined Stanford-RF Speaking Vocabulary Performance Level

	Grade	Overall	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American	Low Income	IEP	LEP
2005										
	K	33.7	44.1	45	31.1	27.3	33.3	34.3	29.7	22.7
	1	53.9	57.6	67	50.5	68.2	60	55.7	49.1	40.6
	2	34	50.6	39.8	30.6	20.8	66.7	34.5	25.8	26.3
	3	36.6	38.2	33	37.5	29.4	0	36.8	18	37.9
2007										
	K	36.7	47.1	48	35.2	19	60	36.8	28.6	29.9
	1	51.9	70.4	54.3	48.1	57.1	50	51.5	35.7	24.5
	2	41.8	37.5	39.7	43.6	36.4	0	41.8	27.8	40.3
	3	42.5	50.8	46.6	41.1	33.3	20	41.8	31.3	29.4
Change										
	K	3.0	3.0	3.0	4.1	-8.3	26.7	2.5	-1.1	7.2
	1	-2.0	12.8	-12.7	-2.4	-11.1	-10.0	-4.2	-13.4	-16.1
	2	7.8	-13.1	-0.1	13.0	15.6	-66.7	7.3	2.0	14.0
	3	5.9	12.6	13.6	3.6	3.9	20.0	5.0	13.3	-8.5

Table 8

Cohort 1 Stanford-RF Oral Reading Fluency Performance Level

	Grade	Overall	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American	Low Income	IEP	LEP
2005										
	K	46.3	47.1	65	43.7	36.4	33.3	46.5	40.5	33.5
	1	44.7	56.1	53.4	39.8	86.4	60	45.3	21.1	32.4
	2	31.2	33.3	33.3	31	33.3	0	31.2	16.9	27
	3	29.9	34.2	24.8	29	47.1	0	29.4	8	28.6
2007										
	K	60.6	76.5	72	58.5	47.6	100	59.9	44.4	38.1
	1	55.4	55.6	61.3	53.3	71.4	50	54.8	23.8	38
	2	36.6	35.7	38.4	36.1	45.5	50	36.9	13.9	31.4
	3	35.3	37.5	26.7	35.4	66.7	20	35.1	21.1	29.8
Change										
	K	14.3	29.4	7.0	14.8	11.2	66.7	13.4	3.9	4.6
	1	10.7	-0.5	7.9	13.5	-15.0	-10.0	9.5	2.7	5.6
	2	5.4	2.4	5.1	5.1	12.2	50.0	5.7	-3.0	4.4
	3	5.4	3.3	1.9	6.4	19.6	20.0	5.7	13.1	1.2

Table 9

Cohort 1 and 2 Stanford-RF Total Performance Level

	Grade	Overall	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American	Low Income	IEP	LEP
2005										
	K	49.7	55.9	72.5	44.9	54.5	33.3	49.7	45.9	36.3
	1	31.3	43.9	33.7	27.8	59.1	40	31.6	17.5	19.5
	2	24.1	33.3	28	21.3	34.8	33.3	22.9	6.9	9.7
	3	30	40.8	28.7	27.8	38.2	0	30.2	5.9	19.2
2007										
	K	65.5	78.8	74	63.7	57.1	100	65.2	51.7	43.1
	1	54.9	66.7	62	51.2	71.4	0	54.1	24.4	30.5
	2	31.8	41.1	39.7	28.2	45.5	0	30.8	20.3	18.2
	3	38.5	53.1	37.2	36	61.1	20	37.6	18.9	26.1
Change										
	K	15.8	22.9	1.5	18.8	2.6	66.7	15.5	5.8	6.8
	1	23.6	22.8	28.3	23.4	12.3	-40.0	22.5	6.9	11.0
	2	7.7	7.8	11.7	6.9	10.7	-33.3	7.9	13.4	8.5
	3	8.5	12.3	8.5	8.2	22.9	20.0	7.4	13.0	6.9

Change in Reading Proficiency from 2006 to 2007

Evaluation data, including scores on the Stanford-Reading First test, were collected in all of the schools during the 2005-2006 and the 2006-2007 school years. Sample sizes for specific groups of students by grade level from Spring 2007 are shown below. These percentages are similar for students who participated in Spring 2005 and Spring 2006. Please note that achievement trends for Native American and Asian students should be interpreted cautiously due to the relatively low sample sizes in these groups.

Table 10

Number of Students Tested (Spring 2007) in Cohorts 1, 2, and 3 Combined

Grade	Overall	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American	Low Income	IEP	LEP
K	481	56	52	339	24	6	397	61	135
1	524	74	84	341	16	2	449	44	153
2	500	79	78	327	12	3	449	86	163
3	674	91	87	471	18	5	618	96	232

Test scores from the SAT-RF achievement test for students in Cohort 1, 2, and 3 schools are presented in Tables 11 through 18. In each of these tables, the numbers in the cells represent the percentage of students who exhibited grade level proficiency on the area tested. If no students attained grade level proficiency, the number 0 appears. If no students were tested, then a period appears in the cell. Data are tabled separately for Spring 2006 and the Spring 2007. At the bottom of each table are rows that show the change between 2006 and 2007 in the percentage of students who meet proficiency standards. Separate columns show the percentage of students attaining grade level proficiency overall, then by race/ethnicity. The percentage of students attaining grade level proficiency is also shown for students from low-income families, as well as for students with an Individualized Education Program (IEP) and Limited English Proficiency (LEP). By breaking the results out by this level of detail, we hope that the information provided may help to guide efforts in specific grade levels within schools.

These tables show change in grade level proficiency for each of the following key skills that are assessed by the SAT-RF: Phonemic Awareness (Table 11), Phonics (Table 12), Vocabulary Development (Table 13), Reading Fluency (Table 14), Reading Comprehension (Table 15), Speaking Vocabulary (Table 16), and Oral Reading Fluency (Table 17). Each of these skill areas represent core elements of scientifically based reading instruction. These tables are followed by ones that provide an overall summary score across these essential skill areas. Table 18 shows the percentage of students with grade level proficiency in the SAT-RF Total. The results of the SAT-RF vary considerably by grade, race/ethnicity, poverty, IEP, and LEP status. We will consider each of these trends in turn.

Overall Trends

Overall, the results of the SAT-RF in both 2006 and the 2007 indicate that the Reading First schools serve a large proportion of students who are in need of additional intervention in order to attain grade level proficiencies in critical reading skills. In 2007, the results for the SAT-RF Total (Table 18)

indicate that grade level proficiency was attained by about 62% of the students in Kindergarten, 58% of the students in First Grade, 33% of the students in Second Grade, and 40% of the students in Third Grade. For some groups of students within the Reading First schools, proficiency levels were even lower, depending on the students' grade, race/ethnicity, income, LEP, and IEP status. Levels of proficiency did not increase markedly between 2006 and 2007, by contrast with the findings reported about for 2005 to 2007. Substantial gains were noted only in Grade One, where the percentage of students who were proficient on the SAT-RF increased by 13.1% from 44.9% to 58%. It should be noted that the present analysis encompasses a shorter time span, and includes one Cohort 3 school that has not participated in the Reading First project for as many years as those in Cohorts 1 and 2.

Grade Level Trends

Generally higher levels of achievement were found for students at the lower grade levels compared with higher grades in both the 2006 and the 2007 testing. As shown in Table 18, in 2007, 62% of the Kindergarten students, and 58% of the First Grade students, demonstrated proficiency on the SAT-RF Reading First Total. By contrast, only 33% of Second Grade and 40% of Third Grade students attained proficiency. Similar trends were found in all of the other SAT-RF sub-tests, with the exception of the SAT-RF Speaking Vocabulary test.

Race/Ethnicity Trends

Performance on the SAT-RF achievement tests was related with students' race/ethnicity. In 2006 and 2007, both Black and Hispanic Kindergarten students exhibited higher levels of proficiency than White students at the same grade level. However, by the Third Grade, a smaller proportion of Black and Hispanic students attained grade level proficiency compared with White students.

Poverty Trends

Between years, the percentage of low-income students who were proficient on the SAT-RF tests increased somewhat in Kindergarten and First Grade. As shown in Table 18, the percentage of low-income students who were proficient on the SAT-RF Total test increased by 6.0% in Kindergarten and 13.9% in First Grade. The percentage of students who were proficient did not change significantly in Second and Third Grade.

Trends for Students with an IEP

Grade level proficiency was generally much lower for students with an Individualized Education Program, particularly in higher grade levels. Levels of grade level proficiency were particularly low in the First, Second and Third Grades. In most grade levels, students with an IEP showed increased levels of proficiency. The percentage of students who were proficient on the SAT-RF Total test increased by 18.9% in Kindergarten, 8.7% in Second Grade, and 8.9% in Third Grade. Levels of proficiency remained basically unchanged in First Grade.

Trends for Students with LEP

In both years, students with LEP exhibited lower levels of proficiency on the SAT-RF tests compared with other students. Illustratively, in 2007, only 42.2% of students with LEP in Kindergarten were proficient on the SAT-RF Total. Proficiency levels among students with LEP were even lower in the higher grade levels. Over time, proficiency levels among students with LEP have increased. As shown in Table 18, between 2006 and 2007, the percentage of students with LEP who attained proficiency on the SAT-RF Total test increased by 17.2% in Kindergarten, 11.1% in First Grade, 8.7% in Second Grade, and 7.2% in Third Grade.

Table 11

Cohorts 1, 2, and 3 Combined Stanford-RF Phonemic Awareness Performance Level

	Grade	Overall	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American	Low Income	IEP	LEP
2006										
	K	67.8	73.1	75.4	64.3	68.8	50.0	66.9	48.5	51.6
	1	65.8	80.7	73.7	59.5	72.7	100.0	63.8	51.6	45.5
	2	88.9	95.0	95.0	86.6	89.5	66.7	88.0	82.4	73.8
	3	66.0	80.6	73.6	60.4	82.4	100.0	65.6	48.2	48.3
2007										
	K	71.6	85.7	72.5	70.4	62.5	66.7	71.3	63.9	51.9
	1	71.4	78.7	78.8	67	81.3	50	70.3	50	44.8
	2	91	96.2	91	89.7	100	100	92	83.9	81.7
	3	67.6	70.7	73	65.2	84.2	60	67.4	42.3	62.5
Change										
	K	3.8	12.6	-2.9	6.1	-6.3	16.7	4.4	15.4	0.3
	1	5.6	-2.0	5.1	7.5	8.6	-50.0	6.5	-1.6	-0.7
	2	2.1	1.2	-4.0	3.1	10.5	33.3	4.0	1.5	7.9
	3	1.6	-9.9	-0.6	4.8	1.8	-40.0	1.8	-5.9	14.2

Table 12

Cohorts 1, 2, and 3 Combined Stanford-RF Phonics Performance Level

	Grade	Overall	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American	Low Income	IEP	LEP
2006										
	K	74.2	80.8	75.4	72.2	76.5	50.0	72.8	57.6	50.0
	1	23.6	34.9	25.0	20.4	18.2	25.0	22.1	22.6	9.2
	2	29.2	40.0	31.3	26.0	52.6	33.3	28.0	12.2	7.3
	3	43.8	61.2	42.9	38.8	47.1	50.0	41.7	24.5	17.0
2007										
	K	80	76.8	78.8	81.6	62.5	100	81.3	67.2	62.5
	1	37.4	44	37.6	34.5	50	100	35.2	23.9	20.8
	2	27.8	34.2	34.6	24.5	33.3	33.3	27.9	27.6	14.5
	3	51.7	62	51.7	48.8	78.9	40	51	35.1	33.3
Change										
	K	5.8	-4.0	3.4	9.4	-14.0	50.0	8.5	9.6	12.5
	1	13.8	9.1	12.6	14.1	31.8	75.0	13.1	1.3	11.6
	2	-1.4	-5.8	3.3	-1.5	-19.3	0.0	-0.1	15.4	7.2
	3	7.9	0.8	8.8	10.0	31.8	-10.0	9.3	10.6	16.3

Table 13

Cohorts 1, 2, and 3 Combined Stanford-RF Vocabulary Development Performance Level

	Grade	Overall	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American	Low Income	IEP	LEP
2006										
	K	54.5	67.3	56.5	50.8	58.8	50	54.8	33.3	31.3
	1	30.7	45.8	40.8	24.3	27.3	25	28.3	17.2	11.9
	2	36.3	63.8	46.3	29.2	36.8	33.3	32.8	18.9	11.2
	3	29.7	49	31.9	24.9	17.6	50	28.6	11.8	19.9
2007										
	K	57.2	53.6	57.7	57.4	58.3	66.7	59.8	55.7	38.2
	1	46.7	64	56.5	38.8	68.8	50	43.1	23.9	17.5
	2	38	58.2	42.3	32.1	33.3	66.7	36.5	27.6	17.6
	3	30.4	45.7	31.5	26.2	47.4	40	29.6	13.4	17.2
Change										
	K	2.7	-13.7	1.2	6.6	-0.5	16.7	5.0	22.4	6.9
	1	16.0	18.2	15.7	14.5	41.5	25.0	14.8	6.7	5.6
	2	1.7	-5.6	-4.0	2.9	-3.5	33.4	3.7	8.7	6.4
	3	0.7	-3.3	-0.4	1.3	29.8	-10.0	1.0	1.6	-2.7

Table 14

Cohorts 1, 2, and 3 Stanford-RF Reading Fluency Performance Level

	Grade	Overall	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American	Low Income	IEP	LEP
2006	K	49.6	46.2	50.7	49.8	70.6	0	50.7	27.3	27.3
	1	46.6	56.6	52.6	42.1	36.4	25	43.5	39.1	30.1
	2	38.6	60	38.8	34	52.6	33.3	36.8	13.5	13.6
	3	40.4	52	35.2	37.5	52.9	0	38.8	17.3	19.9
2007	K	57	48.2	65.4	57.4	54.2	66.7	59.8	49.2	39
	1	62.9	77.3	68.2	58	81.3	0	60.9	43.5	40.3
	2	38	54.4	39.7	33.6	41.7	33.3	38.3	25.3	21.8
	3	38.1	53.3	39.3	34.2	47.4	40	37.4	25.8	26.3
Change	K	7.4	2.0	14.7	7.6	-16.4	66.7	9.1	21.9	11.7
	1	16.3	20.7	15.6	15.9	44.9	-25.0	17.4	4.4	10.2
	2	-0.6	-5.6	0.9	-0.4	-10.9	0.0	1.5	11.8	8.2
	3	-2.3	1.3	4.1	-3.3	-5.5	40.0	-1.4	8.5	6.4

Table 15

Cohort 1, 2, and 3 Combined Stanford-RF Reading Comprehension Performance Level

	Grade	Overall	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American	Low Income	IEP	LEP
2006	K	31.8	48.1	31.9	27.2	52.9	0	31.9	15.2	13.3
	1	65	69.9	77.6	60.1	72.7	75	63.6	51.6	44.1
	2	23.3	40	25	19	31.6	0	21.7	12.2	4.4
	3	34.8	46.9	37.4	31.6	23.5	0	34.4	15.5	19.9
2007	K	31.5	30.4	38.5	30	41.7	50	32.3	21.3	14.7
	1	73.8	85.3	76.5	69.6	87.5	100	71.4	52.2	46.8
	2	22.7	34.2	25.6	18.8	33.3	33.3	22.1	18.4	12.7
	3	31.8	46.7	37.1	27	47.4	40	30.6	20.6	19.4
Change	K	-0.3	-17.7	6.6	2.8	-11.2	50.0	0.4	6.1	1.4
	1	8.8	15.4	-1.1	9.5	14.8	25.0	7.8	0.6	2.7
	2	-0.6	-5.8	0.6	-0.2	1.7	33.3	0.4	6.2	8.3
	3	-3.0	-0.2	-0.3	-4.6	23.9	40.0	-3.8	5.1	-0.5

Table 16

Cohorts 1, 2, and 3 Combined Stanford-RF Speaking Vocabulary Performance Level

	Grade	Overall	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American	Low Income	IEP	LEP
2006	K	38.2	50	53.6	32.7	29.4	0	37.1	13.9	13.1
	1	50.7	61	49.4	46.2	63.6	50	47.6	38.5	27.7
	2	39.7	51.9	40.7	37	31.6	0	36.8	22.7	23.6
	3	43.4	61.2	37	42.9	17.6	0	42.2	34.2	37.7
2007	K	41	66.7	50	36.6	25	66.7	37.3	31.8	30.2
	1	55.2	78.4	57	49	62.5	50	53.2	41.3	25.5
	2	46.2	55.7	43.6	45	41.7	33.3	44.8	33.7	41.7
	3	45.3	65.2	47.2	41.6	33.3	20	43.2	32	30
Change	K	2.8	16.7	-3.6	3.9	-4.4	66.7	0.2	17.9	17.1
	1	4.5	17.4	7.6	2.8	-1.1	0.0	5.6	2.8	-2.2
	2	6.5	3.8	2.9	8.0	10.1	33.3	8.0	11.0	18.1
	3	1.9	4.0	10.2	-1.3	15.7	20.0	1.0	-2.2	-7.7

Table 17

Cohorts 1, 2, and 3 Stanford-RF Oral Reading Fluency Performance Level

	Grade	Overall	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American	Low Income	IEP	LEP
2006	K	50.4	50	63.8	47.6	64.7	0	49.5	22.2	21.9
	1	52.7	53.7	59.2	49.5	54.5	50	50.7	37.5	33.8
	2	35.9	44.4	39.5	33.5	47.4	25	34.1	18.7	18.3
	3	34.9	44.3	28.3	34.4	23.5	50	32.2	15.3	33.3
2007	K	50.6	47.4	71.2	49	41.7	66.7	51.6	34.8	33.1
	1	53.9	67.6	62.4	48	68.8	0	51	28.9	28.8
	2	39	50.6	33.3	37.6	41.7	33.3	37	20.9	35
	3	39.3	56	32.2	36.9	50	20	37.3	24	30.4
Change	K	0.2	-2.6	7.4	1.4	-23.0	66.7	2.1	12.6	11.2
	1	1.2	13.9	3.2	-1.5	14.3	-50.0	0.3	-8.6	-5.0
	2	3.1	6.2	-6.2	4.1	-5.7	8.3	2.9	2.2	16.7
	3	4.4	11.7	3.9	2.5	26.5	-30.0	5.1	8.7	-2.9

Table 18

Cohorts 1, 2, and 3 Combined Stanford-RF Total Performance Level

	Grade	Overall	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American	Low Income	IEP	LEP
2006										
	K	59.5	67.3	73.9	54.2	64.7	50	58.7	30.3	25
	1	44.9	51.2	58.7	38.6	54.5	25	41.8	30.2	20.3
	2	36.3	53.8	36.3	32.2	47.4	33.3	33.7	12.2	9.7
	3	38.1	52.6	40.7	33.3	41.2	50	35.9	10.9	19.1
2007										
	K	62.4	57.1	73.1	61.9	58.3	100	64.7	49.2	42.2
	1	58	75.7	64.3	51.9	75	0	55.7	29.5	31.4
	2	33.2	45.6	39.7	28.4	41.7	33.3	31.6	20.9	18.4
	3	40.4	60.4	37.9	36.1	61.1	20	38.7	19.8	26.3
Change										
	K	2.9	-10.2	-0.8	7.7	-6.4	50.0	6.0	18.9	17.2
	1	13.1	24.5	5.6	13.3	20.5	-25.0	13.9	-0.7	11.1
	2	-3.1	-8.2	3.4	-3.8	-5.7	0.0	-2.1	8.7	8.7
	3	2.3	7.8	-2.8	2.8	19.9	-30.0	2.8	8.9	7.2