

## Summary of Performance Evaluations by Goal

### Summary of Major FY 2008 Program Evaluations and Studies

Name of Report	Goal	Issue	Findings and Recommendations	Department's Response	Link to the Report
<b><i>Evaluation of the DC Opportunity Scholarship Program: Impacts After Two Years (Institute of Education Sciences NCEE 2008-4024) June 2008</i></b>	1	The purpose of the Opportunity Scholarship Program (OSP) is to provide low-income students, particularly those attending schools in need of improvement or corrective action under <i>No Child Left Behind</i> , with opportunities to attend higher-performing schools. The study evaluated the differences in test scores between students who received an OSP scholarship and those that did not.	After two years, there were no statistically significant differences in test scores between students who were offered an OSP scholarship and students who were not. Both performed at comparable levels on reading and mathematics. While the program had a positive impact on overall parent satisfaction and parent perceptions of school safety, it did not have a similar impact on students' perceptions of satisfaction and safety.	The report submitted to Congress in June of 2008. The report is also available on the Department's Web site.	<a href="http://ies.ed.gov/nc/ee/pubs/20084023.asp">http://ies.ed.gov/nc/ee/pubs/20084023.asp</a>
<b><i>Implementation Study of Smaller Learning Communities: Final Report (OPEPD/PPSS) May 2008</i></b>	1	The purpose of this study was to evaluate the implementation of the federal education law that authorizes funding for the Smaller Learning Communities Program by describing the strategies and practices used by local educational agencies in implementing Smaller Learning Communities.	Changes in schoolwide academic outcomes were neutral overall, with a good deal of variation between schools. Trend data appear to suggest increases in the percentage of graduating students planning to attend either two- or four-year colleges. There was a statistically significant positive trend in the percentage of 9 <sup>th</sup> grade students being promoted to 10 <sup>th</sup> grade.	The report has been published.	<a href="http://www.ed.gov/r/schstat/eval/other/small-communities/final-report.pdf">http://www.ed.gov/r/schstat/eval/other/small-communities/final-report.pdf</a>
<b><i>Implementation of the Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities Program: Final Report (OPEPD/PPSS) April 2008</i></b>	1	The purposes of this study were to describe how grantees under the Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities Program implemented their activities and how the Program achieved its legislative purpose.	According to commercial lenders, investment banks, and rating agency representatives, many of the assisted schools would otherwise not have received facility loans because lenders believed that they reflected a high level of risk. More than 23,000 students were enrolled in the 84 charter schools assisted under the Program during FY 2003 and FY 2005. These students were more likely to be low-income and minority. Through FY 2006, the grant recipients assisted a total of 138 schools and leveraged over \$407 million worth of financing for charter schools facilities improvement.	The report is under review by the Department.	<a href="http://www.ed.gov/r/schstat/eval/choice/charter-school-facilities/final-report.doc">http://www.ed.gov/r/schstat/eval/choice/charter-school-facilities/final-report.doc</a>

Name of Report	Goal	Issue	Findings and Recommendations	Department's Response	Link to the Report
<p><b>Reading First Impact Study: Interim Report (Institute of Education Sciences NCEE 2008-4019) April 2008</b></p>	<p>1</p>	<p>This report presents findings from the interim Reading First Impact Study, a congressionally mandated evaluation of the <i>No Child Left Behind</i> initiative (Title I, Part B, Subpart 1) to help all children read at or above grade level by the end of the third grade. The report is the first of two and examines the impact of Reading First funding in 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 in 17 school districts across 12 states and one statewide program.</p>	<p>Across the 18 participating sites, impacts on student reading comprehension test scores were not statistically significant as compared to non-Reading First schools in Reading First school districts. The Program increased instructional time spent on the five components of reading instruction. The study sites that received their Reading First grants later in the federal funding process experienced positive and statistically significant impacts both on the time teachers spent on the five essential components of reading instruction and on first and second grade reading comprehension.</p>	<p>Additional <i>Consolidated State Performance Report</i> data provided by state educational agencies indicate that the Reading First Program has increased reading scores. The study in question reflected schools in the same district, some of which were Reading First schools and some of which were not. Reading First materials and curricula may have been shared across schools within the district. The study's final report, to be released in 2009, will provide an additional year of follow-up data, and will examine whether the magnitude of impacts on the use of scientifically based reading instruction is associated with improvements in reading comprehension.</p>	<p><a href="http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pdf/20084016.pdf">http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pdf/20084016.pdf</a></p>
<p><b>State and Local Implementation of the No Child Left Behind Act: Volume IV—Title I School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services: Interim Report (OPEPD/PPSS) April 2008</b></p>	<p>1</p>	<p>This report presents findings on the implementation of parental choice options from the first year of the National Longitudinal Study of <i>No Child Left Behind</i> (NLS-NCLB) and the Study of State Implementation of Accountability and Teacher Quality Under <i>No Child Left Behind</i> (SSI-NCLB) through school year 2004-05.</p>	<p>In 2004-05, nearly 6.2 million students were eligible for Title I school choice and as many as 1.8 million were eligible for Title I supplemental educational services. Low participation rates in Title I school choice and supplemental educational services may be related to problems communicating with parents. Parents who took advantage of Title I school choice were very satisfied with the new schools, which had substantially higher average student achievement than did the previous schools.</p>	<p>The report is under review by the Department.</p>	<p><a href="http://www.ed.gov/r schstat/eval/choice/nclb-choice-ses/nclb-choice-ses.doc">http://www.ed.gov/r schstat/eval/choice/nclb-choice-ses/nclb-choice-ses.doc</a></p>

Name of Report	Goal	Issue	Findings and Recommendations	Department's Response	Link to the Report
<p><b><i>The Enhanced Reading Opportunities Study: Early Impact and Implementation Findings (Institute of Education Sciences NCEE 2008-4017) January 2008</i></b></p>	1	<p>This first of three reports focuses on the first of two cohorts of ninth-grade students and describes the impact that two interventions had on their reading comprehension skills through the end of their ninth-grade year.</p>	<p>On average, across the 34 participating high schools, there was a statistically significant improvement in participating students' reading comprehension test scores. The magnitudes of the impact estimates for each literacy intervention are the same as those for the full study sample. Impacts on reading comprehension are larger for the 15 schools where the intervention began within six weeks of the start of the school year and implementation was classified as well aligned with the program model.</p>	<p>The Department will respond after the final report.</p>	<p><a href="http://ies.ed.gov/nc/ee/pubs/20084015.asp">http://ies.ed.gov/nc/ee/pubs/20084015.asp</a></p>
<p><b><i>National Assessment of Title I: Final Report (Institute of Education Sciences NCEE 2007-4014) October 2007</i></b></p>	1	<p>In <i>No Child Left Behind</i>, Congress mandated a national assessment of Title I to evaluate the implementation and impact of the program. This mandate requires a scientifically based longitudinal study of Title I schools and includes studies of program implementation and of the effectiveness of specific interventions.</p>	<p>The number of Title I participants has tripled over the past decade. The percentage of students achieving at or above the state's Proficient level rose for most student subgroups. Three-quarters of all schools and districts met applicable adequate yearly progress targets. Student participation in school choice options and supplemental educational services has increased since the first year of the implementation of the choice provisions. The majority of teachers across the country have been designated as "highly qualified" under <i>No Child Left Behind</i>.</p>	<p>The study is under review by the Department.</p>	<p><a href="http://ies.ed.gov/nc/ee/pubs/20084012/">http://ies.ed.gov/nc/ee/pubs/20084012/</a></p>
<p><b><i>Early Outcomes of the GEAR UP Program: Final Report (OPEPD/PPSS) August 2008</i></b></p>	3	<p>The GEAR UP program fosters increased preparation for postsecondary education among low-income students and their families. This report provides descriptive information on the implementation of the program and the association between program participation and student and parent outcomes.</p>	<p>Attending a GEAR UP school was positively associated with both students' and parents' knowledge of the opportunities and benefits of postsecondary education. For African-American students, attendance at a GEAR UP school was positively associated with the number of rigorous or above-grade-level courses taken during middle school.</p>	<p>The study is under review by the Department.</p>	<p><a href="http://www.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/higher/gearup/early-outcomes.pdf">http://www.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/higher/gearup/early-outcomes.pdf</a></p>