



Evaluation Matters

Volume 8, Number 3

November 2018

Steven M. Urdegar, Ph.D., Director

Summer Programs: *An Analysis of Participation and Impact, 2018*

1. What is the purpose of this report?

This report examines the outcomes of the in-class summer programs operated in Miami-Dade County Public Schools (M-DCPS). The Summer Programs, offered to provide supplemental instruction for students in need of remediation, are comprised of Literacy for Rising 3rd Grade Students, Algebra I End-of-Course (EOC) remediation, and Course Recovery. Not included in this report is the state-mandated summer program for retained third graders, which is addressed in a separate evaluation.¹

2. Which populations are targeted in this report?

The samples for the summer programs comprised students in Grade 3 (Literacy for Rising 3rd Grade Students), Grades 6 through 8 (Course Recovery) and Grades 9-12 (Algebra 1 Remediation) who registered for each component, entered within the first two days of the summer reporting cycle, and remained enrolled in the respective component for the duration of the summer session. Only students who were eligible to participate as delineated by the Department of Summer Services (2018) were included in the evaluation. Comparison groups were also defined for each component comprised of students who met the eligibility requirements, but who did not participate in the program. Students in the comparison group who partially participated in the program and students in both groups who did not have valid pre- and post-test scores at consecutive grades were excluded from analyses of impact.

3. How were the data for this report collected and analyzed?

Participation data were obtained from the student course registration data file and examined through descriptive statistics. Each component with a defined comparison group was then analyzed by comparing the outcomes for students who participated in the component with students who did not, while considering the influence of demographic differences and baseline achievement. Each component without a defined comparison group was analyzed by gauging whether increased use was associated with superior outcomes, once students' demographic characteristics and baseline achievement were considered. The results for Course Recovery were limited to descriptive statistics.

¹ *Third Grade Summer Reading Camps, 2018 Evaluation* by Steven M. Urdegar, 2018, Miami, FL: Miami-Dade County Public Schools.

4. What are the outcomes of the Literacy for Rising 3rd Grade Students component?

The Literacy for Rising 3rd Grade Students provided students, whose scores fell between the 26th and the 49th percentiles on the Spring 2018 administration of the Stanford Achievement Test in Grade 2, the opportunity to bolster their reading skills. The curriculum used was a research-based intervention program called Flex Literacy, developed by McGraw Hill. It may be noted that this curriculum was also used in the Third-Grade Summer Reading Camps for retained students. The curriculum utilized whole-group and small-group instruction to bolster reading comprehension skills. The curriculum included a self-directed technology component as well as a component that targeted reading comprehension, critical thinking, and writing skills. The sections that follow examine both the participation in and impact of these components.

- **Participation.** Table 1 lists the number and percentage of registered students who completed the Literacy for Rising 3rd Grade Students component, participated and withdrew prior to completion, and registered but did not participate.

Table 1. Participation in the Literacy for Rising 3rd Grade Students Component

Total	Participation					
	Full ^a		Partial ^b		None ^c	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
2,008	1,299	64.7	106	5.3	603	30.0

^aStudents who completed the component. ^bStudents who participated and withdrew prior to completion. ^cStudents who initially registered but did not attend (i.e., no shows).

- A total of 2,008 students registered for the component.
- Nearly two-thirds of the students who registered to participate completed the component.
- **Impact.** Comparison groups of non-participating students were identified by examining their scores on the spring 2018 administration of the Reading Comprehension subtest of the SAT-10. Then, statistical regression procedures were used to compare the outcomes for students who participated in the program with students who did not, controlling for the influence of demographic differences and initial ability as measured by the iReady Diagnostic Test administered during spring 2018. The outcomes were the students' composite scaled scores on the iReady Diagnostic Test administered during August-October 2018.
 - Students who participated in the Literacy for Rising 3rd Grade Students scored a statistically significant 2.6 scaled score points higher on the iReady Diagnostic test administered during fall 2018.
 - The time within the administration period for the iReady Diagnostic Test, which lasted from August 27 through September 21, did not have a significant impact on the students' posttest scores.

5. What are the outcomes of the Algebra I EOC Remediation Component?

The Algebra I EOC remediation component is designed to prepare students who did not receive passing scores on the Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) version of the Algebra 1 End of Course (EOC) assessment, as required to meet the Algebra 1 graduation test criteria. The component, which focused on reviewing and strengthening specific skills, was revised to include new course materials, and to align more closely with the Florida Standards. High school students were offered the course through the adult education centers, while middle/high school students at selected alternative schools were offered the course at those locations.

Participation. Table 2 lists the number and percentage of registered students who completed the Algebra I remediation component, participated and withdrew prior to completion, or registered but did not participate in the program, by grade level.

Table 2. Participation in the Algebra I EOC Remediation Component

Summer 2018		Participation					
		Full ^b		Partial ^c		None ^d	
Grade	Total	n	%	n	%	n	%
9	123	64	52.0	35	28.5	24	19.5
10	708	519	73.3	149	21.0	40	5.6
11	249	89	35.7	85	34.1	75	30.1
12	182	40	22.0	51	28.0	91	50.0
Total ^a	1,266	713	56.3	323	25.5	230	18.2

^aIncludes a small number of eighth graders. ^bStudents who completed the component. ^cStudents who participated and withdrew prior to completion. ^dStudents who initially registered but did not attend (i.e., no shows).

- Nearly 1,300 students enrolled in the component.
- Of the students who enrolled, over half completed the program.
- Nearly 75% of the students who completed the program were tenth graders.
- **Impact:** Statistical regression procedures were used to estimate the impact of demographic differences, baseline achievement (as measured by the spring Algebra I EOC) and program participation, on the students' chances of passing the summer Algebra 1 EOC. The passing score for the Algebra I EOC is an achievement level of 3 and above.

- **Pass rate:** Table 3 lists by participation type, the total number of students followed by the percent of students who passed the end of summer FSA Algebra I EOC exam, by EOC grade.

Table 3. Pass Rates on the Summer FSA Algebra 1 EOC by Program Participation

EOC Grade	Program Participation							
	Overall		Full		Partial		None	
	All Students	%Passing	All Students	%Passing	All Students	%Passing	All Students	%Passing
9	941	15.1	366	10.7	43	16.3	532	18.0
10	156	12.2	53	13.2	7	0.0	96	12.5
11	53	11.3	14	21.4	1	0.0	38	7.9
12	8	0.0	--	--	1	0.0	7	--
Total	1,246	17.0	433	11.3	52	13.5	761	20.5

Note. Includes 88 non-participating 7th and 8th grade students, 51.1% of whom (n= 45) passed the Algebra 1 EOC.

- The pass rate for all students was 17.0%.
- The pass rate for all students who completed the course was 11.3%, while the pass rates for students who did not attend was 20.5%.
- **Effect:** A statistical analysis of students’ test scores found participating 11th graders to be significantly more likely to pass the FSA summer Algebra 1 EOC than their counterparts who did not take the course.
 - No significant programmatic effects were found at Grades 9 – 10, and there were insufficient data to analyze programmatic effects at Grade 12.
 - Non-programmatic effects were observed at ninth and tenth grades, as follows.
 - ♦ At each tested grade, students with higher pretest scores, the more likely they were to pass the test.
 - ♦ Ninth graders classified as Students with Disabilities were one-fifth as likely to pass the test as their peers who were not so classified.

6. What are the outcomes of the Credit Recovery component?

The Credit Recovery component provided an opportunity for middle school students who failed to earn core course credit to do so during the summer. The totals do not include participation in the Algebra I remediation component.

- **Participation.** Table 4 lists by grade; the total number of courses followed by the number and percent of courses in which students (a) registered and completed; (b) registered and withdrew prior to completion; and (c) registered but did not participate.

Table 4. Participation in the Credit Recovery Component

Summer Grade	Courses Enrolled	Completion					
		Full ^b		Partial ^c		None ^d	
		n	%	N	%	n	%
6	464	293	63.1	33	7.1	138	29.7
7	1,711	1,118	65.3	154	9.0	439	25.7
8	1,705	1,209	70.9	142	8.3	354	20.8
Total ^a	3,882	2,620	67.5	331	8.5	931	24.0

Note. Counts are duplicated as students could have attempted multiple courses. ^aIncludes a small number of ninth graders. ^bStudents who completed the component. ^cStudents who participated and withdrew prior to completion. ^dStudents who initially registered but did not attend (i.e., no shows).

- A total of 3,640 students attempted an average of 1.07 courses each, completing 67.5% (n=2,620) of them.
- Most of the attempted courses were completed by seventh and eighth graders.
- **Course Completion.** Table 5 lists the academic grades earned during summer school by the students who completed the component and subsequently were awarded credit, by subject area.

Table 5. Academic Grades Earned by Students Who Completed the Component by Subject Area

Courses Completed	Percent Graded	Final Grade										
		A		B		C		D		F		
		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	
Language Arts	437	96.8	27	6.4	154	36.4	189	44.7	35	8.3	18	4.3
Mathematics	1,059	96.9	57	5.6	341	33.2	452	44.1	150	14.6	26	2.5
Science	459	96.3	22	5.0	146	33.0	214	48.4	51	11.5	10	2.3
History	664	95.9	90	14.1	225	35.3	282	44.3	30	4.7	10	1.6
Total	2,620	96.5	196	7.8	866	34.2	1,137	45.0	266	10.5	64	2.5

- Nearly all the students who completed the courses earned final grades.
- A plurality of the students, 45%, earned a grade of C, while nearly 35% earned grade of B.
- Students who took courses in language arts and history earned the highest percentage of A and B grades.

7. What are the principal conclusions of this report?

Overall, the Summer Programs were designed to provide remedial support to students who require it, and student outcomes indicate that they were successful at doing so. Students who participated in the Literacy for Rising Third Grade component enjoyed significantly better outcomes on the iReady Diagnostic Test administered in the fall than students who did not attend the summer sessions. In addition, the Algebra I remediation significantly improved the odds of passing the End of Course exam for summer participants in Grade 11, but not at any other grade. Finally, over two-thirds of the courses attempted by students who participated in Course Recovery were completed (over 45% with a grade of C and nearly 35% with a grade of B), helping students meet promotion criteria.

Reference

Department of Summer Services (2018). *2018 Summer Implementation Document*. Miami, FL: Miami-Dade County Public Schools. Retrieved July 26, 2018, from http://summerschool.dadeschools.net/pdfs13/implementation_doc.pdf