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ABSTRACT
Students enrolled in the 1988/89 College Bound Program of the New York City public schools met evaluation criteria in writing and mathematics but dia not meet reading evaluatinn objectives. The Program, funded under Chapter 1 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act, is designed to improve the reading, writing, and mathematics skills of students to prepare them to enter college and comprises remedial courses and intensive supportive services. During 1988/89, 5,843 students from 22 high schools participated in remedial reading and/or writing courses and 612 stidents from 8 high schools participated in remedial mathematics courses. The evaluation objectives stated that at least 70 percent of the students would show improvement in program subject areas as measured by norm-referenced and criterion-referenced tests. About 63 percent of both full- and half-year students improved their performance in reading. About 84 percent of full- and half-year students improved their performance in writing. About 72.9 percent of the full-year students and about 79.9 percent of tine half-year students improved their performance in mathematics. Statistical data on two tables are included. An evaluation summary is also included. The appendices comprise 10 tables of statistical data reporting test score results by superintendency and school-by-school. (FMW)
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SUMMARY

The Chapter 1 funded College Bound Program is designed to improve the reading, writing, and mathematics skills of high school students to prepare them to enter college. During the 1988-89 school year 5,843 students from 22 high schools participated in reading and/or writing, and 612 students from eight schools received math remediation in the College Bound program. About 63 percent of both full-year and half-year students participating in reading showed improved performance. About 84 percent of both ralf-and full-year students made gains in writing as well. In math, 72.9 percent of full-year students, and 79.7 percent of half-year students showed improvement. Thus, overall, students met evaluation objectives in writing and math but did not meet reading evaluation objectives.

## PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The program includes intensive supportive services offered in conjunction with remedial classes to prepare studencs to enter college. Although many students who were enrolled in the College Bound Program received both reading and writing instruction, some students needed remediation in only one or the other area. Other students needed remediation in mathematics as well. Additionally, students enrolled in College Bound mathematics may receive a full-year of instruction (full-year students) or a single term (half-year students depending on the extent of their skills deficiencies. Although students enrolled in reading and writing are supposed to receive a full year of instruction, some schools program students for only for a single term. Student mobility results in some participants taking part in the reading/writing program for only a single term as well.

## PROGRAM GOALS

The evaluation objectives for reading, writing, and math state that at least 70 percent of the students should show improvement in program subject areas as measured by changes in norm-referenced or criterion-referenced test results.

## CONCLUSIONS

It should be noted that a large amount of the missing R.C.T. math data for full-year students is due to the fact that College Bound students generally pass the R.C.T. on their first attempt. Thus, they have no posttest scores since they would not be required to take the test once they have passed it.
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## I. OVERVIEW

The Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment (OREA) annually evaluates the Chapter 1 funded high school College Bound Program. This program is designed to improve the reading, writing, and mathematics skills of Chapter 1 eligible high school students to prepare them to enter college. The program includes intensive supportive services offered in conjunction with remedial classes. Overall program results, and results by superintendency for 1988-89 as well as school-by-school summary statistics in reading, writing, math, and attendance are detailed in this report.

Although many students who were enrolled in the College Bound program received both reading and writing instruction, some students needed remediation in only one or the other area. For this reason, reading and writing performance results are reported separately. Some students need remediation in mathematics as well. Mäth results for those students are also reported separately. Additionally, students enrolled in College Bound may receive a full year of instruction (full-year students) or a single term (half-year students) in these areas depending on the extent of their skills deficiency. Consequently, the math performance for full-year and half-year students are also reported separately. Although students enrolled in reading and writing are supposed to receive a full year of instruction, some schools program students for only a single term. Student mobility results in some participants
taking part in the reading/writing program for only a single term as well. For these reasons, reading and writing performance for full-year and half-year students is also reported separately.

Citywide tests are used to measure the overall progress of New York City ligh school students. These tests are also utilized as the evaluation instruments for students in the Chapter 1 College Bound reading and writing and math program. The Degrees of Reading Power (D.R.P.) test is used to assess reading progress in the ninth and tenth grades. The D.R.P. is a criterion-referenced test of reading comprehension which considers a student's ability in relation to the difficulty of text items. D.R.P. scores indicate the level of text difficulty a student can read independently or for enjoyment (independent level), the level a student can read with assistance (instructional level), and the level a student is unlikely to comprehend (frusiration level). The D.R.P. test that ninth and tenth grade College Bound students took in spring 1988 served as a pretest. The spring 1989 test was used as a posttest.

The Regents Competency Tests (R.C.T.s) in reading and math are criterion-referenced tests of minimal competency required for all New York state students in order to receive a high school diploma. They also serve as the evaluation instruments for College Bound reading students in the eleventh and twelfth grades and for full-year College Bound math students. According to State Education Department (S.E.D.) guidelines, the reading
R.C.T. can be given to students beginning in the spring of their eleventh grade. Students are administered the math R.C.T. beginning with the spring of their ninth grade. Thereafter students have the opportunity to take the appropriate R.C.T. up to three times a year (winter, spring, summer) until they pass it. The R.C.T. testing cycle presents some difficulties for assessments of improvement in Chapter 1 classes particularly since Chapter 1 evaluation objectives require pretest and posttest comparisons.* Generally speaking, students who have passed the reading R.C.T. are only eligible for remediation in writing; those who have passed the math R.C.T. should not continue to receive math remediation in the college Bound Program. In practice, some students may be programmed for additional remediation if school staff believe that the student may not have passed the appropriate R.C.T. or because the student received a borderline passing score and administrators don't want to take the chance that the passing score might be reversed by the S.E.D.

Reading performance on the D.R.P. is examined by evaluating pretest and posttest Normal Curve Equivalents (N.C.E.). R.C.T. scores have been converted to D.R.P. units and then to N.C.E.s.

[^1]N.C.E.s provide a standard against which students' progress can be evaluated. A gain in N.C.E. scores from pretest to posttest indicates a student's performance is better than what would be expected by normal growth and chance. The evaluation objective of the College Bound program stipulates that improvement should be greater than the expected improvement without the "treatment" of the program. Thus, a student who has a higher posttest than pretest N.C.E. score has met the evaluation objective.

Writing performance for full and half-year students is evaluated by examining student writing samples before and after program participation. Trained reading/writing teachers evaluate students' writing samples using a holistic assessment method. Teachers assess writing samples using a five-point scale that considers the overall adequacy of the paper as well as students' adherence to the topic, word choice and usage, and other criteria. Math improvement in full-year students is measured by the math R.C.T. which is reported in percentages.

The progress of half-year students receiving math remediation in the College Bound program is measured by a program-developed criterion referenced test (C.R.T.) Students are given a C.R.T. designed by Science Research Associates specifically for use in the College Bound Program at the beginning of the term so that teachers can diagnose their skill deficiencies and prfipare an appropriate course of remediation for them. Students are posttested on the same test at the end of the term to determine the extent to which they have mastered
the skills in which they were deficient. The evaluation objective states that at least 70 percent of the students in the program for one term should master one new mathematics akill for every 20 days of instruction.

TABLE 1
CHAPTER I FUNDED PROGRAMS 1988-1989 COLLEGE BOUND PROGRAM STUDENT OUTCOMES IN READING AND WRITING

| STATUS | GRADE | TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WITH } \\ & \text { VALID } \\ & \text { ATTENDANCE } \end{aligned}$ | mean PERCENT ATTENDANCE | * WITH VALID READING SCORE | MEAN PRETEST SCORE | MEAN POSTTEST SCORE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% WHO } \\ & \text { IMPROVED } \\ & \text { IN } \\ & \text { READING } \end{aligned}$ | - HITH VALID WRITING SCORE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% WHO } \\ & \text { IMPROVED } \\ & \text { IN } \\ & \text { WRITING } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HALF YEAR | 9TH | 433 | 403 | 75.9 | 208 | 38.7 | 41.7 | 60.6\% | 215 | 75.8\% |
|  | 10TH | 784 | 740 | 75.3 | 381 | 44.5 | 48.4 | 65.4\% | 366 | 81.7\% |
|  | 11 TH | 603 | 581 | 78.8 | 254 | 46.6 | 49.0 | 58.7\% | 245 | 83.7\% |
|  | 12TH | 483 | 471 | 80.0 | 22 | 28.2 | 37.9 | 86.4\% | 187 | 87.7\% |
|  | MISSING | 7 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| TOTAL |  | 2310 | 2195 | 77.3 | 865 | 43.3 | 46.7 | 62.8\% | 1013 | 82.0\% |
| FULL YEAR | 9 TH | 643 | 617 | 83.3 | 440 | 39.1 | 42.0 | 62.5\% | 545 | 87.5\% |
|  | 10TH | 1150 | 1122 | 83.3 | 838 | 42.1 | 46.2 | 69.3\% | 959 | 82.8\% |
|  | 11TH | 1070 | 1058 | 84.8 | 705 | 46.5 | 47.7 | 53.0\% | 849 | 88.2\% |
|  | : 2 TH | 670 | 657 | 87.8 | 39 | 29.9 | 38.5 | 92.3\% | 614 | 82.6\% |
| TOTAL |  | 3533 | 3454 | 84.6 | 2022 | 42.8 | 45.7 | 62.6\% | 2967 | 85.2\% |
| TOTAL |  | 5343 | 5649 | 81.8 | 2887 | 42.9 | 46.0 | 62.7\% | 3980 | 84.4\% |

## II. OVERALL RESULTS

Overall, 5,843 students from 22 high schools were reported to have participated in reading and/or writing and 417 students from nine schools received math remediation from the College Bound Program during the 1988-89 school year. Attendance averaged 81.8 percent for full-year students in reading and writing and 77.3 percent. for half-year students. Attendance among math students was approximately 83 percent for full-year students and 83 percent for half-year students.

Of the 3,533 full-year students in the coilege Bound reading/writing program, 643 were in ninth grade, 1,150 were in tenth grade, 1,020 were in the eleventh grade, and 670 were in the twelfth grade. Similarly among half-year students, 433 were in the ninth grade, 784 were reported to be in the tenth grade, 603 were in the eleventh grade, and 483 were twelfth graders. The results of the reading/writing program for both full-year and half-year students are summarized overall and by grade in Table 1.

READING RESULTS

## Full-Year students

In the 1988-89 school year 3,533 students received reading instruction in the College Bound Program for the full year; 2,022 of them had valid reading scores.* Findings can only be

[^2]```
, TABLE 2
```

CHAPTER 1 FUNDED PROGRAMS 2988-1989
COLLEGE BOUND PROGRAM
STUDENT OUTCOMES IN MATHEMATICS

| STATUS | GRADE | TOTAL - OF STUDENTS | - HITH VALID ATTENDANCE | MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE | * HITH VALID CRT SCORE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AVERAGE } \\ & \text { OF OF } \\ & \text { SKILLS } \\ & \text { HASTERED } \end{aligned}$ | $\%$ HHD MASTERED REQUIRED SKILLS | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FHITH } \\ & \text { VALID } \\ & \text { RCT } \\ & \text { SCORE } \end{aligned}$ | mean PRETEST SCORE | MEAM POSTTEST SCORE | x HHO IMPROVED IN MATH |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HALF YEAR | 9TH | 103 \} | 103 | 81.5 | 82 | 9.2 | 76.3\% | 0 |  |  |  |
|  | 10TH | 132 | 132 | 84.5 | 94 | 12.6 | 83.1\% | 0 |  |  |  |
|  | 11 TH | 41 | 40 | 81.2 | 31 | 10.4 | 77.8\% | 0 |  |  |  |
|  | 12TH | 10 | 10 | 84.1 | 9 | 7.7 | 83.3\% | 0 |  |  |  |
| TOTAL |  | 286 | 285 | 83.0 | 216 | 10.8 | 79.7\% | 0 |  |  |  |
| FULL YEAR | 9 TH | 59 | 58 | 79.4 | 0 |  |  | 33 | 41.2 | 48.0 | 66.7x |
|  | 10TH | 53 | 52 | 83.8 | 0 |  |  | 13 | 41.5 | 56.3 | 92.3\% |
| $\infty$ | 11TH | 17 | 17 | 93.9 - | 0 |  |  | 2 | 59.2 | 66.7 | 50.0\% |
|  | 12TH | 2 | 2 | 95.6 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| total |  | 131 | 129 | 83.3 | 0 |  |  | 48 | 42.1 | 51.0 | 72.9x |
| total |  | 417 | 414 | 83.1 | 216 | 10.8 | 79.7\% | 48 | 42.1 | 51.0 | 72.9x |

reported for students with both pretest and posttest scores since program effectiveness is determined by changes in scores from the pretest to the posttest. To meet the reading objective, 70 percent of these students must demonstrate an N.C.E. gain. Sixty-three percent of the fuil-year students with valid scores made the necessary N.C.E. gain. This percentage falls short of the evaluation objective.

Half-Year Students
In 1988-89, 2,310 students received reading instruction for the half-year, 865 of whom had valid scores. Sixty-three percent of half year students made improvemencis in reading, falling short of the evaluation criteria of 70 percent. WRITING RESULTS

## Full-Year students

Eighty-four percent of full-year students had valid writing scores. To meet the evaluation objective, 70 percent of the full-year students had to demonstrate improvement in their writing as measured by teachers' holistic assessments. In fact, 85.2 percent of these students met the writing evaluation objective. Thus, the program surpassed its evaluation goal for full-year writing students.

## Half-Year Students

About 49 percent of half-year students had valid writing scores. Of these students, 82 percent met the evaluation objective. Thus the writing goal was surpassed among half-year
students as well.

## MATH RESULTS

## Full-Year Students

In the 1988-89 school year, 131 students were reported to have received math remediation in the Coll.ege Bound Program for the full-year. The evaluation objective for full-year students stipulates that 70 percent of the students sinould demonstrate a gain in R.C.T. scores from the pretest to the posttest. This objective is problematic since norming table to convert R.C.T. scores into standardized scores such as Normal Curve Equivalents (N.C.E.S), do nct exist. Consequently, R.C.T. scores are reported in percentages. Percentage scores are not standard or equivalent. Therefore, it is not correct to measure students' progress by subtracting students' scores on the posttest from the pretest. Nevertheless, percentage scores and the proportion of students who met the evalution objective according to this criterion (i.e., students whose percentage scores evidenced a gain from the pretest to the posttest) are reported in Table 2 to satisfy the requirements of the funding source. As seen in this table, 37 percent (48) of the students had both pretest and posttest R.C.T. scores. Of these students 72.9 percent met the evaluation objective, surpassing the criterion of 70 percent. It should be noted that a large amount of the missing R.C.T. math data for full-year students is due to the fact that College Bound students generally pass the R.C.T. on their first attempt. Thus, they have no posttest scores since they would not be
required to take the test once they have passed it. Half-year Students

A total of 286 students received one-term of math remediation in the College Bound Program during 1988-89. Seventy-six percent of the students had valid scores. To meet the cvaluation objective, at least 70 percent of the halr-year students had to master one new mathematics skill for every 20 days of instruction. This objective was surpassed since 79.7 percent of the students mastered an average of 10.8 skills.

The following tables showing total student cutcomes are organized by superintendency followed by student outcomes of individual high schools in that superintendency.

CHAPTER I FUNDED PROGRAMS 1988-1989
COLLEGE BOUND PROGRAM
STUDENT OUTCOMES IN READING AND WRITING

| SUPERINTENDENCY | Status | GRADE | tOTAL NUMBER OF Students | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WITH } \\ & \text { VALID } \\ & \text { ATTENDANCE } \end{aligned}$ | MEAN PERCENTI ATTENDANCE | - HITH VALID READING SCORE | mean PRETEST SCORE | MEAN POSTTEST SCORE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { K WHO } \\ & \text { IMPROVED } \\ & \text { IN } \\ & \text { READING } \end{aligned}$ | * HITK VALID HRITINO SCORE | $x$ WHO IMPROV IN WRITIN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MANHATTAN | HALF YEAR | 9 TH | 71 | 70 | 77.8 | 38 | 37.4 | 40.9 | 65.8\% | 29 | 93.1\% |
|  |  | 10TH | 213 | 212 | 74.9 | 99 | 41.9 | 46.4 | 68.7\% | 109 | 74.3\% |
|  |  | 11TH | 130 | 122 | 81.1 | 59 | 49.1 | 50.1 | 49.2\% | 53 | 84.9\% |
|  |  | 12TH | 126 | 122 | 84.1 | 8 | 30.0 | 36.9 | 75.0\% | 58 | 93.1\% |
|  |  | MISSING | 1 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |
|  | TOTAL |  | 541 | 526 | 78.8 | 204 | 42.7 | 46.1 | 62.7\% | 249 | 83.1\% |
|  | FULL YEAR | 9TH | 94 | 94 | 82.0 | 67 | 40.4 | 41.4 | 49.3\% | 79 | 92.4\% |
| $\underset{\sim}{N}$ |  | 10TH | 199 | 199 | 81.4 | 138 | 41.2 | 45.7 | 71.0\% | 163 | 86.5\% |
|  |  | 11TH | 234 | 230 | 86:2 | 155 | 48.3 | 48.8 | 49.7\% | 174 | 90.2\% |
|  |  | 12TH | 144 | 143 | 87.7 | 9 | 28.0 | 37.7 | 100.0\% | 128 | 96.1\% |
|  | TOTAL |  | 671 | 666 | 84.5 | 369 | 43.7 | 46.0 | 58.8\% | 544 | 90.8\% |
| TOTAL |  | - | 1212 | 1192 | 82.0 | 573 | 43.3 | 46.0 | 60.2\% | 793 | 88.4\% |

CHAPTER I FUNDED PROGRAMS 1988-1989
COLLEGE BOUND PROGRAM
STUDENT OUTCNMES IN READING AND WRITING


CHAPTER I FUNDED PROGRAMS 1988-1989 COLLEGE BOUND PROGRAM student outcomes in reading and writing


CHAPTER I FUNDED PROGRAMS 1988-1989 COLLEGE BOUND PROGRAM STUDENT OUTCOMES IN READING AND WRITING

|  | SUPERINTENDENCY | SCHOOL | STATUS | GRADE | TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WITH } \\ & \text { VALID } \\ & \text { ATTENDANCE } \end{aligned}$ | MEAN PERCENT ATtENDANCE | * WITH VALID READING SCORE |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% WHD } \\ & \text { IMPROVED } \\ & \text { IN } \\ & \text { READING } \end{aligned}$ | WITH VALID WRITING SCORE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Y HHO } \\ & \text { IMPROVE } \\ & \text { IN } \\ & \text { WRITING } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | MANHATTAN | LOUIS D. BRANDEIS | HALF YEAR | 9TH | 1 | 1 | 78.9 | 1 | 29.0 | 43.0 | 100.0\% | 1 | 100.0\% |
|  |  |  |  | 10TH | 66 | 65 | 66.8 | 16 | 31.6 | 35.1 | 62.5\% | 23 | 95.7\% |
|  |  |  |  | 11 H | 23 | 21 | 72.1 | 9 | 41.4 | 43.9 | 55.6\% | 8 | 100.0\% |
|  |  |  |  | 12TH | 17 | 17 | 69.0 | 4 | 34.5 | 37.7 | 75.0\% | 3 | 100.0\% |
|  |  |  | TOTAL |  | 107 | 104 | 68.3 | 30 | 34.8 | 38.4 | 63.3\% | 35 | 97.1\% |
|  |  |  | FULL YEAR | 9TH | 1 | 1 | 64.4 | 0 |  |  |  | 1 | 100.0\% |
|  |  |  |  | 10TH | 37 | 37 | 73.7 | 20 | 37.5 | 43.8 | 80.0\% | 28 | 85.7\% |
| $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathrm{G}}$ |  |  |  | 11TH | 52 | 52 | 83.5 | 27 | 46.5 | 49.0 | 59.3\% | 44 | 100.0\% |
|  |  |  |  | 12TH | 43 | 42 | 80.4 | 4 | 23.5 | 37.5 | 100.0\% | 38 | 100.0\% |
|  |  |  | TOTAL |  | 133 | 132 | 79.6 | 51 | 41.2 | 46.0 | 70.6\% | 111 | 96.4\% |
|  |  | total |  |  | 240 | 236 | 74.6 | 81 | 38.8 | 43.2 | 67.9\% | 146 | 96.6\% |

CHAPTER I FUNDED PROGRRMS 1988-1989 COLIEGE BOUND PROGRAM COLIEGE BOUND PROGRAM
STUDENT OUTCOMES IN READING AND WRITING


CHAPTER I FUNDED PROGRAMS 1988-1989 COLLEGE BOUHD PROGRAM
STUDENT OUTCOMES IN READING AND HRITING

|  | SUPER INTENDENCY | SCHOOL |  |  | STATUS |  | GRADE | TOTAL NUMBER 0 F STUDENTS | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WITH } \\ & \text { VALID } \\ & \text { ATTENDAHCE } \end{aligned}$ | MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EWITH } \\ & \text { VALIID } \\ & \text { READING } \\ & \text { SCCRE } \end{aligned}$ | MEAN PRETEST SCORE | MEAN POSTTEST SCORE | ```% WHO IPMPROVED IN READING``` | * WITH VALID WRITING SCORE | \% WHO IMPROVE IN WRITING |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | MANHATTAM | MARTIN | LUTHER | KING | HALF | YEAR | 10TH | 38 | 38 | 85.1 | 23 | 50.9 | 52.9 | 56.5\% | 18 | 27.8\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11TH | 28 | 26 | 82.7 | 9 | 51.8 | 54.9 | 77.8\% | 4 | 50.0\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12TH | 41 | 38 | 88.9 | 2 | 26.5 | 29.0 | 50.0\% | 7 | 71.4\% |
|  |  |  |  |  | total |  |  | 107 | 102 | 85.9 | 34 | 49.7 | 52.0 | 61.8\% | 29 | 41.4\% |
|  |  |  |  |  | FULL | YEAR | 10TH | 31 | 31 | 90.0 | 21 | 44.3 | 48.3 | 66.7\% | 27 | 51.9\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 117H | 65 | 61 | 86.6 | 49 | 53.1 | 51.3 | 34.7\% | 28 | 50.0\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12TH | 19 | 19 | 89.6 | 1 | 41.0 | 44.0 | 100.0\% | 8 | 37.5\% |
| $\stackrel{\sim}{v}$ |  |  |  |  | TOTAL |  |  | 115 | 111 | 88.1 | 71 | 50.4 | 50.3 | 45.1\% | 63 | 49.2\% |
| total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 222 | 213 | 87.0 | 105 | 50.1 | 50.9 | 50.5\% | 92 | 46.7\% |

COLLEGE I FUNDED PROGRAMS 1988-1989 COLLEGE BOUND PROGRAM STUDENT OUTCOMES IN READING AND WRITIHG

|  | SUPERINTENDENCY | SCHOOL | status | grade | total NUMBER OF STUDENTS | \# HITH VALID ATTENDANCE | MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { HITH HITH } \\ & \text { VALIDD } \\ & \text { READING } \\ & \text { SCORE } \end{aligned}$ | MEAN PRETEST SCORE | MEAN POSTTEST SCORE | \% WHO <br> IMPROVED <br> IN <br> READING | $\begin{aligned} & \text { हWITH } \\ & \text { VALID } \\ & \text { WRITING } \\ & \text { SCORE } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% HHO } \\ & \text { IMPROVE } \\ & \text { IN } \\ & \text { HRITING } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | MANHATTAN | PARK WEST | HALF YEAR | 9TH | 8 | 8 | 66.0 | 6 | 41.5 | 50.0 | 83.3\% | 2 | 100.0\% |
|  |  |  |  | 10TH | 16 | 16 | 48.6 | 5 | 41.2 | 44.6 | 60.0\% | 2 | 100.0\% |
|  |  |  |  | 11 HH | 3 | 3 | 92.6 | 3 | 63.7 | 56.7 | 0.0 | 3 | 66.7\% |
|  |  |  |  | 12TH | 5 | 5 | 89.5 | 0 |  |  |  | 2 | 100.0\% |
|  |  |  | TOTAL |  | 32 | 32 | 63.5 | 14 | 46.1 | 49.5 | 57.1\% | 9 | 88.9\% |
|  |  |  | FULL YEAR | 9TH | 17 | 17 | 36.2 | 14 | 44.1 | 48.3 | 71.4\% | 17 | 100.0\% |
|  |  |  |  | 10TH | 58 | 58 | 75.7 | 37 | 43.5 | 48.6 | 78.4\% | 46 | 91.3\% |
| $\underset{\infty}{+\infty}$ |  |  |  | 11 TH | 38 | 38 | 87.7 | 26 | 52.7 | 52.0 | 42.3\% | 34 | 91.2\% |
|  |  |  |  | 12TH | 37 | 37 | 88.9 | 1 | 34:0 | -40.0 | 100.0\% | 37 | 100.0\% |
|  |  |  | total |  | 150 | 150 | 83.2 | 78 | 46.5 | 49.6 | 65.4\% | 134 | 94.8\% |
|  |  | total |  |  | 182 | 182 | 79.7 | 92 | 46.5 | 49.6 | 64.1\% | 143 | 94.4\% |
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| SUPERINTENDENCY | STATUS | GRADE | TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WITH } \\ & \text { VALID } \\ & \text { ATTENDANCE } \end{aligned}$ | MEAN PERCENT attendance | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WITH } \\ & \text { VAL1D } \\ & \text { READING } \\ & \text { SCORE } \end{aligned}$ | MEAN PRETEST SCORE | MEAN <br> POST- <br> TEST <br> SCOR | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{\chi} \text { WHO } \\ & \text { IMPROVED } \\ & \text { IN } \\ & \text { READING } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { HITH } \\ & \text { VALID } \\ & \text { WRITING } \\ & \text { SCORE } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BRONX | HALF YEAR | 9 TH | 126 | 125 | 75.1 | 74 | 38.6 | 41.0 | $56.8 \%$ | 75 | 68.0\% |
|  |  | 10 TH | 331 | 323 | 78.4 | 192 | 44.1 | 48.5 | $66.7 \%$ | 176 | 83.5\% |
|  |  | 11 TH | 287 | 284 | 80.1 | 141 | 46.0 | 49.1 | $63.1 \%$ | 150 | 81.3\% |
|  |  | 12TH | 200 | 199 | 80.3 | 8 | 26.6 | 39.7 | 87.5\% | 95 | 85.3\% |
|  |  | MISSING | 2 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |
|  | TOTAL |  | 946 | 931 | 78.9 | 415 | 43.4 | 47.2 | $64.1 \%$ | 496 | 80.8\% |
|  | FULL YEAR | 9TH | 81 | 80 | 81.0 | 66 | 38.1 | 42.8 | 77.3\% | 60 | 88.3\% |
| $\stackrel{\bullet}{\circ}$ |  | 10 TH | 360 | 348 | 86.1 | 283 | 42.6 | 46.8 | 70.0\% | 289 | 86.2\% |
|  |  | 11 TH | 269 | 265 | 87.1 | 203 | 46.5 | 48.2 | 53.2\% | 231 | 87.0\% |
|  |  | 12TH | 215 | 206 | 89.4 | 15 | 29.7 | 38.1 | 86.7\% | 195 | 78.5\% |
|  | TOTAL |  | 925 | 899 | 86.7 | 567 | 43.1 | 46.6 | 65.3\% | 775 | 84.6\% |
| total |  |  | 1871 | 1830 | $82.7{ }^{\circ}$ | 982 | 43.2 | 46.8 | 64.8\% | 1271 | 83.2\% |
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## CHAPTER I FUINDED PROGRAMS 1.988-1989 COLLEGE BOUND PROGRAM

 STUDEHT OUTCOMES IN READING AND WRITING|  | SUPERINTENDENCY | SCHOOL | StATUS | GRADE | tOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WITH } \\ & \text { VALID } \\ & \text { ATTENDANCE } \end{aligned}$ | MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE | WITH VALID READING SCORE |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% WHO } \\ & \text { IMPROVED } \\ & \text { IN } \\ & \text { READING } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WITH } \\ & \text { VALIDD } \\ & \text { HRITING } \\ & \text { SCORE } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% WHO } \\ & \text { IMPROVE } \\ & \text { INRITING } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | BRONX | WILLIAM H. TAFt | HALF YEAR | 9TH | 2 | 2 | 47.1 | 0 |  |  |  | 1 | 100.0\% |
|  |  |  |  | 10TH | 16 | 15 | 70.9 | 7 | 31.9 | 39.4 | 85.7\% | 5 | 100.0\% |
|  |  |  |  | 11TH | 75 | 75 | 76.2 | 34 | 40.2 | 45.6 | 82.4\% | 40 | 87.5\% |
|  |  |  |  | 12TH | 38 | 38 | 75.4 | 5 | 26.0 | 39.0 | 80.0\% | 27 | 100.0\% |
|  |  |  | total |  | 131 | 131 | 74.9 | 46 | 37.4 | 43.9 | 82.6\% | 73 | 93.2\% |
|  |  |  | FULL Year | 10TH | 55 | 54 | 83.3 | 39 | 33.1 | 39.4 | 84.6\% | 49 | 98.0\% |
|  |  |  |  | 11TH | 13 | 13 | 79.9 | 7 | 23.7 | 37.4 | 100.0\% | 13 | 76.9\% |
| N |  |  |  | 12TH | 35 | 35 | 82.3 | 7 | 28.6 | 35.7 | 71.4\% | 31 | 96.8\% |
|  |  |  | total |  | 103 | 102 | 82.5 | 53 | 31.3 | 38.7 | 84.9\% | 93 | 94.6\% |
|  |  | total |  |  | 234 | 233 | 78.2 | 99 | 34.1 | 41.1 | 83.8\% | 166 | 94.0\% |


| SUPERINTENDENCY | SCH0OL | Status | GRADE |  |  | riean PERCENT ATTENDANCE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WITH } \\ & \text { VALID } \\ & \text { CRT } \\ & \text { SCORE } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AVERAGE } \\ & \text { SOF } \\ & \text { SILLS } \\ & \text { MASTERED } \end{aligned}$ | * HHO MASTERED REQUIRED SKILLS | - HITH <br> UALID <br> R.CT <br> SCORE | MEAN PRETEST SCORE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MEAN \% HHO } \\ & \text { POST- IMPROVED } \\ & \text { TEST IN MATH } \\ & \text { SCORE } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| bronx | WILLIAM H. TAFt | HALF YEAR | 9TH | 1 | 1 | 88.2 | 1 | 9.0 | 100.0\% | 0 |  |  |
|  | - |  | 10TH | 19 | 19 | 79.6 | 15 | 5.2 | 53.8\% | 0 |  |  |
|  |  |  | 11TH | 8 | 8 | 72.3 | 6 | 7.2 | 60.0\% | 0 |  |  |
|  | 。 | TOTAL |  | 28 | 28 | 77.8 | 22 | 5.9 | $57.9 \%$ | 0 |  |  |
|  | total |  |  | 28 | 28 | 77.8 | 22 | 5.9 | 57.9\% | 0 |  |  |
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JAMES MONROE
BRONX
total

Status Grade


HALF YEAR 9TH
10TH
11TH
12TH
total
FULL YEAR 9TH
10TH
11TH
12TH
TOTAL
145 51
51
38
29
20
138
83.316
70.9
31.0

* WITH MEAN MEAN \% WHO VALID PRE- POST- IMPROUED $\begin{array}{ll}\text { VALID } & \text { PRE- } \\ \text { READING TEST } \\ \text { SCORE } & \text { SCOR }\end{array}$ POST- IMPROVED
TEST IN
SCORE READIMG WITH
VALID
WRITING
\% NHO SCORE SCORE SCORE READING SCORE IfPROVE
IN
WRITING

| 83.0 | 23 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 82.0 | 18 |

$38.9 \quad 40.5 \quad 48.3 \%$
$44.249 .361 .1 \%$
$44.6 \quad 46.1 \quad 50.0 \%$
$\qquad$
32
66.7\%

63
41.9
44.

45
$2.4 \%$
105
05
70.5\%

## 80.

27
64.
47.2
66.12
80.3

65
42.0
44.
50.0
$0.0 \%$
3
1
1 100.0\%
1 100.0\%
$683.3 \%$
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## total

| Status | GRADE | TOTAL HUMBER OF STUDENTS | $\begin{aligned} & \text { HITH } \\ & \text { VALID } \\ & \text { ATTENDANCE } \end{aligned}$ | MEAN PERCENT ATTEMDANCE | * HITH VALID READING SCORE | MEAN PRETEST SCORE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MEAN } \\ & \text { POST- } \\ & \text { TEST } \\ & \text { SCORE } \end{aligned}$ | ```% WHO IMPROYED IN READING``` | WITH VALID HRITING SCORE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { K HHO } \\ & \text { IMPROVEI } \\ & \text { IN } \\ & \text { WRITING } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HALF YEAR | 10TH | 42 | 39 | 86.2 | 25 | 48.2 | 56.0 | 76.0\% | 23 | 87.0\% |
|  | 11TH | 32 | 31 | 86.8 | 11 | 49.4 | 53.1 | 72.7\% | 15 | 73.3\% |
|  | 12TH | 35 | 35 | 94.0 | 0 |  |  |  | 8 | 87.5\% |
| total |  | 109 | 105 | 89.0 | 36 | 48.6 | 55.1 | 75.0\% | 46 | 82.6\% |
| FULL Year | 10TH | 65 | 63 | 95.4 | 51 | 50.3 | 57.0 | 80.4\% | 58 | 87.9\% |
|  | 11TH | 75 | 74 | 91.6 | 60 | 55.9 | 55.2 | 31.7\% | 72 | 33.3\% |
|  | 12TH | 55 | 55 | 94.7 | 0 |  |  |  | 50 | 76.0\% |
| total |  | 195 | 192 | 93.7 | 111 | 53.3 | 56.0 | 54.1\% | 180 | 82.8\% |
|  |  | 304 | 297 | 92.0 | 147 | 52.1 | 55.8 | 59.2\% | 226 | 82.7\% |

CHAPTER 1 FUNDED PROGRANS 1988-1989 COLLEGE BOUND PROGRAM student outcomes in mathematics

|  | SUPERINTENDENCY | SCHOOL | STATUS | GRADE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TOTAL } \\ & \text { OF } \\ & \text { STU- } \\ & \text { DENTS } \end{aligned}$ | 右 WITH <br> VALID <br> ATTEN- <br> DANCE | MEAN PERCENT ATTEHDANCE | WITH CRT SLDRE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AVERAGE } \\ & \text { OF } \\ & \text { SKILLS } \\ & \text { MASTERED } \end{aligned}$ | x WHO MASTERED REQUIRED SKILLS |  | mean PRETEST SCDRE | MEAN X HHO POST- IHPROVED TEST IN MATH SCORE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | BRONX | EVANDER CHILDS | HALF YEAR | 10TH | 7 | 7 | 86.5 | 6 | 10.5 | 66.7\% | 0 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 11TH | 4 | 3 | 92.3 | 3 | 9.0 | 100.0\% | 0 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 12TH | 3 | 3 | 90.2 | 3 | 5.3 | 100.0\% | 0 |  |  |
|  |  |  | TOTAL |  | 14 | 13 | 88.7 | 12 | 8.8 | 83.3\% | 0 |  |  |
|  |  |  | FULL YEAR | 10TH | 4 | 4 | 90.7 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & N \\ & \alpha \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | 11TH | 3 | 3 | 96.3 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 12TH | 1 | 1 | 97.8 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |
|  |  |  | TOTAL |  | 8 | 8 | 93.7 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |
|  |  | TOTAL |  |  | 22 | 21 | 90.6 | 12 | 8.8 | 83.3\% | 0 |  |  |

CHAPTER I FUNDED PROGRAMS 1988-1989 COLLEGE BOUND PROGRAM student outcomes in reading and writing

| SUPERINTENDENCY | SCHOOL | Status | GRADE | total NUMBER OF STUDENTS | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WITH } \\ & \text { VALID } \\ & \text { ATTENDANCE } \end{aligned}$ | MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE | * HITH <br> VALID <br> READING <br> SCORE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MEAN } \\ & \text { PRE- } \\ & \text { TEST } \\ & \text { SCORE } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Y HHO } \\ & \text { IMPROVED } \\ & \text { IN } \\ & \text { READING } \end{aligned}$ | - WITH <br> VALID <br> WRITING <br> SCGRE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% WHO } \\ & \text { IMPROVE } \\ & \text { IN } \\ & \text { WRITING } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BRONX | WALTON | HALF YEAR | 9TH | 15 | 15 | 60.5 | 3 | 35.7 | 46.7 | 100.0\% | 4 | 75.0\% |
|  |  |  | 10 TH | 20 | 19 | 81.9 | 5 | 40.8 | 47.4 | 80.0\% | 9 | 100.0\% |
|  |  |  | 11TH | 9 | 9 | 93.5 | 3 | 55.7 | 58.7 | 66.7\% | 3 | - $66.7 \%$ |
|  |  |  | 12TH | 4 | 3 | 83.5 | 0 |  |  |  | 2 | 50.0\% |
|  |  | total |  | 48 | 46 | 77.3 | 11 | 43.5 | 50.3 | 81.8\% | 18 | 83.3\% |
|  |  | FULL YEAR | 9 TH | 51 | 50 | 83.1 | 42 | 40.5 | 45.2 | 78.6\% | 36 | 86.1\% |
|  |  |  | 10TH | 60 | 59 | 89.4 | 46 | 40.1 | 43.5 | 58.7\% | 56 | 96.4\%. |
|  |  |  | 11 TH | 51 | 50 | 91.5 | 48 | 42.9 | 45.9 | 62.5\% | 45 | 95.6\% |
|  |  |  | 12TH | 37 | 37 | 90.2 | 6 | 29.8 | 39.3 | 100.0\% | 37 | 78.4\% |
|  |  | TOTAL |  | 199 | 196 | 88.5 | 142 | 40.7 | 44.6 | 67.6\% | 174 | 90.2\% |
|  | total |  |  | 247 | 242 | 86.4 | 153 | 40.9 | 45.0 | 68.6\% | 192 | 89.6\% |
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|  | SUPERINTENDENCY | SCHOOL | status | GRADE |  | - HITH <br> VALID <br> ATTEN- DANCE DANC | MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE | HITH VALID CRT SCORE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AVERAGE } \\ & \text { KOF } \\ & \text { SKILLS } \\ & \text { MASTERED } \end{aligned}$ | $\%$ H HO MASTERED REQUIRED SKILLS |  |  | MEAN POSTTEST SCORE | $x$ HHO IMPROVED IN MATH |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | BRONX | WALTON | HALF YEAR | 97H | 3 | 3 | 74.9 | 2 | 4.0 | 100.0\% | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 10TH | 3 | 3 | 89.1 | 3 | 3.7 | 66. $7 \%$ | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 11 TH | 4 | 4 | 91.8 | 4 | 3.5 | 50.0\% | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | - |  | 12TH | 2 | 2 | 86.5 | 2 | 3.5 | 50.0\% | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | TOTAL |  | 12 | 12 | 86.0 | 11 | 3.6 | 62.5\% | 0 |  |  |  |
| $\begin{gathered} N \\ \infty \end{gathered}$ |  |  | FULL YEAR | 10TH | 8 | 8 | 83.5 | 0 |  |  | 1 | 60.0 | 76.7 | 100.0\% |
|  |  |  |  | 11 TH | 13 | 13 | 94.0 | 0 |  |  | 1 | 61.7 | 78.3 | 100.0\% |
|  |  |  |  | 12TH | 1 | 1 | 93.3 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | TOTAL |  | 22 | 22 | 90.2 | 0 |  |  | 2 | 60.8 | 77.5 | 100.0\% |
|  |  | TOTAL |  |  | 34 | 34 | 88.7 | 11 | 3.6 | 62.5\% | 2 | 60.8 | 77.5 | 100.0x |

## CH'APTER I FUNDED PROGRAMS 1938-1989

 COLLEGE BOUND PROGRAM STUDENT OUTCOMES IN READING AND WRITING|  | SUPERINTENDENCY | SCHOOL | STATUS | GRADE | total NUMBER OF $\qquad$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WITH } \\ & \text { VALID } \\ & \text { ATTENDANCE } \end{aligned}$ | MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WITH. } \\ & \text { VALID } \\ & \text { READING } \\ & \text { SCORE } \end{aligned}$ | MEAN PRETEST SCORE | MEAN POSTTEST SCORE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% HHO } \\ & \text { IMPROVED } \\ & \text { IN } \\ & \text { READING } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8 \text { WITH } \\ & \text { VALID } \\ & \text { WRITING } \\ & \text { SCORE } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \%HHO } \\ & \text { IMPRREV } \\ & \text { IN } \\ & \text { WRITING } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | BRONX | DEWITT CLINTON | HALF YEAR | 9TH | 56 | 55 | 72.7 | 42 | 38.6 | 40.9 | 59.5\% | 25 | 88.0\% |
|  |  |  |  | 10TH | 25 | 25 | 67.5 | 15 | 41.5 | 42.1 | 53.3\% | 8 | 50.0\% |
|  |  |  |  | 11TH | 15 | 14 | 81.6 | 6 | 52.2 | 53.2 | 50.0\% | 5 | 100.0\% |
|  |  |  | total |  | 96 | 9.4. | -7.2.7 | -63 | 40.6 | 42.4 | 57.1\% | 38 | 81.6\% |
|  |  |  | FILL YEAR | 9TH | 25 | 25 | 76.8 | 21 | 33.4 | 38.3 | 76.2\% | 20 | 95.0\% |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { N } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | 10TH | 47 | 45 | 79.5 | 38 | 36.5 | 38.5 | 57.9\% | 47 | 72.3\% |
|  |  |  |  | 11TH | 46 | 45 | 83.4 | 27 | 40.1 | 42.3 | 63.0\% | 42 | 95.2\% |
|  |  |  | TOTAL | . | 118 | 115 | 80.4 | 86 | 36.9 | ご. 6 | 64.0\% | 109 | 85.3\% |
|  |  | TOTAL |  |  | 214 | 209 | 76.9 | 149 | 38.4 | 40.8 | $61.1 \%$ | 147 | 84.4\% |


| SUPERINTENDENCY | SCHOOL | Status | GRADE |  |  | mean PERCENT ATTENDANCE |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AYERAGE } \\ & \text { FOF } \\ & \text { SKILS } \\ & \text { MASTERED } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% HHO } \\ & \text { MASTERED } \\ & \text { RERUIRED_ } \\ & \text { SKILLS } \end{aligned}$ | WITH MEAN VALID PRE- RCI TEST SCORE SCORE | MEAN $x$ HHO POST- IMPROVED $\underset{\text { SCORE }}{\text { TEST_MATH }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 8ROHX | DEWITT Cilinluit | HALF YEAR | 10TH | 3 | 3 | 95.8 | 3 | 9.0 | 100.0\% | 0 |  |
|  |  |  | 11TH | 1 | 1 | 90.5 | 1 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | total |  | 4 | 4 | 94.5 | 4 | 7.5 | 75.0\% | 0 |  |
|  | TOTAL |  |  | 4 | 4 | 94.5 | 4 | 7.5 | 75.0\% | 0 |  |

$0 \varepsilon$
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## CHAPTER I FUKDED PROGRAMS 1988-1989 COLLEGE BOUND PROGRAM CTUDENT OUTCOMES IN READING AND WRITIHG

| SUPERINTENDENCY | STATUS | GRADE | total NUMBER OF STUDENTS | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WITH } \\ & \text { VALID } \\ & \text { ATTENDANCE: } \end{aligned}$ | MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { E HITH } \\ & \text { VALID } \\ & \text { READING } \\ & \text { SCORE } \end{aligned}$ | MEAN PRETEST SCORE | MEAN <br> POST- <br> TEST <br> SCORE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { K HHO } \\ & \text { IMPROVED } \\ & \text { IN } \\ & \text { READING } \end{aligned}$ | HITH VALID HRITING SCORE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { K HHO } \\ & \text { IMPROVI } \\ & \text { IN } \\ & \text { WRITIN } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BASIS | HALF YEAR | 9TH | 160 | 137 | 77.2 | 71 | 38.6 | 43.9 | 73.2\% | 76 | 71.1\% |
|  |  | 10 TH | 148 | 115 | 66.7 | 52 | 48.0 | 49.4 | 51.9\% | 41 | 92.7\% |
|  |  | 11 TH | 100 | 92 | 76.3 | 31 | 42.8 | 46.3 | 64.5\% | 16 | 100.0\% |
|  |  | 12TH | 56 | 51 | 82.4 | 3 | 29.7 | 39.0 | 100.0\% | 13 | 100.0\% |
|  | TOTAL |  | 464 | 395 | 74.6 | 157 | 42.4 | 46.1 | 65.0\% | 146 | 82.9\% |
|  | FULL YEAR | 9TH | 228 | 208 | 81.6 | 135 | 38.8 | 42.9 | $66.7 \%$ | 200 | 80.5\% |
|  |  | 10TH | 302 | 289 | 80.6 | 197 | 41.6 | 44.9 | 68.5\% | 255 | 82.4\% |
| $\underset{\Delta}{\omega}$ |  | 11TH | 274 | 270 | 82.0 | 162 | 46.1 | 46.4 | 48.8\% | 199 | 88.4\% |
|  |  | 12TH | 130 | 129 | 89.8 | 5 | 31.6 | 40.2 | 100.0\% | 126 | 88.1\% |
|  | TOTAL |  | 934 | 896 | 82.6 | 499 | 42.2 | 44.8 | 61.9\% | 780 | 84.4\% |
| total |  |  | 1398 | 1291 | 80.1 | 656 | 42.3 | 45.1 | 62.7\% | 926 | 84.1\% |
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| SUPERINTENDENCY | StATUS | Grade | total " OF STUDENTS | WITH VALID ATTENDANCE | MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { HITH } \\ & \text { VALID } \\ & \text { CRT } \\ & \text { SCORE } \end{aligned}$ | AVERAGE - OF SKILLS MASTERED | $x$ WHO MASTERED REQUIRED SKILLS | $\begin{aligned} & \text { HITH } \\ & \text { VALID } \\ & \text { RCT } \\ & \text { SCORE } \end{aligned}$ | MEAN PRETEST SCORE | MEAN POSTTEST SCDRE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ¿ HHO } \\ & \text { IMPROV } \\ & \text { IN MAT } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BASIS | HALF YEAR | 9TH | 47 | 47 | 78.0 | 36 | 4.4 | 60.0\% | 0 |  | - |  |
|  |  | 10TH | 16 | 16 | 81.6 | 1 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | 11 TH | 1 | 1 | 60.0 , | 1 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  | total |  | 64 | 64 | 78.6 | 38 | 4.3 | 58.3\% | 0 |  |  |  |
|  | FULL YEAR | 9 TH | 55 | 54 | 79.4 | 0 |  |  | 32 | 41.2 | 48.5 | 68.8\% |
|  | total |  | 55 | 54 | 79.4 | 0 |  |  | 32 | 41.2 | 48.5 | 68.8\% |
| TOTAL |  |  | 119 | 118 | 79.0 | 38 | 4.3 | 58.3\% | 32 | 41.2 | 48.5 | 68.8\% |

CHAPTER I FUNDED PROGRAMS 1988-1989 COLLEGE BOUND PROGRAM STUDENT OUTCOMES IN READING AND WRITING

|  | SUPERINTENDENCY | SCHOOL | Status | GRADE | TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS | * WITH VALID ATTENDANCE | MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE | * WITH VALID READING SCORE | MEAN PRETEST SCORE |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% WHO } \\ & \text { IMPROVED } \\ & \text { IN } \\ & \text { READING } \end{aligned}$ | WITH VALID WRITING SCORE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Y WHO } \\ & \text { IMPROYE } \\ & \text { IN } \\ & \text { WRITING } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | BASIS | BOYS AND GIRLS | HALF YEAR | 9TH | 63 | 61 | 88.4 | 39 | 41.3 | 48.8 | 82.1\% | 45 | 53.3\% |
|  |  |  |  | 10TH | 42 | 42 | 66.1 | 23 | 48.8 | 51.7 | 56.5\% | 14 | 100.0\% |
|  |  |  |  | 11 TH | 15 | 15 | 68.6 | 7 | 44.9 | 52.1 | 71.4\% | 0 |  |
|  |  |  |  | 12TH | 10 | 8 | 79.8 | 1 | 32.0 | 41.0 | 100.0\% | 2 | 100.0\% |
|  |  |  | TOTAL |  | 130 | 126 | 78.1 | 70 | 44.0 | 50.0 | 72.9\% | 61 | 65.6\% |
|  |  |  | FULL YEAR | 9TH | 50 | 49 | 92.3 | 41 | 45.9 | 51.9 | 73.2\% | 50 | 72.0\% |
|  |  |  |  | 10TH | 63 | 63 | 78.7 | 53 | 46.4 | 49.6 | 73.6\% | 35 | 100.0\% |
| $\stackrel{\omega}{\boldsymbol{\omega}}$ |  |  |  | 119.1 | 74 | 74 | 81.1 | 63 | 50.2 | 50.3 | 49.2\% | 0 |  |
|  |  |  |  | 12TH | 72 | 72 | 90.1 | 3 | 32.7 | 27.7 | 100.0\% | 70 | 80.0\% |
|  |  |  | total |  | 259 | 258 | 85.2 | 160 | 47.5 | 50.1 | 64.4\% | 155 | 81.9\% |
|  |  | TOTAL |  |  | 389 | 384 | 82.8 | 230 | 46.4 | 50.1 | 67.0\% | 216 | 77.3\% |
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CHAPTER I FUNDED PROGRAMS 1988-1989 COLLEGE BOUND PROGRAM
SOUDENT OUTCOMES IN READING AND WRITING

| status | GRADE | TOTAL NUMBER 0 O sTUDENTS | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WITH } \\ & \text { VAL1D } \\ & \text { ATTENDANCE } \end{aligned}$ | MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WITH } \\ & \text { VALIDD } \\ & \text { READING } \\ & \text { SCORE } \end{aligned}$ | MEAN PRETEST SCORE |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% WHO } \\ & \text { IMPROVED } \\ & \text { IN } \\ & \text { READING } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FHITH } \\ & \text { VALIDD } \\ & \text { WRITING } \\ & \text { SCRRE } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% WHO } \\ & \text { IMPROVE } \\ & \text { IN } \\ & \text { HRITING } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HALF YEAR | 9TH | 14 | 11 | 74.1 | 6 | 38.8 | 36.3 | 16.7\% | 3 | 100.0\% |
|  | 10 TH | 18 | 18 | 80.7 | 8 | 50.1 | 53.7 | 87.5\% | 13 | 76.9\% |
|  | 11TH | 19 | 19 | 81.7 | 6 | 48.3 | 44.2 | 33.3\% | 3 | 66.7\% |
|  | 12TH | 29 | 29 | 80.4 | 0 |  |  |  | 3 | 100.0\% |
| TOTAL |  | 80 | 77 | 79.9 | 20 | 46.2 | 45.6 | 50.0\% | 22 | 81.8\% |
| FULL YEAR | 9TH | 30 | 29 | 89.6 | 26 | 38.2 | 43.6 | 76.9\% | 26 | 80.8\% |
|  | 10TH | 61 | 61 | 91.4 | 50 | 44.1 | 50.5 | 86.0\% | 48 | 64.6\% . |
|  | 11 TH | 63 | 63 | 91.3 | 45 | 48.6 | 51.0 | 71.1\% | 60 | 71.7\% |
|  | 12TH | 34 | 34 | 89.6 | 0 |  |  |  | 33 | 84.8\% |
| total |  | 188 | 187 | 90.8 | 121 | 44.5 | 49.2 | 78.5\% | 167 | 73.7\% |
|  |  | 268 | 264 | 87.6 | 141 | 44.7 | 48.7 | 74.5\% | 189 | 74.6\% |

CHAPTER 1 FUNDED PROGRAMS 1988-1989 COLLEGE BOUND PROGRAM STUDENT OUTCOMES IN MATHEMATICS

| STAIUS | GRADE | TOTAL \% OF STUDENTS | - WITH <br> VALID ATTEHDANCE | MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WITH } \\ & \text { VALID } \\ & \text { CRT } \\ & \text { SCORE } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AVERAGE } \\ & \text { OF } \\ & \text { SKILLS } \\ & \text { MASTERED } \end{aligned}$ | \% WHO <br> MASTERED <br> REGJIRED <br> SKILLS | $\begin{aligned} & \text { HITH } \\ & \text { VALID } \\ & \text { RCT } \\ & \text { SCORE } \end{aligned}$ | MEAN PRETEST SCORE | MEAN <br> POST- <br> TEST <br> SCORE | $\begin{aligned} & X \text { WHO } \\ & \text { IMPROVED } \\ & \text { IN MATH } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HALF YEAR | 9 TH | 43 | 43 | 88.6 | 37 | 14.5 | 87.9\% | 0 |  |  |  |
|  | 10 TH | 50 | 50 | 88.4 | 36 | 16.4 | 90.9\% | 0 |  |  |  |
|  | 11TH | 16 | 16 | 83.8 | 11 | 26.0 | 100.0\% | 0 |  |  |  |
|  | 12TH | 5 | 5 | 79.5 | 4 | 23.0 | 100.0\% | 0 |  |  |  |
| TOTAL |  | 114 | 114 | 87.5 | 88 | 15.9 | 89.8\% | 0 |  |  |  |
| FULL YEAR | 9 TH | 3 | 3 | 73.7 | 0 |  |  | 1 | 42.0 | 34.0 | 0.0 |
|  | 10 TH | 17 | 16 | 87.8 | 0 |  |  | 9 | 38.1 | 53.1 | 88.9\% |
|  | 11TH | 1 | 1 | 85.9 | 0 |  |  | 1 | 56.7 | 55.0 | 0.0 |
| TOTAL |  | 21 | 20 | 85.6 | 0 |  |  | 11 | 40.2 | 51.6 | 72.7\% |
|  | - | 135 | 134 | 87.2 | 88 | 15.9 | 89.8\% | 11 | 40.2 | 51.6 | 72.7\% |



CHAPTER 1 FUNDED PROGRAMS 1988-1989 COLLEGE BOUND PROGRAM STUDENT OUTCOMES IN MATHEMATICS
SUPERINTENDENCY SCHOOL STATUS GRADE
$\stackrel{A}{G}$
TOTAL

| Status | GRADE |
| :---: | :---: |
| HALF YEAR | 9TH |
|  | 10TH |
|  | 11 TH |
| total |  |
| FULL YEAR 10TH |  |
| TOTAL |  |


| total - OF STUgents |  | MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE | * WITH <br> VALID CRT SCORE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AVERAGE } \\ & \text { OF } \\ & \text { SKILLS } \\ & \text { MASTERED } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \% \text { WHO } \\ & \text { MASTERED } \\ & \text { REQUIRED } \\ & \text { SKILIS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WITH } \\ & \text { VALID } \\ & \text { RCT } \\ & \text { SCORE } \end{aligned}$ | MEAN PRETEST SCORE | MEAN <br> POST- <br> TEST <br> SCORE | * NHO IMPROVED IN MATH |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 1 | 42.1 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| 8 | $\delta$ | 82.4 | 6 | 12.0 | 100.0\% | 0 |  |  |  |
| 6 | 6 | 73.0 | 4 | 9.3 | 100.0\% | 0 |  |  |  |
| 15 | 15 | 75.9 | 10 | 11.1 | 100.0\% | 0 |  |  |  |
| 5 | 5 | 82.5 | 0 |  |  | 3 | 45.6 | 58.9 | 100.0\% |
| 5 | 5 | 82.5 | 0 |  |  | 3 | 45.6 | 58.9 | 100.0\% |
| 20 | 20 | 77.6 | 10 | 11.1 | 100.0\% | 3 | 45.6 | 58.9 | 100.0\% |
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 COLLEGE BOUND PROGRAM STUDENT OUTCOMES IN READING AND WRITING


CHAPTER I FUNDED PROGRAMS 1988-1989
COLLEGE BOUND PROGRAM
STUDENT OUTCOMES IN READING AND NRITING

| SUPERINTENDENCY | Status | GRADE | total NUMBER OF STUDENTS | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WIIH } \\ & \text { VALI: } \\ & \text { ATTENDANCE } \end{aligned}$ | MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WIITH } \\ & \text { VALID } \\ & \text { READING } \\ & \text { SCORE } \end{aligned}$ | MEAN PRETEST SCORE <br> SCORE | MEAN POSTTEST SCORE | $\begin{aligned} & x \text { WHO } \\ & \text { IMPROVED } \\ & \text { IN } \\ & \text { READING } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { हHITH } \\ & \text { VALID } \\ & \text { HRITING } \\ & \text { SCORE } \end{aligned}$ | $x$ HHO IPRPROV <br> IN <br> WRITIN. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| QUEENS | HALF YEAR | STH | 18 | 1: | 74.5 | 8 | 44.0 | 45.5 | 50.0\% | 11 | 90.9\% |
|  |  | 10 TH | 37 | 36 | 76.8 | 19 | 45.2 | 49.7 | 68.4\% | 19 | 89.5\% |
|  |  | 11 TH | 26 | 26 | 78.0 | 6 | 52.3 | 49.7 | 16.7\% | 14 | 92.9\% |
|  |  | 12TH | 30 | 30 | 75.0 | 2 | 33.0 | 42.0 | 100.0\% | 12 | 83.3\% |
|  |  | MISSING | 3 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |
|  | TOTAL |  | 114 | 109 | 76.2 | 35 | 45.4 | 48.3 | 57.1\% | 56 | 89.3\% |
|  | FULL YEAR | 9TH | 93 | 90 | 82.9 | 61 | 38.4 | 39.1 | 55.7x | 77 | 94.8\% |
| $\underset{\infty}{\infty}$ |  | 10 TH | 109 | 106 | 82.6 | 73 | 45.7 | 48.1 | 60.3\% | 90 | 94.4\% |
|  |  | 1i TH | 101 | 101 | 84.6 | 60 | 44.9 | 47.7 | 61.7\% | 87 | 96.6\% |
|  |  | 12TH | 68 | 66 | 79.9 | 4 | 31.5 | 42.3 | 100.0\% | 59 | 88.1\% |
|  | TOTAL |  | 371 | 363 | 82.7 | 198 | 42.9 | 45.1 | 60.1\% | 313 | 93.9\% |
| Jotal |  |  | 485 | 472 | 81.2 | 233 | 43.3 | 45.6 | 59.7\% | 369 | 93.2\% |

CHAPTER I FUNDED PROGRAMS 1988-1989 COLLEGE BOUND PROGRAM STUDENT OUTCOMES IN READING AND WRITING

|  | SUPERINTENDENCY | SCHOOL | status. | GRADE | total nUMBER OF STUDEN | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WITH } \\ & \text { VALID } \\ & \text { ATTENDANCE } \end{aligned}$ | MEAN PERCENT atyendance | - WITH VALID READING SCORE | MEAN PRETEST SCORE | Mean <br> POST- <br> TEST SCORE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% WHO } \\ & \text { IMPROVED } \\ & \text { IN } \\ & \text { READING } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { HITH } \\ & \text { VALID } \\ & \text { WRITING } \\ & \text { SCORE } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { K HHO } \\ & \text { IMPROVE } \\ & \text { IN } \\ & \text { WRITING } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | queEns | franklin K. lane | HALF Year | 9TH | 17 | 16 | 75.0 | 8 | 44.0 | 45.5 | 50.0\% . | 10 | 100.0\% |
|  |  |  |  | 10TH | 15 | 14 | 59.9 | 3 | 38.7 | 47.3 | 100.0\% | 4 | 50.0\% |
|  |  |  |  | 11TH | 8 | 8 | 75.6 | 1 | 70.0 | 55.0 | 0.0 | 5 | 80.0\% |
|  |  |  |  | 121H | 20 | 20 | 80.1 | 2 | 33.0 | 42.0 | 100.0\% | 11 | 81.8\% |
|  |  |  |  | MISSING | 3 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |
|  |  |  | TOTAL |  | 63 | 58 | 73.2 | 14 | 43.1 | 46.1 | 64.3\% | 30 | 83.3\% |
|  |  |  | FULL Year | 97H | 93 | 90 | 82.9 | 61 | 38.4 | 39.1 | 55.7\% | 77 | 94.8\% |
| $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0}$ |  |  |  | 10TH | 61 | 58 | 77.3 | 29 | 43.6 | 46.5 | 65.5\% | 47 | 89.4\% |
|  |  |  |  | 11TH | 44 | 44 | 85.1 | 32 | 42.7 | 46.7 | 62.5\% | 36 | 91.7\% |
|  |  |  |  | 12TH | 9 | 9 | 88.1 | 0 |  |  |  | 7 | 100.0\% |
|  |  |  | TOTAL |  | 207 | 201 | 82.0 | 122 | 40.7 | 42.9 | 59.8\% | 167 | 92.8\% |
|  |  | TOTAL |  |  | 270 | 259 . | 80.0 | 136 | 41.0 | 43.2 | 60.3\% | 197 | 91.4\% |




[^0]:    
    *
    Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original document.

[^1]:    *Program staff administer levels $J$ and $K$ of the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills (C.T.B.S.) internally to assess the reading improvement of eleventh and twelfth graders. This circumvents some of the problems with the reading R.C.T. and allows program staff to evaluate the reading progress of students who have already passed the R.C.T. C.T.B.S. results are not reported because they are used for program diagnostic information and are not the official Chapter I evaluation instrument.

[^2]:    *The percentage of students with valid reading data is due to missing test scores. Test scores are obtained from central data files, which are themselves incomplete.

