The Native Language Arts-English as a Second Language Program was designed for economically disadvantaged students whose native language was not English and whose ability to read and write in English and in some cases in their own tongue was not adequate. It was in operation from February through June of 1976 in 14 high schools serving 10,041 students in grades 9-12. Depending upon student need, a double or single period of small group instruction in English as a second language or native language arts was provided. The audio-lingual method of language acquisition was used to provide systematic and sequential instruction in pronunciation, sentence structure, vocabulary, rhythm and intonation patterns of American English. Reading and writing were introduced in English as students became more proficient. Wherever possible, parallel programming of beginning, intermediate and advanced level classes was maintained, enabling students to move within as they demonstrated language proficiency. As a result of six months, one term and half-term testing of 792 students in grades 9-12, statistically significant differences in English reading and auditory skills were noted for 23 of the 26 groupings. Where significance was not obtained, pre to post treatment interval gains were observed. (Author/AM)
An evaluation of a New York City school district educational project funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-10) performed for the Board of Education of the City of New York for the 1975-1976 school year.
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I. THE PROGRAM

Description of the Program

The Native Language Arts - English as a Second Language Program (Part C) was designed to serve educationally disadvantaged students whose native language is not English and whose ability to read and write in English and, in some instances, in their own tongue is not adequate enough to permit them any degree of success in school.

In operation in fourteen high schools from February 1, 1976 to June 30, 1976, the Native Language Arts - English as a Second Language Program (Part C) served 1004 pupils in grades 9-12, exceeding the design proposal of 850 students. Seventeen teachers and sixteen educational assistants administered to these students in small classes of fourteen to twenty. The program supplemented the tax-levy English Class of each school.

It was introduced to accommodate the overflow of NLA-ESL students in the NLA-ESL Program in operation from September 1, 1975, B/E No. 09-69614.

Selection of Subjects

Title I eligible students were selected to participate in the Native Language Arts - English as a Second Language Program (Part C) by various means: standardized tests; diagnostic tests; referrals by guidance counselors, teachers and friends; interviews; and voluntary enrollment.

The final criteria for consideration in the program were ratings of C through F on the Puerto Rican Study Scale A, "Rating Pupils' Ability to Speak English," and reading at a level at least two years below grade as determined by the Stanford Achievement Test administered shortly after initial entry.
Eligibility for instruction in the native language arts component was mandated by functional illiteracy in the student's language of origin.

Program Objectives

Program Objective No. 1: To obtain a statistically significant improvement in students' reading comprehension and auditory grade-equivalent levels on the Stanford Achievement Test.

Program Objective No. 2: To obtain a statistically significant improvement in students' raw score reading level on the Cooperative International American Test, Pruebas de Lectura.

Program Methodology

Students attended a double or single period of English as a Second Language and/or a double or single period of native language arts depending upon their individual needs and teacher availability. The audio-lingual method of language acquisition was utilized to provide systematic and sequential instruction in pronunciation, sentence structure, vocabulary, rhythm and intonation patterns. Oral practice drills, visual reinforcements, teacher modelling and grammatical review were stressed. As ESL students became more proficient in their spoken language ability, reading and writing were introduced. Reading and writing were the focus of the native language arts class where oral communication was already developed.

Wherever possible, parallel programming of beginning, intermediate and advanced level classes were maintained enabling students to move within as they demonstrated language proficiency. Class trips and excursions were
planned from time to time to enrich their experiential background.

Every effort was made for students to acquire the basic skills needed for their success in school and for their integration into mainstream activities. Teachers, educational assistants and all personnel affiliated with the program displayed dedication, concern and enthusiasm for these students. For the most part, a friendly and pleasant classroom environment was established which provided students with an enjoyable experience and with an atmosphere conducive to learning.
II. EVALUATIVE PROCEDURES

COGNITIVE OBJECTIVES

Evaluation Objective No. 1: It was expected that the mean posttest grade-equivalent scores achieved by the treatment group on the Reading Comprehension and Auditory Subtests of the Stanford Achievement Test would surpass its mean pretest scores at the .05 level of statistical significance when results were submitted to analysis with a t test for correlated groups.

1.1 The Sampling: The treatment group, 1004 students, consisted of Title I eligible students receiving English as a Second Language instruction.

1.2 Methods and Procedures: The Reading Comprehension and Auditory Subtests of the Stanford Achievement Test, Form B, Levels II and III, were administered to 792 students on a pre/post basis.

1.3 Data Analysis: Results were analyzed separately by grade and treatment interval with the "Pretest-Posttest (without controls)" design. The difference between grade-equivalent means was tested for statistical significance at the .05 level with the correlated t test.

1.4 Time Schedule: The pretest was administered in December 1975, February 1976 and March 1976. The posttest was administered April 1976. Complete data were collected from the schools between June 14-18, 1976.
Evaluation Objective No. 2: It was expected that the mean posttest raw scores achieved by the treatment group on the Cooperative Inter-American Test, Pruebas de Lectura, would surpass its mean pretest score at the .05 level of statistical significance when submitted to analysis with a t test for correlated groups.

2.1 The Sampling: The treatment group, 132 students, consisted of all Title I eligible students in the Part C Program receiving Native Language Arts instruction.

2.2 Methods and Procedures: The Pruebas de Lectura subtest of the Cooperative Inter-American Series, Form CES, Levels I and II, was administered to 98 students on a pre/post basis.

2.3 Data Analysis: Results were analyzed by grade and treatment interval with the "Pretest-Posttest (without controls)" design. The difference between raw score means was tested for statistical significance at the .05 level with the correlated t test.

2.4 Time Schedule: The pretest was administered December 1975, February 1976 and March 1976.

The posttest was administered April 1976.

Data were collected from the schools June 14-18, 1976.
PROCESS OBJECTIVE

Evaluation Objective No. 3:

To determine the extent of congruence between the original program proposal specifications and actual implementation.

To determine the strengths and weaknesses of the program in order to provide recommendations for recycling, planning and staff development.

3.1 Methods and Procedures: The evaluator-consultant observed a sampling of the fourteen high schools for a total of ten visits. Conferences and interviews were held in the schools, at the Office of Bilingual Education-English as a Second Language Program headquarters and at the Board of Education with all personnel associated with the program: the Assistant Director of the ESL Program, principals, department chairmen, coordinators, teachers, educational assistants, teacher trainers and the Title I liaison.
III. FINDINGS

EVALUATION OBJECTIVES:

Evaluation Objective No. 1: To determine whether, as a result of participation in the English as a Second Language Program, the mean posttest grade-equivalent scores achieved by the treatment group on the Reading and Auditory Comprehension Subtests of the Stanford Achievement Test would surpass its mean pretest scores at the .05 level of statistical significance when submitted to analysis with a t test for correlated groups.

RESULTS: As a result of six months, four months (one term), and two months (half-term) testing of 792 students in grades 9-12, statistically significant differences in American English reading and auditory skills were noted for twenty-three of the twenty-six treatment groups:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE I</th>
<th>Stanford Achievement Test</th>
<th>Levels of Significant Gains</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>By Length of Treatment, Grade + Test Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Length of Treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 9</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>.001 .01 .001 .01 .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>ns ns .001 .001 .05 .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 10-12</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>.001 .001 .001 .001 .001 .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>.01 ns .001* .001* .001 .001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Separate analyses were performed for Grade 10 and Grades 11-12. In both cases, significant gains at the .001 level were attained in reading and auditory comprehension.

** ns - no statistical significance
In the four treatment groups where significance was not obtained, pre to post interval gains were noted by the evaluator-consultant. The short length of treatment, two months, may be responsible in part for the lack of significant results in three of the four groups (Level III, Grade 9, Reading and Auditory, Grades 10-12, Auditory).

**Evaluation Objective No. 2:** To determine whether, as a result of participation in the Native Language Arts Program, the mean posttest raw scores achieved by the treatment group on the Cooperative Inter-American Test, Pruebas de Lectura, would surpass its mean pretest score at the .05 level of statistical significance when submitted to analysis with a t-test for correlated groups.

**RESULTS:** As a result of one term and half-term testing of 89 students in grades 9-12, statistically significant differences in native language reading were noted for three of the four treatment groups beyond the .001 level:

| TABLE II |
| Native Language Arts |
| Levels of Significant Gains |
| By Length of Treatment, Grade + Test Level |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Level</th>
<th>Length of Treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ns*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 10-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* ns - no statistical significance
In the one group where significance was not obtained, Level I, Grade 9, one term treatment, pre to post interval gains were noted during classroom observations.

An analysis of statistical significance was not made for nine subjects whose treatment groups consisted of too few participants. (See Appendix C, Table 12, Components with small number of eligible participants, for a listing of these subjects and their scores on the Pruebas de Lectura).

Evaluation Objective No. 3:

To determine the extent of congruence between the original program proposal specifications and actual implementation.

To determine the strengths and weaknesses of the program in order to provide recommendations for recycling, planning and staff development.

RESULTS: The ten visits made by the evaluator-consultant to the project schools observing more than thirty classroom lessons, talking with teachers, ESL coordinators, departmental chairmen and principals, revealed that the Native Language Arts-English as a Second Language Program (Part C) as implemented coincided with the program proposal specifications. The methodology emphasized the audio-lingual approach in a small class setting. Aural-oral skills were stressed in the beginning levels while reading and writing were introduced in the more advanced levels. Teachers taught a single or double period of ESL and/or NLA for a total of five periods. They were assisted by an educational assistant who tutored students, especially the new arrivals, on a one-to-one basis or in small groups and who performed
many of the record-keeping and administrative responsibilities of the classroom. The teacher trainers visited the schools regularly. They observed classroom procedures, disseminated materials and demonstrated techniques to teachers and educational assistants. They also lent administrative expertise and support to department chairmen and coordinators in their implementation of the program. The Project Director (Assistant Director of Bilingual Education) scheduled conferences during the school year enabling teachers and educational assistants to meet one another, to discuss test scores and to exchange ideas, activities and interests. Teachers attended in-service training where necessary.
Adequacy of Materials and Facilities

A variety of print and text materials were abundantly available for teachers to use throughout the year. The Lado English Series continue to be the primary texts during the first and second year of ESL instruction while a variety of additional texts and readers were in evidence in the more advanced levels. Hines, Skits in American English, Kieszak, Turning Point, and the curriculum and workbook to accompany it by Baskin and Isabella, two teachers in the NLA-ESL Program, were favorites.

The selection of a text frequently depended upon individual student and teacher preference. Teachers were continually encouraged by the teacher trainers to try different classroom texts, materials and techniques while they, in turn, readily suggested additional materials and texts which the Office of Bilingual Education might procure for their classes.

Newspapers were regularly available for students to enjoy.

Visual literacy focused upon still pictures used frequently and successfully to encourage conversation and stimulate vocabulary at the beginning levels. Videotaping of both teacher and student performance was an extremely effective tool when used on occasion. Filmstrips, slides and films for individual or small group instruction were not in evidence. Auditory stimuli were limited to the teacher and to an occasional record or audiotape. Language laboratories were not in use. A classroom resource facility at which students might practice on their own or with the educational assistant was not available. Language tapes or records for students to borrow overnight were not available.

Physical plants ranged from large and traditional to makeshift and
alternative. Students and teachers appeared to be comfortable under all conditions.

Recommendations from Last Prior Study

Recommendations from the last prior study are cited below: ¹

1. "Another level test should be found to substitute for the Stanford Reading and Auditory Test, Primary Level II. Level III of the Stanford Achievement Test should be tried for students evaluated as B or C on the Puerto Rican Scale, while continuing with Level II, for students rated D, E, and F, on the Puerto Rican Scale. Criterion reference tests should be tried since there is presently no achievement test that is normed on a representative sample similar to this population."

2. "The Inter-American Series Test Level I and Level II, should be used as both pre- and post-tests. According to the findings reported elsewhere, a sizeable number of youngsters are at the top or at the bottom of the test. Two groups, a Level I and Level II, should be created in the NLA program."

3. "Many teachers and chairpersons in ESL and MLA program find that their students need more than two years in ESL. Students slow progress in learning to speak and read and write English as shown in the achievement levels in this report concur with the reactions of personnel working with the students. Therefore, a transitional fifth term of English as a bridge between ESL and high school English class should be created."

4. "Schools that have 3 or more teaching positions in ESL and NLA programs need a position of coordinator to oversee its operation and organization. It is suggested that the coordinator have special qualifications. They are: a. experience in the ESL/NLA program; b. positive human relationships with the students, teachers and chairpersons connected with the program; c. an understanding and sensitivity to the cultural background of students in the program; d. an ability to guide and counsel students and/or be able to refer students for help; e. an awareness of all the forms (screening, placement and prescriptive) which must be kept for each student in the program; f. a responsible keeping of statistical data for the program (book orders, inventories, evaluation sheets, drop-out rates, discharge rates and accurate testing procedures). See Data Loss Form."

5. "From statements received from teachers there is a dire need for a bilingual psychologist to assist with severe, moderate and mild language learning problems."

6. "Time and money should be allotted for full day workshops to be planned for NLA teachers, ESL teachers, paraprofessionals, coordinators, subject area teachers and chairmen of various subject area departments."

7. "All ESL and NLA material should be indexed and catalogued and ordered well in advance. Special materials should be ordered for certain schools having special programs. Different models of ESL/NLA programs exist in various schools and need special materials."
8. "A continuous evaluation of the students are needed. Attendance and testing figures must be kept in order. Discharge students and January graduates must be tested before the youngsters leave the program. See Data Loss Form."

9. "Coordinators of the program should be given only three teaching periods. There should be an alternation of reimbursable positions so that teachers in those positions can learn prescriptive teaching techniques under the supervision of the coordinator."

10. "A proper clarification of student selection in the NLA programs needs to be considered. A proper placement of students on various levels within the NLA and ESL programs needs to be considered."

11. "A stronger reading component within the ESL/NLA program needs to be considered."

For the most part all of the above recommendations were implemented to the degree to which funds were available. Item numbers 1, 2, 4, 6 and 7 have been thoroughly implemented. Items 3 and 5 are being implemented in those schools with sufficient personnel. Items 8, 9, 10 and 11 are being continually worked upon and improved. For example, criterion-referenced tests are being developed by the Program Coordinator and his staff for implementation of the concept of Item 8 above which calls for continuous evaluation of the students. These tests are being field-tested in preparation for full-scale implementation.
Servicing the Needs of the Population

The Native Language Arts-English as a Second Language Program, designed for non-native students handicapped by their inability to speak and understand English and, in some cases, by their inability to succeed in their own language, serviced the needs of that population during the 1975-1976 school year.

Cognitive gains in reading and auditory comprehension in English were realized for the majority of students as measured by the results of the Stanford Achievement Test. Cognitive gains in native language reading comprehension were also realized by the majority of students who participated in that program as measured by the results of the Pruebas de Lectura.

Affective gains were recorded as well. Students appeared to be receptive to learning and adjusting to their new environment. In most of the observed classrooms, they remained attentive and responsive. The small ungraded classes, the homogeneous groupings, the variety of materials, the teachers' dedication and concern and the overall responsiveness of the Office of Bilingual Education - ESL Program headquarters staff permitted a positive and healthy atmosphere to be established in the majority of classrooms.

Teachers worked diligently, gave generously of their time and maintained a high level of morale in their classrooms. Teacher trainers assisted them to acquire the desired degree of professionalism by demonstrating techniques, approaches and materials applicable to their particular needs and temperaments and to their students.
Students responded accordingly. Their attendance records attest to the success of the program in providing them with an enjoyable experience.

### TABLE III
A Comparison of Percentages of Attendance Between ESL Students and School-wide Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.  %</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Irving</td>
<td>70  91.58</td>
<td>71.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Jay</td>
<td>73  80.72</td>
<td>56.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seward Park</td>
<td>88  82.88</td>
<td>70.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.E. Stevenson</td>
<td>73  75.54</td>
<td>71.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table III presents attendance figures for the Spring 1976 term from a sampling of schools participating in the NLA-ESL Program. At each school attendance was higher, even dramatically higher, for ESL students than for the students in the mainstream.

The Native Language Arts - English as a Second Language Program served students in excess of its proposed specifications for everyone involved in the program felt a responsibility towards the non-native speaker. This sense of responsibility and the high degree of interaction between the Project Director, the teacher trainers, the teachers, educational assistants and students were some of the strengths of the program. Everyone worked to help students adjust to their new...
environment and to acquire a feeling of accomplishment, belonging and success by assisting them in their acquisition of the necessary language skills and by providing them with a genuine sense of friendliness and concern. Suggestions for improving the quality of the experience are offered in Chapter IV.
IV. SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary of Major Findings

1. Program implementation coincided with design proposal specifications.

2. The program's cognitive objective to produce a statistically significant improvement in students' ability to read and understand English was met for the majority of pupils as shown by the results of the Stanford Achievement Test.

3. The program's cognitive objective to produce a statistically significant improvement in students' ability to read in their native language was met for the majority of pupils as shown by the results of the Pruebas de Lectura.

4. Other indicators of improvement were noted during classroom observations.

5. A sampling of Native Language Arts-English as a Second Language Program attendance figures indicates that program averages exceed school-wide averages demonstrating student satisfaction.

6. Program personnel, for the most part, are dedicated, concerned and professional.

Conclusions

On the basis of the above findings and summary, it is concluded that the NLA/ESL Program met its program objectives. Statistically significant gains in reading and auditory comprehension in English were recorded for the majority of participating pupils. Statistically significant gains in native language reading comprehension were recorded for the majority of participating pupils also.
Recommendations

In view of the foregoing evaluative data presented, it is recommended that:

1. The Native Language Arts-English as a Second Language Program be continued.

2. Every effort be made to provide the program with continuity in staffing and activities. The program's efforts to establish a stable learning environment for promoting success and achievement in language acquisition are not supported by the New York City financial crisis: Board of Education excessing and relicensing requirements need to be reconsidered. Appointments to the NLA-ESL Program be cooperatively approved by the Office of Bilingual Education headquarters, the school principal and the on-site ESL Coordinator to ensure consistency and quality.

3. Assessment and prescription of individual student needs to be more personalized and course content modules be established to enable students to proceed at their own pace and readiness.

   a. All levels of high school curricular concepts be integrated into the native language arts-English as a second language classroom to better prepare students for entry into the mainstream and to accelerate that entry wherever possible.

   b. Record and playback tape recorders be adapted for individual or small group use to improve aural-oral capabilities. Language practice cassette tapes and records be available to borrow on a library basis.

   c. Visual literacy be encouraged and stimulated in individual or group instructional activities by the increased utilization of TV, films, filmstrips and slides.
4. Assessment instruments to measure teacher and educational assistant performance be developed cooperatively by the Office of Bilingual Education headquarters staff, teachers and educational assistants to provide everyone with objective tools for measuring performance. If possible, modular training programs be developed as part of a resource library to correlate with competencies measured and implemented on site as needed with the appropriate teacher and educational assistant.

5. The Stanford Achievement Test be replaced or supplemented by another instrument to measure student achievement. Grade-equivalent ratings are not viable criteria for monitoring the ESL student. If the instrument must be used, alternate forms should be given on a pre-post basis.
The Native Language Arts-English as a Second Language (Part C) was designed for economically disadvantaged students whose native language is not English and whose ability to read and write in English and in some instances in their own tongue is not adequate enough to permit them any degree of success in school. In operation from February 1, 1976 through June 30, 1976 in 14 high schools serving 100% of students in grades 9-12, the program supplemented the city tax-levy program. There were 17 teachers and 16 educational assistants. Depending upon student need, a double or single period of small group instruction in English as a Second Language or Native Language Arts or both was provided. The audio-lingual method of language acquisition was utilized to provide systematic and sequential instruction in pronunciation, sentence structure, vocabulary, rhythm and intonation patterns of American English. Reading and writing were introduced in English as students became more proficient in their spoken language ability and switched in the native language where oral communication was developed. Wherever possible, parallel programming of beginning, intermediate and advanced level classes were maintained enabling students to move within as they demonstrated language proficiency.

The cognitive achievement sought to determine whether students who participated in the program would obtain a statistically significant improvement in their English reading and auditory skills and in their native language reading level. The Reading Comprehension and Auditory Subtests of the Stanford Achievement Test were administered on a pre/post basis to 792 students. The difference between grade equivalent score means on each subtest was submitted to analysis with a t test for correlated groups and tested for significance at the .05 level. The Pruebas de Lectura Subtest (Reading) of the Cooperative InterAmerican Series was administered to 123 students on a pre/post basis. The difference between raw score means was tested for statistical significance at the .05 level with the correlated t test.

As a result of six months, one term and half-term testing of 792 students in grades 9-12, statistically significant differences in English reading and auditory skills were noted for 23 of the 26 groupings: Level II, Grade 9, six months (Reading only); one term and half-term treatment; Grade 10-12, six months; one term and half-term treatment; Level III, Grades 9-12, six months, one term and half-term treatment. As a result of one term and half-term testing of 98 students in grades 9-12, statistically significant differences in native language reading levels were noted for Level II, Grades 9-12. Where significance was not obtained, pre to post treatment interval gains were observed. Ten visits to the project schools revealed that the program as implemented coincided with the specifications of the design proposal. Participating students were provided with an atmosphere conducive to their learning the basic skills of English and their native language and to their integration into the mainstream.

It is recommended that the program be refunded at current levels for the 1976-1977 school year. The following are also suggested in the planning and development of future programs: continuity and stability in staffing be maintained; student assessment and prescription be more personalized; educational media be integrated into the program; instruments to measure teacher and educational assistant performance be developed along with on-site training programs; and the Stanford Achievement Test be replaced or supplemented by another instrument to measure English as a Second Language achievement.
## APPENDIX B

**Table II**  
Norm referenced achievement data not applicable to Table 9.

**NATIVE LANGUAGE ARTS-ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE (PART C)**

In the table below, enter the requested assessment information about the test:
ivens of major project component/activities in achieving cognitive objective.
read all footnotes. Attach additional sheets if necessary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component Code</th>
<th>Activity Code</th>
<th>Test Used</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Total N</th>
<th>Group ID</th>
<th>Score Type</th>
<th>Pretest Date</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>614150</td>
<td>0720</td>
<td>Stanf. Rdg.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stanf. Aud.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stanf. Rdg.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stanf. Aud.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1/ Identify test used and year of publication (MAT-58; CAT-70, etc.)
2/ Total number of participants in the activity.
3/ Identify the participants by specific grade level (e.g., grade 3, grade 5). Where several grades are combined, enter the 4th and 5th digits of the component code.
4/ Total number of participants for whom both pre and post test data are provided.
5/ 1 = grade equivalent; 2 = percentile rank; 3 = z score; 4 = publisher's standard score; 5 = stanine; 6 = raw score; 7 = other.

6/ Stand the form.

7/ Test.

8/ Obtained.

**Notes:**
- **Hmps:** Norm referenced achievement data not applicable to Table 9.
NATIVE LANGUAGE ARTS—ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE (PART C)

In the table below, enter the requested assessment information about the tests used to evaluate the effectiveness of major project component/activities in achieving cognitive objectives. Before completing this form, attach additional sheets if necessary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Code</th>
<th>Test Used</th>
<th>Group ID</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Total N</th>
<th>Score Type</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th>Statistical Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00720</td>
<td>Pre/Post</td>
<td>Pre/Pre</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12/</td>
<td>19/</td>
<td>Corr 2.32 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00720</td>
<td>Pre/Post</td>
<td>Pre/Pre</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12/</td>
<td>19/</td>
<td>Corr 2.32 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00720</td>
<td>Pre/Post</td>
<td>Pre/Pre</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12/</td>
<td>19/</td>
<td>Corr 2.32 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00720</td>
<td>Pre/Post</td>
<td>Pre/Pre</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12/</td>
<td>19/</td>
<td>Corr 2.32 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00720</td>
<td>Pre/Post</td>
<td>Pre/Pre</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12/</td>
<td>19/</td>
<td>Corr 2.32 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00720</td>
<td>Pre/Post</td>
<td>Pre/Pre</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12/</td>
<td>19/</td>
<td>Corr 2.32 **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued next page

1/ Pretest
2/ Posttest
3/ Test used and year of publication (MAT-58; CAT-70, etc.)
4/ Number of participants in the activity.
5/ Number of participants by specific grade level (e.g., grade 5).
6/ Where several grades are combined, the 4th and 5th digits of the component code.
7/ Number of participants for whom both pre and post data are provided.
8/ Standard Deviation - only required of the following districts: Albany, Buffalo, Hempstead, Mount Vernon, New York City, Niagara Falls, Rochester, Syracuse, Utica, Yonkers.
9/ Test statistics (e.g., t; F; X²).
10/ Obtained value of test statistic (e.g. F=13.25)

* Statistically significant at p<.05
** Statistically significant at p<.001
ns No statistical significance
In the table below, enter the requested assessment information about the tests used to evaluate the effectiveness of major project component/activities in achieving cognitive objectives. Before completing this form, read all footnotes. Attach additional sheets if necessary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component Code</th>
<th>Activity Code</th>
<th>Test Used</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Total N</th>
<th>Group ID</th>
<th>Score Type</th>
<th>Pretest Date</th>
<th>Pretest Mean</th>
<th>Pretest S.D.</th>
<th>Posttest Date</th>
<th>Posttest Mean</th>
<th>Posttest S.D.</th>
<th>Statistical Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 1 4 1 6 0 0 7 2 0</td>
<td>7 2 0</td>
<td>Stand.</td>
<td>Rdg.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12/</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 1 4 1 6 0 0 7 2 0</td>
<td>7 2 0</td>
<td>Stand.</td>
<td>Aud.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12/</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 1 4 1 6 0 0 7 2 0</td>
<td>7 2 0</td>
<td>Stand.</td>
<td>Rdg.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2/</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 1 4 1 6 0 0 7 2 0</td>
<td>7 2 0</td>
<td>Stand.</td>
<td>Aud.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2/</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 1 4 1 6 0 0 7 2 0</td>
<td>7 2 0</td>
<td>Stand.</td>
<td>Rdg.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3/</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 1 4 1 6 0 0 7 2 0</td>
<td>7 2 0</td>
<td>Stand.</td>
<td>Aud.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3/</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1/ Identify test used and year of publication (MAT-58; CAT-70, etc.)
2/ Total number of participants in the activity.
3/ Identify the participants by specific grade level (e.g., grade 3, grade 5). Where several grades are combined, enter the 4th and 5th digits of the component code.
4/ Total number of participants for whom both pre and post test data are provided.
5/ 1 = grade equivalent; 2 = percentile rank; 3 = z score; 4 = publisher's standard score; 5 = stanine; 6 = raw score; 7 = other.
6/ Standard Deviation - only required of the following districts: Albany, Buffalo, Hempstead, Mount Vernon, New York City, Niagara Falls, Rochester, Syracuse, Utica, Yonkers.
7/ Test statistics (e.g., t; F; X^2).
8/ Obtained value of test statistic (e.g., F=13.25

** Statistically significant at p<.001
In the table below, enter the requested assessment information about the tests used to evaluate the effectiveness of major project component/activities in achieving cognitive objectives. Before completing this form, read all footnotes. Attach additional sheets if necessary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component Code</th>
<th>Activity Code</th>
<th>Test Used</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Total N</th>
<th>Group ID</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Score Type</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th>Statistical Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 1 4 1 6 0 0 7 2 0</td>
<td>Stanf Rdg. B B</td>
<td>Pre Post</td>
<td>Pre Post</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12/75</td>
<td>3.48 1.03</td>
<td>76 4.06 1.08</td>
<td>+ t 7.35**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 1 4 1 6 0 0 7 2 0</td>
<td>Stanf Aud. B B</td>
<td>Pre Post</td>
<td>Pre Post</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12/75</td>
<td>2.48 1.34</td>
<td>76 3.24 1.68</td>
<td>+ t 5.02**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 1 4 1 6 0 0 7 2 0</td>
<td>Ost Rdg. B B</td>
<td>III III</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3/76</td>
<td>4.08 .93</td>
<td>76 4.65 1.26</td>
<td>Corr. 2.37*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 1 4 1 6 0 0 7 2 0</td>
<td>Ost Aud. B B</td>
<td>III III</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3/76</td>
<td>3.90 1.89</td>
<td>76 6.05 1.18</td>
<td>t 5.79**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 1 4 1 6 0 0 7 2 0</td>
<td>Stanf Rdg. B B</td>
<td>III III</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2/76</td>
<td>4.18 .99</td>
<td>76 4.54 1.20</td>
<td>t 3.74**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 1 4 1 6 0 0 7 2 0</td>
<td>Stanf Aud. B B</td>
<td>III III</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2/76</td>
<td>3.83 1.46</td>
<td>76 8.34 1.73</td>
<td>t 5.94**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 1 4 1 6 0 0 7 2 0</td>
<td>Stanf Rdg. B B</td>
<td>III III</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2/76</td>
<td>3.83 .99</td>
<td>76 4.38 1.38</td>
<td>t 5.90**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 1 4 1 6 0 0 7 2 0</td>
<td>Stanf Aud. B B</td>
<td>III III</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2/76</td>
<td>3.66 1.39</td>
<td>76 4.02 1.52</td>
<td>t 5.08**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1/ Identify test used and year of publication (MAT-58; CAT-70, etc.)
2/ Total number of participants in the activity.
3/ Identify the participants by specific grade level (e.g., grade 3, grade 5). Where several grades are combined, enter the 4th and 5th digits of the component code.
4/ Total number of participants for whom both pre and post test data are provided.
5/ 1 = grade equivalent; 2 = percentile rank; 3 = z score; 4 = publisher's standard score; 5 = stanine; 6 = raw score; 7 = other.
6/ Standard deviation - only required of the following districts: Albany, Buffalo, Hempstead, Mount Vernon, New York City, Niagara Falls, Rochester, Syracuse, Utica, Yonkers.
7/ Test statistics (e.g., t; F; X2).
8/ Obtained value of test statistic (e.g., P=13.25

* Statistically significant at p<.01
** Statistically significant at p<.001
ns No statistical significance
**APPENDIX B**

Table 11  Norm referenced achievement data not applicable to Table 9.

**NATIVE LANGUAGE ARTS-ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE (PART C)**

In the table below, enter the requested assessment information about the tests used to evaluate the effectiveness of major project component/activities in achieving cognitive objectives. Before completing this form, read all footnotes. Attach additional sheets if necessary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component Code</th>
<th>Activity Code</th>
<th>Test Used</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Score Type</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th>Statistical Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 6 6 7 1 5 0 0 7 2 0 | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | 6 6 7 1 5 0 0 7 2 0 | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | 6 6 7 1 5 0 0 7 2 0 | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | 6 6 7 1 5 0 0 7 2 0 | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | 6 6 7 1 5 0 0 7 2 0 | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | 6 6 7 1 5 0 0 7 2 0 | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | 6 6 7 1 5 0 0 7 2 0 | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | 6 6 7 1 5 0 0 7 2 0 | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | 6 6 7 1 5 0 0 7 2 0 | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | 6 6 7 1 5 0 0 7 2 0 | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | 6 6 7 1 5 0 0 7 2 0 | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | 6 6 7 1 5 0 0 7 2 0 | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | 6 6 7 1 5 0 0 7 2 0 | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | 6 6 7 1 5 0 0 7 2 0 | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | 6 6 7 1 5 0 0 7 2 0 | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | 6 6 7 1 5 0 0 7 2 0 | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | 6 6 7 1 5 0 0 7 2 0 | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | 6 6 7 1 5 0 0 7 2 0 | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | 6 6 7 1 5 0 0 7 2 0 | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | 6 6 7 1 5 0 0 7 2 0 | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | 6 6 7 1 5 0 0 7 2 0 | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | 6 6 7 1 5 0 0 7 2 0 | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | 6 6 7 1 5 0 0 7 2 0 | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | 6 6 7 1 5 0 0 7 2 0 | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | 6 6 7 1 5 0 0 7 2 0 | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | 6 6 7 1 5 0 0 7 2 0 | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | 6 6 7 1 5 0 0 7 2 0 | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | 6 6 7 1 5 0 0 7 2 0 | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | 6 6 7 1 5 0 0 7 2 0 | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | 6 6 7 1 5 0 0 7 2 0 | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | 6 6 7 1 5 0 0 7 2 0 | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | 6 6 7 1 5 0 0 7 2 0 | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | 6 6 7 1 5 0 0 7 2 0 | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | 6 6 7 1 5 0 0 7 2 0 | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | 6 6 7 1 5 0 0 7 2 0 | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | 6 6 7 1 5 0 0 7 2 0 | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | 6 6 7 1 5 0 0 7 2 0 | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | 6 6 7 1 5 0 0 7 2 0 | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | 6 6 7 1 5 0 0 7 2 0 | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | 6 6 7 1 5 0 0 7 2 0 | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | 6 6 7 1 5 0 0 7 2 0 | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | 6 6 7 1 5 0 0 7 2 0 | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | 6 6 7 1 5 0 0 7 2 0 | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | 6 6 7 1 5 0 0 7 2 0 | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | 6 6 7 1 5 0 0 7 2 0 | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | 6 6 7 1 5 0 0 7 2 0 | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | 6 6 7 1 5 0 0 7 2 0 | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | 6 6 7 1 5 0 0 7 2 0 | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | 6 6 7 1 5 0 0 7 2 0 | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | 6 6 7 1 5 0 0 7 2 0 | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | 6 6 7 1 5 0 0 7 2 0 | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | 6 6 7 1 5 0 0 7 2 0 | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | 6 6 7 1 5 0 0 7 2 0 | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | 6 6 7 1 5 0 0 7 2 0 | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | 6 6 7 1 5 0 0 7 2 0 | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | 6 6 7 1 5 0 0 7 2 0 | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | 6 6 7 1 5 0 0 7 2 0 | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | 6 6 7 1 5 0 0 7 2 0 | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | 6 6 7 1 5 0 0 7 2 0 | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | 6 6 7 1 5 0 0 7 2 0 | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | 6 6 7 1 5 0 0 7 2 0 | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | 6 6 7 1 5 0 0 7 2 0 | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | 6 6 7 1 5 0 0 7 2 0 | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | 6 6 7 1 5 0 0 7 2 0 | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | 6 6 7 1 5 0 0 7 2 0 | Preueba | Preueba | Preueba | Pre祾 0.05
  3/ Test statistics (e.g., t; F; X²).
  4/ Obtained value of test statistic (e.g., F=13.25).
  5/ Standard Deviation - only required of the following districts: Albany, Buffalo, Hempstead, Mount Vernon, New York City, Niagara Falls, Rochester, Syracuse, Utica, Yonkers.
  6/ Statistical significance at p≤.001
  ns No Statistical Significance

1/ Identify test used and year of publication (MAT-58; CAT-70, etc.)
2/ Total number of participants in the activity.
3/ Identify the participants by specific grade level (e.g., grade 3, grade 5). Where several grades are combined, enter the 4th and 5th digits of the component code.
4/ Total number of participants for whom both pre and post test data are provided.
5/ 1 = grade equivalent; 2 = percentile rank; 3 = z score; 4 = publisher's standard score; 5 = stanine; 6 = raw score; 7 = other.
6/ Standard Deviation - only required of the following districts: Albany, Buffalo, Hempstead, Mount Vernon, New York City, Niagara Falls, Rochester, Syracuse, Utica, Yonkers.
7/ Test statistics (e.g., t; F; X²).
8/ Obtained value of test statistic (e.g., F=13.25).
9/ Statistical significance at p≤.001
ns No Statistical Significance
APPENDIX C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pupil #</th>
<th>Component Code</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Test Used</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Pre Test</th>
<th>Post Test</th>
<th>Achievement Test</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th>Number of Contact Hours</th>
<th>Test Date</th>
<th>Standard Score /</th>
<th>Screening Test</th>
<th>Standard Score /</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6671500720</td>
<td>Prueba</td>
<td>deLect.CES</td>
<td>CES</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>4/76</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>est.</td>
<td>Prueba12/</td>
<td>50 hrs.deLect.75</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6671500720</td>
<td>Prueba</td>
<td>deLect.CES</td>
<td>CES</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>4/76</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>est.</td>
<td>Prueba12/</td>
<td>50 hrs.deLect.75</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6671500720</td>
<td>Prueba</td>
<td>deLect.CES</td>
<td>CES</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>4/76</td>
<td>81.82</td>
<td>est.</td>
<td>Prueba12/</td>
<td>50 hrs.deLect.75</td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6671500720</td>
<td>Prueba</td>
<td>deLect.CES</td>
<td>CES</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>63.64</td>
<td>4/76</td>
<td>68.73</td>
<td>est.</td>
<td>Prueba12/</td>
<td>50 hrs.deLect.75</td>
<td>63.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6671500720</td>
<td>Prueba</td>
<td>deLect.CES</td>
<td>CES</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>57.27</td>
<td>4/76</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>est.</td>
<td>Prueba12/</td>
<td>50 hrs.deLect.75</td>
<td>57.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6671500720</td>
<td>Prueba</td>
<td>deLect.CES</td>
<td>CES</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>13.64</td>
<td>4/76</td>
<td>64.55</td>
<td>est.</td>
<td>Prueba12/</td>
<td>50 hrs.deLect.75</td>
<td>13.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6671600720</td>
<td>Prueba</td>
<td>deLect.CES</td>
<td>CES</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>2/76</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>4/76</td>
<td>71.25</td>
<td>est.</td>
<td>Prueba12/</td>
<td>27 hrs.deLect.76</td>
<td>72.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6671600720</td>
<td>Prueba</td>
<td>deLect.CES</td>
<td>CES</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>2/76</td>
<td>76.25</td>
<td>4/76</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>est.</td>
<td>Prueba12/</td>
<td>27 hrs.deLect.76</td>
<td>76.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6671600720</td>
<td>Prueba</td>
<td>deLect.CES</td>
<td>CES</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>78.18</td>
<td>4/76</td>
<td>97.27</td>
<td>est.</td>
<td>Prueba12/</td>
<td>50 hrs.deLect.75</td>
<td>78.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1/ Identify test used and year of publication (MAT-58 reading; CAT-70 math, etc).
2/ Publisher's Standard Score. (See publisher's manual). Scaled scores are also acceptable.
3/ Enter the total number of contact hours that this individual received in supplementary services from this funding source.
4/ (Same as #1 above). The screening test is the test that was employed to establish eligibility during the needs assessment/planning phase of the project.
Office of Educational Evaluation - Data Loss Form

(Native Language Arts - English as a Second Language (Part C))

In this table, enter all Data Loss information. Between the MIR and this form, all participants in each activity must be accounted for. The component and activity codes used in completion of the MIR should be used here so that the two tables match. See definitions below table for further instructions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component Code</th>
<th>Activity Code</th>
<th>Group 1 (I.D.)</th>
<th>Test Used</th>
<th>(1) Total N</th>
<th>(4) Number Tested/Analyzed</th>
<th>(5) Participants Not Tested/Not Analyzed</th>
<th>(6) Reasons Why Students Were Not Tested, Or If Tested, Were Not Analyzed</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>614150007209</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Stanford, Rg.II</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>42 13.8</td>
<td>Absent Pre (15) or Posttest (6)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>614150007209</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Stanford, Aud.II</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
<td>Incomplete Results: Pre(5); Post(2); Both(1)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>614150007205</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Stanford, Rg.III</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>54 28.1</td>
<td>Truant (3); Late Entry (3)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>614150007209</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Stanford, Aud.III</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
<td>Discharged (5); Returned Puerto Rico (2)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6141500072010-12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Stanford, Rg.II</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>47 18.8</td>
<td>Absent Pre (10); Post (6); Both (9)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6141500072010-12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Stanford, Aud.II</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
<td>Incomplete Pretest (16); Late Admit (2)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6141500072010-12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Stanford, Rg.III</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>69 26.8</td>
<td>Truant Pretest (1); Posttest (4)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6141500072010-12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Stanford, Aud.III</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
<td>Discharged (6); Transferred (1)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6141500072010-12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Prueba I+II</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>28 31.5</td>
<td>Absent Pre (28); Posttest (18)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6141500072010-12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Prueba II</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6 17.6</td>
<td>Incomplete Posttest Results</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Identify the participants by specific grade level (e.g., grade 3, grade 9). Where several grades are combined, enter the last two digits of the component code.

(2) Identify the test used and year of publication (MAT-70, SDAT-74, Houghton Mifflin (IPMS) Level 1 etc.)

(3) Number of participants in the activity.

(4) Number of participants included in the pre and posttest calculations.

(5) Number and percent of participants not tested and/or not analyzed.

(6) Specify all reasons why students were not tested and/or analyzed. If any further documentation is available, please attach to this form. If further space is needed to specify and explain data loss, attach additional pages to this form.

(7) For each reason specified, provide a separate number count.