Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Third Grade Summer Reading Camps, 2013 Evaluation

November 2013

Principal Evaluator/Author:
Steven M. Urdegar, M.B.A., Ph.D.

ASSESSMENT, RESEARCH AND DATA ANALYSIS
1450 Northeast Second Avenue
Miami, Florida 33132

Sally A. Shay,
District Director

THE SCHOOL BOARD OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA

Ms. Perla Tabares Hantman, Chair
Dr. Martin Karp, Vice Chair
Ms. Susie V. Castillo
Mr. Carlos L. Curbelo
Dr. Lawrence S. Feldman, Vice Chair
Dr. Wilbert "Tee" Holloway
Dr. Dorothy Bendross-Mindingall
Dr. Marta Pérez
Ms. Raquel A. Regalado

Ms. Krisna Maddy, Student Advisor

Mr. Alberto M. Carvalho
Superintendent of Schools

Miami-Dade County Public Schools
giving our students the world

Gisela F. Feild
Administrative Director
Assessment, Research and Data Analysis

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY iii

INTRODUCTION 1
Background 1
Description of the Program 2

METHODOLOGY 4
Research Questions 4
Data Sources 4
Implementation 4
Program Impact 5
Design and Samples 5
Instrumentation 7
Data Analyses 8
Promotion 8
Status 8

RESULTS 9
Return Rate 9
Implementation 9
Program Impact 14
Promotion 14
Status 15

DISCUSSION 17
Summary 17
Conclusions 17
REFERENCES 18

APPENDIX A: SUMMER IMPLEMENTATION SURVEY 19

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Features of the Third Grade Summer Reading Camps 3

Table 2: List of the Reading Camps, 2013 3

Table 3: Good Cause Exemptions to Mandatory Retention Granted to M-DCPS Third Graders who Scored at Level 1 on the FCAT Reading Subtest, 2012-13 6

Table 4: Crosstabulation of Previous vs. Current Program Exposure Status: Students Slated for Retention Number of Students who Participated in the Reading Camps 6

Table 5: The Groups' Demographic Characteristics as a Percentage of the Sample 7

Table 6: Programs that Operate in Conjunction with the Reading Camps 9

Table 7: Categories of School Bus Capacity 10

Table 8: Response Option Categories Assigned to Each Implementation Dimension 10

Table 9: Principals' Responses to Selected Items Addressing Implementation 11

Table 10: After the Bell Daily Dosage 12

Table 11: Principals' Attitudes Toward the Program 13

Table 12: Logistic Regression Analysis of the Posttest Scores 15

Table 13: Regression Analysis of the Posttest Scores 16

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The fundamental goal of the Third Grade Summer Reading Camp program is to bolster the reading skills of third grade students scheduled for retention and to prepare them to demonstrate mastery of state standards in order to be promoted to the fourth grade. The Office of Program Evaluation undertook an evaluation to gauge whether students who completed the program in Summer 2013 exhibited improved performance on the summer alternative assessment when compared to a comparison group of non-participants. The summer alternative assessment, the Stanford Achievement Test, Tenth Edition (SAT-10), was offered to students after the reading camp and served as the posttest. The spring alternative assessment, the Iowa Test of Basic Skills, Edition C (ITBS-C), served as the pretest.

Principals were surveyed regarding their opinions of the reading camps and generally gave positive accounts of planning, transportation, and curriculum/instruction. However, considerable variation between the schools in the duration of the instruction provided to the students using the instructional intervention was found. Therefore, the program could not be judged to be consistently implemented.

A sizable majority of the principals endorsed the level of technical support provided by District reading specialists and felt that the program was effective at improving the students' reading skills. More than half agreed that the program should continue in its current form.

Despite reported variations in the implementation of the program, students who participated in the Reading Camps were significantly more likely to pass the alternative assessment test required for promotion than students who did not attend, but only registered to take the test.

INTRODUCTION

The Third Grade Summer Reading Camps (Reading Camps) is an intensive reading remediation program designed to prepare the students to demonstrate grade level proficiency by earning a passing score on an alternative assessment given at the end of summer school. Students targeted for enrollment are third graders who failed to score above Level 1 on the reading subtest of the FCAT 2.0 and did not qualify for one or more of the statutory "good cause exemptions," and as such are prevented from advancing to grade 4. The following report details the evaluation of the eleventh implementation of the camps (summer 2013) and focuses on their impact on the students' subsequent performance on the alternative assessment test.

Background

Florida Statutes currently prohibit social promotion and mandate that students with academic deficiencies be provided with intensive remediation with particular emphasis on the reading proficiency of students in the grades K through 3. Districts are required to develop an academic improvement plan for each student who exhibited a deficiency in reading that would "identify the student's specific areas of deficiency, . . . , the desired levels of performance in these areas, and the instructional and support services to be provided to meet the desired levels of performance" (*Public School Student Progression*, 2013).

The fundamental goal of such a plan is to remediate the student's reading deficiency by the end of grade 3 as evidenced by the attainment of a score of Level 2 or above on the reading subtest of the FCAT 2.0, administered in grade 3. Scoring at Level 1 on the reading subtest of the FCAT may lead to retention in grade 3, unless the student meets one of the following six types of "good cause" exemptions:

- an acceptable level of performance on an alternative assessment;
- demonstration, through a portfolio, of the ability to read on grade level;
- status as an English Language Learner, with less than two years in English for Speakers of Other Languages programs;
- eligibility for special education (SPED) with an individual education plan (IEP) that indicates that it is not appropriate to take the FCAT;
- eligibility for SPED without FCAT exemption with an IEP or 504 plan demonstrating receipt of two years of intensive remediation in reading, a continuing deficiency in reading, and a previous retention in grades K through 3; or,
- receipt of two years of intensive remediation in reading, a continuing deficiency in reading, and two previous retentions in grades K through 3.

Because large numbers of the state's third graders have historically scored at level 1, the State called for districts to provide "intensive reading camps" during the summer, designed to prepare such students for the next opportunity to pass the test (Florida Department of Education, 2008).

The program has undergone numerous changes in format and length of delivery since its inception and has produced mixed results. While the results of the evaluation of the program that operated during summer 2012 showed an improvement in participating students' reading skills,

their chances of passing the alternative assessment were not significantly different from that of non-participants.

Description of the Program

The Reading Camps' curriculum that operated during summer 2013 represented a change from the curriculum that had operated for the previous four years. It focused entirely on bolstering students' reading skills and did not contain dedicated test preparation activities. The program in place provided students with five hours of reading-related activities per day, five days per week, for four weeks. The curriculum that operated within the school day was *After the Bell* developed by Scholastic.

A half-day training was provided to teachers by the vendor. Teachers were given the scope and sequence of instruction, previewed materials, and given a suggested schedule for the 5 hour block of instruction. Teachers were given the opportunity to walk through the components of the program and ask questions regarding implementation (Department of Language Arts/Reading, personal communication).

The research-based intervention program utilized both whole group and small group instruction. Targeted skills were taught using a program that provided fiction and non-fiction libraries. Each unit targeted reading comprehension skills, phonics instruction, and fluency practice. The following materials were included in the program:

- Student workbooks
- Reading Skills Cards
- Fluency cards
- Phonics reproducibles
- Teacher guides
- Assessment book
- Read-Aloud books
- Independent Reading Library
- Instructional Reading Library

Students were also directed to independent reading activities during small group instruction. Successmaker may also have been used as a supplemental technology component during small group instruction (Department of Language Arts/Reading).

The Department of Language Arts/Reading periodically monitored the delivery of the curriculum during on-site visits to selected Reading Camps. The program vendor also visited every summer service site at least once. Reports of the findings from the vendor's visits were provided to district administrators (Department of Language Arts/Reading).

The program that was implemented in 2013 provided students with 20 full-days of instruction prior to the alternative assessment. The District's, *2013 Summer Implementation Document* (Department of Summer Services, 2013) limited participation in the Reading Camps to "retained third grade students" (p. 8). Consequently, the students targeted by the program remained

primarily the third graders who scored at Level 1 on the reading portion of the FCAT 2.0 administered in April of 2013 and did not meet one of the "good cause" exemptions outlined earlier in this report.

Table 1
Features of the Third Grade Summer Reading Camps

Program Features

	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Hours per day [a]	3	3	3	3	5
Days per week	5	5	5	5	5
Daily schedule	8:30-11:30	8:30-11:30	8:30-11:30	8:30-11:30	8:30-2:00
Weeks per term	5	5	5	5	5
Hours of instruction per term	60	60 [b]	60	60	100
Teacher-student ratio	1:18	1:18	1:18	1:18	1:18
Number of camps	28	26	33	34	25
Student enrollment	2,116	2,375	2,273	1,833	2,048

Note. Each column represents the schedule in effect for that year.
[a] Includes ½ hour for lunch. [b] Post testing was conducted after 17 days of instruction

Table 1 provides information on various operational features of the Reading Camp program in each summer that it was implemented during the last five years. The 2013 summer program saw two major operational changes to the operation of the program: (a) the length of the instructional day was nearly doubled, and the number of host sites was reduced. The schools that implemented Reading Camps in 2013 are listed in Table 2.

Table 2
List of Reading Camps, 2013

North Regional Center		Central Regional Center	
Location	School Name	Location	School Name
5005	David Lawrence, Jr., K-8	5901	Carrie Meek/Westview K-8
0761	Fienberg/Fisher, K-8	1081	Coral Terrace
2241	Gratigny	1121	Coral Way, K-8
2401	Hibiscus	1721	Everglades, K-8
2181	Joella C. Good	1681	Lillie C. Evans, K-8
5971	Nathan B. Young	3381	Miami Springs
5601	Twin Lakes	4841	Santa Clara
		5041	Silver Bluff
		3051	Toussaint L'Ouverture
	(South Regional Center)		
0661	Caribbean		
3621	Coconut Palm Academy, K-8		
0861	Colonial Drive		
1281	Cypress		
2001	Florida City		
2651	Kendale Lakes		
3541	Robert R. Moton		
3111	Wesley Matthews		
5005	David Lawrence, Jr., K-8		

METHODOLOGY

The Reading Camps are designed to provide intensive reading instruction to third graders, slated for retention due to insufficient reading skills. The program aims to prepare them to score high enough on an alternative standardized reading assessment to be promoted to fourth grade.

Research Questions

An evaluation was undertaken by the district's Office of Program Evaluation to assess the implementation of the program, to explore the attitudes of responding principals toward the program, and to gauge its impact. The evaluation was guided by a series of questions:

1. **Were the Reading Camps implemented as planned?**
2. **Did students who participated in the Reading Camps score higher on the summer alternative assessment than students who did not participate?**

Data Sources

Data were gathered from four sources to address the evaluation questions. The first source of data consisted of a review of documents obtained from the District's Division of Language Arts/Reading, the District's School Choice and Parental Options, and the Florida Department of Education. The second source of data was an online instrument designed to measure various aspects of the summer program including enrollment, planning, staffing, transportation, resources, materials, supplies, and specific curricular-factors. The third source and fourth sources of data were students' demographic and assessment records maintained on the District's mainframe computer system. Each of the data sources will be discussed in detail in ensuing sections.

Implementation

Implementation was examined so that any observed effects on participants' achievement could be properly attributed to the program. This portion of the evaluation was concerned with determining whether the Reading Camps were being operated as specified; and, whether or not sufficient planning, resources, and support were evident. Data were gathered from an online survey entitled the Summer Reading Camps Implementation Survey to gauge implementation. (A copy of the survey may be found in Appendix A). The sample of schools for this portion of the evaluation included all participating schools.

The Summer Reading Camps Implementation Survey measures various aspects of the summer program including enrollment, planning, staffing, transportation, resources, materials, supplies, and specific curricular-factors (i.e.; dosage, frequency, and duration of treatment; engagement; and, perceived effectiveness). The survey comprised 33 items of which 24 adhered to a Likert-type format with response options that varied. Two filter questions (16 and 22) were used to enable a branching process by which only an appropriate subset of items were presented to respondents. Respondents were typically exposed to 24 items and two filter questions. Five items (1, 4, 5, 23 and 24) were used for identification, programmatic information, and to provide space for schools that did not offer the district-defined curriculum to describe their program. Two items

(2 and 3) gauged enrollment; six items (5-10) assessed the adequacy of planning, resources, and staffing levels; and, three items (11 – 13) pertained to transportation.

Seventeen program-specific curricular-questions were also defined: Four items (17, 18, 25, and 26) measured dosage, two items (21 and 29) pertained to program effectiveness, and two items (19 and 27) gauged the program's ability to provide differentiated instruction. Two additional items (20 and 28) measured students' engagement. Three summary items (30-32) solicited respondents' overall impressions of the program and the technical support that was available. Finally, space was provided to give respondents the option of suggesting areas for improvement. In all, 17 items measured implementation. The survey was administered online to principals of participating sites during July and August 2013. Key items were organized into one of four implementation categories: Planning, Resources, Transportation, and Curriculum/Instruction. The percent of positive responses within a category are classified as 0-50 (not implemented), 51-69 (partially implemented), and 70-100 (fully implemented. Otherwise, the analysis of the results of the Summer Reading Camps Implementation Survey was limited to descriptive statistics.

An attitudinal component measured principals' summative perceptions of the program. The issues addressed included technical support, effectiveness, satisfaction with the status quo, and suggestions for improvement. Data for this component were drawn from the Summer Implementation Survey. Three of those items (30-32) measured attitude. The analysis of the results for the attitudinal component was limited to descriptive statistics.

Program Impact

Design and Samples

A non-equivalent control group quasi-experimental design (Campbell & Stanley, 1963) was used to compare the performance of a group of students who participated in the Reading Camps with a group of students who did not, using pretest scores to equate the groups' performance prior to exposure and posttest scores to measure their performance afterwards. The groups were considered nonequivalent, because group membership was not assigned randomly.

The population for this evaluation consisted of third grade students who were scheduled for retention after having exhausted all options for promotion available to them prior to the end of the regular school year. Of the 26,711 third grade students who took the reading subtest of the FCAT 2.0 and were active in the district at the end of the 2012-13 school year, 22.1% (n = 5,901) scored within achievement Level 1.

Of those students, 91.4% (n=5,391) faced mandatory retention under state statute, as indicated by their promotion code. A subset of those students qualified for one or more of the good cause exemptions outlined by the state. Table 3 lists the number and percent of students who utilized those exemptions. Students listed as receiving exemptions based on the Portfolio and/or Alternative assessments earned a passing scores on one of those tests. The remaining 2,467 students were eligible to attend the Reading Camps.

Table 3
Good Cause Exemptions to Mandatory Retention Granted to M-DCPS Third Graders Who Scored at Level 1 on the FCAT Reading Subtest, 2012-13

	n	%
English Language Learner [a]	778	26.7
Portfolio Assessment	1,230	42.1
Alternative Assessment [b]	156	5.4
Students with Disabilities [c]	520	17.8
Other [d]	240	8.2
Total	2,924	100.0

[a] Students with less than two years in an English for Speakers of Other Languages Program [b] Includes ITBS-C given in spring. [c] Students with Disabilities who were retained once and had one year of intensive remediation or for whom statewide assessment is not appropriate. [d] Students who received intensive remediation for two or more years and were previously retained for two years.

The students who elected to attend and went on to complete the Reading Camps were included in a treatment pool comprised of students who were either in their first or second year of exposure to summer programs. Students with prior exposure to summer programs who were included in the analysis were limited to those who participated in the *Literacy for Rising Third Grade Students* (Rising Literacy) program in summer 2012. Students who were retained and previously attended the Reading Camps were excluded from the analysis. A comparison group was also defined which consisted of the eligible students who did not attend either the Reading Camps or Rising Literacy programs.

Of the 2,467 students slated for retention, a total of 94.8% (n=2,339) were eligible to included as described above. Table 4 partitions those students according to their current participation in the Reading Camps and their prior participation in the Rising Literacy programs. Students with partial exposure were excluded from both groups because their involvement would have precluded the isolation of the programs' impact.

Table 4
Crosstabulation of Consecutive Program Exposure

	Reading Camps			
Rising Literacy	Complete	Partial	None	Total
Complete	506	62	31	599
Partial	10	1	6	17
None	1,241	228	254	1,723
Total	1,757	291	291	2,339

Table 4 shows the treatment pool to be comprised of 1,778 (shaded) of the 1,816 (599+1,757-506) students who completed the Reading Camps, Rising Literacy, or both programs. Forty-seven of those students, who were all members of the largest group, attended charter schools and were excluded from the analysis.

The control pool was comprised of the 254 students who were not exposed to either program. Of the 1,731 students in the treatment pool, 93.9% (n = 1,626) had valid pre- and post- test (i.e.,

spring and summer alternative assessment) scores, and constituted the treatment groups. Of the 254 students in the control pool, only 22.4% (n = 57) had valid pre- and post- test scores, and constituted the control group. The characteristics of the final sample are described in Table 5. It lists for each subgroup, the percentage of students in the treatment groups and the control group.

Table 5
The Groups' Demographic Characteristics as a Percentage of the Sample

	Treatments			
	Dual	Single		
Subgroup	Reading Camps /Rising Literacy (n = 482)	Reading Camps (n=1,134)	Rising Literacy (n=10)	Control (n = 57)
Gender				
Male	57.9	59.3	70.0	64.9
Female	42.1	40.7	30.0	35.1
Ethnicity				
Black	50.8	40.9	50.0	19.3 [a]
Non-Black	49.2	59.1	50.0	80.7
Free/Reduced Price Lunch				
Eligible	95.9	93.7	90.0	84.2 [b]
non-Eligible	4.1	6.3	10.0	15.8
English Language Learner				
Current	45.2	48.2	42.2	40.4
Former/Never	54.8	51.7	57.8	59.6
Special Education				
Disabled	22.8	19.7	40.0	29.8
non-Disabled/non-Gifted	77.2	80.3	60.0	70.2
Age	9.5	9.5	9.4	9.4

Note. Age is expressed in years.
[a] Statistically significant $\chi^2(3, N=1,683)=27.30$, $p < .001$. [b] Statistically significant $\chi^2(3, N=1,683)=12.00$, $p < .01$.

Table 5 shows that the treatment and control groups differ significantly according to ethnicity and free/reduced lunch eligibility. Non-significant differences in the Special Education strata are also evident.

Instrumentation

The posttest used for this analysis was the Reading Comprehension subtest of the Stanford Achievement Test, Tenth Edition, SAT-10, a standardized norm-referenced test designed to measure students' performance in comparison to a national normative sample, and to facilitate comparisons among individuals and groups. It is currently administered by the district to third grade students as an Alternative Assessment for Grade Three Promotion (AAGTP) at the end of summer school.

The Reading Comprehension subtest of the Iowa Test of Basic Skills, Edition C (ITBS-C) was used as the pretest. The ITBS-C is also a standardized norm-referenced test. It is currently administered by the District to third grade students as an alternative assessment at the end of the school year.

Data Analyses

Demographic and pretest differences are known to influence achievement so that any between group variation on such variables can mask the program's impact. Therefore, the application of the quasi-experimental design used regression analysis to compare the groups' posttest scores, while controlling for students' initial ability and demographic characteristics.

Promotion

The question of whether participants were more likely than non-participants to have scored high enough on the alternative assessment to be promoted was also gauged through a regression analysis that estimated the impact of the program on the students' posttest scores, while controlling for students' pretest scores. However, the outcome of interest was whether or not the students posttest exceeded the 45th percentile, which is the cutoff for promotion: 1 (45th - 99th percentile) and 0 (1st - 44th percentile).

Logistic regression, specially designed to analyze problems with pass/fail outcomes was used to conduct the analysis. Pretest, Reading Camps (1=participant, 0=non-participant, and Rising Literacy (1=participant, 0=non-participant) were the main predictors in the model. Interaction terms (Reading Camps x Pretest, Rising Literacy x Pretest, and Reading Camps x Rising Literacy x Pretest) were also included to determine if the impact of the Reading Camps program was affected by prior participation in the Rising Literacy program, differed with students' pretest scores or some combination of both.

Status

Regression analysis was used to apply the non-equivalent control group design and to compare the groups' posttest scores. It estimated the impact of each program, i.e., Reading Camps and Rising Literacy, on the students' posttest scale scores, while controlling for students' pretest scores. Pretest, Reading Camps (1=participant, 0=non-participant), and Rising Literacy (1=participant, 0=non-participant) were the main predictors in the model. Interaction terms (Reading Camps x Pretest, Rising Literacy x Pretest, and Reading Camps x Rising Literacy x Pretest) were also included to determine if the impact of the Reading Camps program was affected by prior participation in the Rising Literacy program, differed with students' pretest scores or some combination of both.

RESULTS

The evaluation of the Reading Camps was guided by a series of research questions. Question 1 pertains to implementation and perception. Question 2 gauges the program's impact on two measures: (a) on their likelihood of exceeding the cutoff on the alternative assessment required to be promoted and (b) students' alternative assessment scores..

Return Rate

Principals at 25 schools were targeted to receive the Summer Reading Camps Implementation Survey, which was administered online during the summer session. Of those targeted, 64.0% (n=16) completed the survey. Caution should be exercised when attempting to generalize the results to the full population.

Implementation

Implementation was gauged so that any observed effects on participants' achievement could be properly attributed to the program. The online survey was used to make this determination, by measuring various aspects of the summer program including enrollment, planning, staffing, transportation, resources, materials, supplies, and specific curricular-factors (i.e.; dosage, frequency, and duration of treatment; engagement; and, perceived effectiveness). Several schools operated more than one program during the summer. Table 6 lists the number and percent of respondents that reported operating each program.

Table 6
Programs that Operated in Conjunction with the Reading Camps

Program	n	%
Course Credit Recovery	7	43.8
Extended School Year Services	1	6.3
Literacy for Rising Third Grade Students (below 50th percentile on the SAT-10, Grade 2 Reading Comprehension Subtest)	15	93.8
Total	16	100.0

Note. Most schools reported operating two additional programs

Of the responding principals, 93.8% (n=15) reported operating one or more additional programs, 43.8% (n=7) reported operating two or more, and 6.3% (n=1) reported operating three. The most prevalent program was Literacy for Rising Third Grade Students second grade tutoring followed by Course Credit Recovery.

Despite the multiple programs that operated in many cases, the capacity of the schools was often reported to be below capacity. Over one-fifth of the schools operated at or less than one-quarter of capacity, and three-quarters of the schools operated at less than half of capacity. The capacity of the school buses that transported the students was also addressed.

Table 7 lists the number and percent of schools that reported school bus capacity in each of six listed ranges. The table shows that the school buses were often better utilized than the school facilities with over one-third operating at near capacity. Nonetheless, the majority of the busses were reported to be less than half full.

Table 7
Categories of School Bus Capacity

	n	*%*
Less than 20% full	1	6.3
20 to 39% full	1	6.3
40 to 59% full	4	25.0
60 to 79% full	4	25.0
80% or more full	6	37.5
Total	16	100.0

The bulk of the implementation analysis was based on the results of 13 Likert type responses that gauged principals' perception of the adequacy of each of the five major dimensions of implementation: Planning, Resources, Transportation, Instructional Materials/Supplies, and Curriculum. Table 8 lists the positive and negative response options (classified according to a rubric) for each implementation dimension.

Table 8
Response Option Categories Assigned to Each Implementation Dimension

	Response Option Category	
	Positive	Negative
Implementation Dimension	Response Option	Response Option
Planning	Adequately	Less than adequately
	More than adequately	
Resources	An appropriate level	Much less than needed
	More than needed	Somewhat less than need
	Much more than needed	
Transportation	Usually on time	Mostly not on time
	Mostly on time	Usually not on time
Instructional Materials/Supplies	An appropriate level	Much less than needed
	Much more than needed	
Curriculum	Average	Poor
	Good	Fair
	Very good	

Table 9 lists the number and percent of principals who responded positively and negatively to each item within each implementation dimension. A total line is also provided that summarizes the responses within each dimension. Total scores for each dimension are classified as: 0-49.9% (not implemented), 50-69.9% (partially implemented – shaded dark), and 70-100% (fully implemented – shaded light).

Table 9
Principals' Responses to Selected Items Addressing Implementation

	Dimension/Item	Positive		Negative	
		n	%	*n*	%
	Planning				
5	How well was your summer location informed about the academic needs of the students who would be attending?	15	93.8	1	6.3
6	How well was your summer location informed of the number of students that would be attending?	15	93.8	1	6.3
7	How adequate were the instructional staffing levels at the school, relative to the number of students that attended	14	87.5	2	12.5
	Total	44	91.7	4	8.3
	Resources				
8	How would you characterize the amount of basic supplies (e.g., paper, ink, towels, etc.) available at the school?	10	62.5	6	37.5
9	How would you characterize the number of ancillary (e.g., clerical, cafeteria, janitorial, etc.) staff available at the school?	6	37.5	10	62.5
10	How would you characterize the number of security personnel available at the school?	8	50.0	8	50.0
	Total	24	50.0	24	50.0
	Transportation				
12	To what extent did the arrival of the buses typically align with the schedule of the school?	13	81.3	3	18.8
13	To what extent did the departure of the buses typically align with the schedule of the school?	15	93.8	1	6.3
	Total	28	87.5	4	12.5
	Instructional Materials/Supplies				
14	How sufficient was the amount of curricular materials (i.e., books, workbooks, manipulatives, etc.) available?	13	81.3	3	18.8
15	How sufficient was the amount of instructional supplies (i.e., computers, whiteboards, pencils, paper, etc.) available?	7	43.8	9	56.3
	Total	20	62.5	12	37.5
	Curriculum				
19	How would you rate the ability of the After the Bell to remediate different students with different learning problems in the same classroom at the same time?	11	91.7	1	8.3
20	How would you rate the engagement of students in the thematic subject matter covered by After the Bell?	11	91.7	1	8.3
21	How would you rate the effectiveness of After the Bell at addressing the skills deficits of the students?	8	66.7	4	33.3
	Total	30	83.3	6	16.7

Note. Total scores for each aspect are categorized as follows: 0-49.9% (not implemented), 50-69.9% (partially implemented – shaded dark), and 70-100% (fully implemented – shaded light). Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

The table shows that nearly all the principals rated the planning, for the number and needs of students that would be attending their schools, positively. Staffing levels were assessed positively as a result. In terms of planning, the program may be considered to be fully implemented.

On the issue of resources, the principals were less sanguine with over 35% reporting shortages of clerical staff and half reporting not having an adequate number of security staff. In terms of resources, the program may be considered to be partially implemented.

On the issue of transportation, the vast majority of principals reported that the arrival and departure of the school buses aligned with the school schedule. In terms of transportation, the program may be considered to be fully implemented.

On the issue of Instructional Materials/Supplies, while over 80% of the principals felt that the amount of curricular materials were adequate, nearly 60% were dissatisfied with the amount of instructional supplies. In terms of instructional materials/supplies, the program may be considered to be partially implemented.

Curriculum was the primary area of inquiry and as such was addressed by four items one of which asked respondents to identify the program operating in their school. All of the 16 principals queried identified After the Bell as an implemented program. However, (12.5%, n=2) reported using a blended model that included MyOn Reader as a Web based supplement.

Of the principals who identified After the Bell, approximately two-thirds judged that it was able to remediate students with different learning problems within the same classroom. Nearly all felt that its subject matter was engaging to students and that it was effective at addressing the skill deficits of the students. On the issue of curriculum, the program may be considered to be fully implemented.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, principals were asked to indicate the daily time allotted to After the Bell. Table 10 lists the number and percent of schools that reported operating After the Bell for each of the range of times provided.

Table 10
After the Bell Daily Dosage

	Schools	
Range (minutes)	*n*	*%*
301 or more	3	25.0
241 to 300	5	41.7
181 to 240	0	0.0
121 to 180	0	0.0
61 to 120	1	8.3
60 or less	3	25.0
Total		100.0

Note. Recommended daily dosage is 300 minutes per day per program guidelines.

Although, all of the responding schools reported operating the program five days per week, one-third (n=4) reported operating the program for a fraction of the recommended time. Regarding, uniformity and nature of instructional delivery, the program does not appear to have been consistently implemented.

The attitudinal component of implementation measures principals' summative perceptions of the program. The issues addressed included technical support, effectiveness, satisfaction with the status quo, and suggestions for improvement. Table 11 lists the number and percent of principals that responded positively and negatively to the pertinent items.

Table 11
Principals' Attitudes Toward the Program

		Positive		Negative	
		n	%	*n*	%
30	How would you characterize the support provided by staff from curriculum and instruction?	15	93.8	1	6.3
31	How effective do you believe the Reading Camps were at helping students improve their reading skills?	14	87.5	2	12.5
32	To what extent do you agree that the program should continue to operate in its current form?	9	56.3	7	43.8

Note. Positive responses: (Average to Very Good and Agree to Strongly Agree). Negative responses: (Poor to Fair and Strongly disagree to Unsure). Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

The table shows that nearly all principals endorsed the level of technical support provided by District reading specialists and the effectiveness of the program at improving the students' reading skills. However, slightly more than half agreed or strongly agreed that the program should continue in its current form.

Space was also provided for principals to provide an open ended comment. Three-eighths of the principals who completed the implementation items responded to this question. Two of the six comments concerned student needs.

One principal said,

> A reading coach should be assigned to the school site on a daily basis. The reading coach could provide needed support materials for lower level students. Some students are unable to do independent activities. Additional materials could be provided by the coach. A paraprofessional should be assigned to each teacher to provide small group intervention support . . . [and] assist the students with the rotation and technology support while the teacher is working with the small groups.

Another principal felt,

> It would be ideal to ensure that each of the schools represented at the summer reading camps were taught by their school's teachers. Students have a hard time adapting to a new environment and a new face that they have not met prior to the summer reading camp.

Two of the six comments concerned effectiveness, with one principal noting: "Overall [the] program seems to be effective. Teachers were pleased with the program and students were engaged." Another principal opined that, "results [would] show [the] effectiveness of [the] program."

One principal expressed concerns about planning,

> Principals should be informed of the components/requirements of the program with enough time to make sure summer school classrooms have computers and so principals can provide assistance to teachers in the implementation of the curriculum. Also, any necessary testing requirements (i.e., pretest using Edusoft) should be given to principals in advance so arrangements can be made for materials to be ready for teachers' answer sheets.

In sum, principals generally gave positive reports of the core aspects of implementation (i.e., planning, resources, transportation, instructional materials/supplies and curriculum). However, the availability of resources and instructional materials/supplies were rated as sufficiently wanting to cause them to be judged as only partially implemented. These sentiments were echoed in open ended comments in which lack of resources constituted an additional cause of concern.

Finally, although, the Reading Camps curricula were rated as effective, nearly half of respondents did not agree that they should continue in their present form. Notwithstanding the foregoing, an analysis of program dosage revealed wide variation.

Program Impact

The quasi-experimental designs were applied by using statistical procedures called regression analyses to compare the posttest scores of participating and non-participating students. The analyses controlled for students demographic characteristics and initial ability as measured by their pretest scores when making these comparisons.

Promotion

The program's impact on the likelihood that participants would pass the alternative assessment, and ultimately be promoted, was gauged through a special regression analysis that compared the odds of exceeding the cutoff for participating and non-participating students after their demographic characteristics and pretest scores and were taken into account. The posttest scores were converted to pass/fail outcomes based on whether or not the scores met or exceeded the criterion for promotion (i.e., 45th percentile). The analysis estimates the impact of the various predictors including the program impact in terms of the odds[1] of passing.

Table 12 lists for each effect, the predictor weight (*B*) and its standard error (*SE*) followed by the change in the odds ratio due to the predictor, and the Wald statistic used to gauge its statistical significance).

[1] Odds, which represent the likelihood of passing divided by the likelihood of failing, enable the discontinuous change from failing to passing to be mathematically modeled as a smooth transition called a logistic curve.

Table 12
Logistic Regression Analysis of the Posttest Scores

	B	S.E.	Odds Ratio	Wald
Intercept	-2.60	0.47	0.07	31.01***
English Language Learner - Former	0.95	0.37	2.59	6.50*
Special Education	-0.97	0.21	0.38	20.21***
Pretest	0.09	0.01	1.09	156.28***
Reading Camps	1.05	0.47	2.85	5.07*
Rising Literacy[a]	-0.33	0.16	0.72	4.28*
R^2=.23				

Note. All predictors are grand-mean centered. *B* gives the predictor weight, which is the influence of the indicated effect on the outcome variable expressed on a log-odds scale. Wald is a measure of statistical significance given by the square of the ratio of *B* to its standard error. The odds ratio is found by raising the base of the natural logarithm to the power given by the predictor. This gives the probability of meeting the criterion divided by the probability of not meeting the criterion.
[a]Prior participation (2012)
* $p < .05$. *** $p < .001$.

Of the 1,683 students in this study who took the AAGTP at the end of summer school, 18.8% (n=303) of the students who attended the Reading Camps and 9.8% (n = 6) of the students in the comparison group passed the test. The Intercept gives the odds of passing for a student who is current LEP/non-LEP, non-SPED/Gifted with a pretest score equal to the sample mean, and who did not attend either the Reading Camps or Rising Literacy programs. The odds of passing for such a "reference group" student are 0.07 to 1.

The odds of passing were lower for SPED students and higher for Former-ELL students than their non-SPED/non-Gifted and Current-ELL/non-ELL counterparts, respectively. **The odds of passing the test for students who completed the Reading Camps were 2.85 times higher than those who did not participate**, once their pretest scores and demographic characteristics were taken into account. Finally, the odds of passing, for students who previously participated in the Rising Literacy program, were lower than for those who did not participate.

Status

Regression analysis was used to apply the quasi-experimental non-equivalent control design and to compare the groups' posttest scores. Table 13 presents the results of a regression analysis of the reading posttest. The tables list for each effect, the mean and standard error of its unstandardized predictor weight, followed by the standardized weight, followed by the results of a test which gauges the statistical significance of the weight. The model R^2, included at the bottom of each table, is an effect size that classifies the proportion of variation in the outcome explained by the predictors in the model as .01 (weak), .13 (moderate), and .26 (strong), Cohen (1988).

All continuous predictors are expressed as deviations from their sample mean value. Therefore, the intercept gives the value of the outcome variable when all dichotomous predictors are at their references values (i.e., non-Black, non-Female, non-ELL, non-SPED/non-Gifted, non-Current-participant, and non-Prior participant) and the continuous predictors are equal to their sample mean values. The table gives the incremental impact of a one point change in each predictor on

the students' posttest scores, when all the remaining predictors are included in the model. The second through fifth predictors are dichotomously coded so their predictor weights give the difference in the outcome variable between the group coded "1" (i.e., the listed group) and the group coded "0."

Table 13
Regression Analysis of the Posttest Scores

	Unstandardized (B)			
Predictor	M	S.E.	Standardized (β)	t
Intercept	620.76	11.83		52.47***
Age	-2.63	1.22	-.05	-2.16*
Black	-4.76	1.48	-.08	-3.23**
Female	3.52	1.19	.06	2.97**
English Language Learner - Current	-5.61	1.43	-.10	-3.92***
Special Education	-11.57	1.45	-.17	-7.99***
Pretest	1.11	0.05	.45	21.43***
Reading Camps	2.38	2.98	.02	0.80
Rising Literacy[a]	-4.35	1.28	-.07	-3.40***
R^2=.28				

Note. The weights represent the influence on the criterion variable of a unit change in the predictor. All predictors are expressed as deviations from the sample mean (i.e., grand-mean centered). Unstandardized weights are in original units. Standardized weights result from rescaling all variables to zero mean and unit variance. The t statistic represents the ratio of the mean weight to its standard error and tests whether the weight is significantly different from zero.
[a] Prior participation (2012)
*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001

Table 13 shows that Black, Current-ELL, and SPED students scored lower on the posttest, while Female students scored higher, and students who previously participated in the Rising Literacy program scored 4.35 points lower on the posttest than students who did not previously participate. Examination of the standardized weights reveals that students' pretest scores were the strongest predictor of how they scored on the posttest followed by SPED status. Similarly influential were Current-ELL status, classification as Black or Female and the Prior program. **No significant difference between the mean scores of students who participated in the Reading Camps and students who did not was found** .

In sum, the impact of the Reading Camps on passing the AAGTP varied widely so that some students benefited, while other students did not. Although, there was no significant difference between the mean scores of participating and non-participating students, Participants were nearly three times more likely to pass the AAGTP than students who did not participate. Students who previously participated in the Rising Literacy program not only had lower AAGTP scores but also had lower odds of exceeding the cutoff for promotion than non-participating students did.

DISCUSSION

The district undertook an evaluation to gauge whether students who completed the Reading Camps program exhibited improved performance on the alternative assessment when compared to a comparison group of students who did not participate.

Summary

The evaluation of the Reading Camps described the operation and assessed outcome measures for the program that operated during its tenth year of implementation. Conducted by the district's Office of Program Evaluation, the study was guided by a series of questions that can now be answered.

1. Were the Reading Camps implemented as planned?

While principals gave positive accounts of planning, transportation, and curriculum/instruction, and rated all three parts of the curricululum as effective; the availability of materials and supplies was rated as somewhat wanting. Most principals endorsed the level of technical support provided by District reading specialists and the effectiveness of the program at improving the students' reading skills. However, an analysis of *After the Bell* program dosage revealed wide variation. Therefore, the program could not be judged to be consistently implemented, and the following results must be reviewed with this in mind.

2. Did students who participated in the Reading Camps score higher on the summer alternative assessment than students who did not?

Students who participated in the Reading Camps were significantly more likely to meet the cutoff for promotion than students who did not attend but only registered to take the test. Although, the average scores of students who participated was not significantly higher than those who did not, the increase was sufficient to allow 303 students to be promoted at the end of the Summer Reading Camps.

Conclusions

Students who participated in the Reading Camps were significantly more likely to pass the alternative assessment test required for promotion, than students who did not attend, but only registered to take the test, even though, the average reading scores of students who participated were not significantly higher than those who did not. Reported variations in the implementation of the program may explain why the program's benefits were not consistently distributed. Principals gave mostly positive reports of the core aspects of the program, but expressed concern regarding the availability of resources.

REFERENCES

Becker, L.A. (1999). GLM repeated measures: One within, one between. *SPSS Course Content – Fall 2000*. (Web based syllabus). University of Colorado at Colorado Springs. Retrieved August 26, 2009, from http://web.uccs.edu/lbecker/SPSS/glm_1w1b.htm

Campbell, D.F., &, Stanley, J.C. (1963). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Casanova, P. F., Garcia-Linares, M. C., de la Torre, M. J., & de la Villa Carpio, M. (2005). Influence of family and sociodemographic variables on students with low academic achievement [Electronic version]. Educational Psychology, 25(4), 423-435.

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Department of Language Arts/Reading (personal communication). *Description of the remedial components for third grade students.* (Email transmittal, May 7, 2013). Miami, FL: Miami-Dade County Public Schools.

Department of Summer Services (2013). *2013 Summer Implementation Document.* Miami, FL: Miami-Dade County Public Schools. Retrieved August 15, 2013, from http://summerschool.dadeschools.net/pdfs13/implementation_doc.pdf

Eamon, M. K. (2005). Social-demographic, school, neighborhood, and parenting influences on the academic achievement of Latino young adolescents [Electronic version]. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 34*(2), 163-174.

Florida Department of Education. (2008). *Critical information for parents of third graders* [Electronic version] Retrieved July 27, 2013 from http://flbsi.org/pdf/2008ReadtoLearn.pdf

McLoyd, V. C. (1990). The impact of economic hardship on black families and children: Psychological stress, parenting, and socioemotional development. *Child Development, 61*(1).

Public School Student Progression; Remedial Instruction; Reporting Requirements [Electronic version], 48 Fla. Stat. §1008.25 (2013). Retrieved July 27, 2013, from http://www.flsenate.gov/Laws/Statutes/2013/1008.25

Urdegar, S.M. (2008). *Beyond Fidelity: Relating educational practices and their determinants to student learning gains.* (Doctoral dissertation, Florida Atlantic University, 2008).

Appendix A

Summer School Implementation Survey

Summer Reading Camps Implementation Survey, 2013

Instructions

This survey is designed to assess various aspects of the programs that operate at the school to which you are assigned during the summer. The information that you provide will be used to furnish formative feedback and inform future planning in the areas of logistics, human resources, and curriculum. Your impressions are very important to the future success of this initiative. If you have any questions or need assistance with this survey you may contact Dr. Steven M. Urdegar at (305) 995-7538. Please reflect honestly on your experience as an administrator and answer each item in the survey that follows to the best of your ability. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Introduction

The items that follow pertain to the school to which you are assigned during the summer.

1. Which of the following choices best describes your role at the school?

(Select only one)

- ☐ Principal
- ☐ Assistant Principal
- ☐ Other (specify):

2. Approximately, how many students are enrolled in this school during the regular school year?

(Provide only one response)

3. Approximately, how many students participate in one or more of the summer programs?

(Provide only one response)

Planning

The items that follow pertain to ALL the programs operating at the school during the summer session.

4. Which programs operate at the school?

(Select all that apply)

- ☐ Course Credit Recovery
- ☐ Extended School Year (ESY) Services
- ☐ Literacy for Rising 3rd Grade Students (below 50th percentile on the SAT-10, Grade 2 Reading Comprehension Subtest)
- ☐ Summer Voluntary Pre-Kindergarten (VPK)
- ☐ Third Grade Summer Reading Camps
- ☐ Other (specify):

5. How well has your present summer location been informed about the academic needs of the students who would be attending?

(Select only one)

- ☐ Less than adequately
- ☐ Adequately
- ☐ More than adequately
- ☐ Not applicable

6. How well has your summer location been informed of the number of students that would be attending?

(Select only one)

- ☐ Less than adequately
- ☐ Adequately
- ☐ More than adequately
- ☐ Not applicable

7. How adequate are the instructional staffing levels at the school, relative to the number of students that attended

(Select only one)

- ☐ More than 20% understaffed
- ☐ 10 to 19% understaffed
- ☐ Appropriately staffed
- ☐ 10 to 19% overstaffed
- ☐ More than 20% overstaffed

Resources

The questions that follow pertain to all the programs operating at the summer school.

8. How would you characterize the amount of basic supplies (e.g., paper, ink, towels, etc.) available at the school?

(Select only one)

- ☐ Much less than needed
- ☐ Somewhat less than needed
- ☐ An appropriate level
- ☐ More than needed
- ☐ Much more than needed

9. How would you characterize the number of ancillary (e.g., clerical, cafeteria, janitorial, etc.) staff available at the school?

(Select only one)

- ☐ Many fewer than needed
- ☐ Somewhat fewer than needed
- ☐ An appropriate level
- ☐ More than needed
- ☐ Many more than needed

10. How would you characterize the number of security personnel available at the school?

(Select only one)

- ☐ Many fewer than needed
- ☐ Somewhat fewer than needed
- ☐ An appropriate level
- ☐ More than needed
- ☐ Many more than needed

Transportation

11. On average, how full are the school buses used to transport the students to and from the school?

(Select only one)

- ☐ Less than 20% full
- ☐ 20 to 39% full
- ☐ 40 to 59% full
- ☐ 60 to 79% full
- ☐ 80% or more full

12. To what extent does the arrival of the buses typically align with the schedule of the school?

(Select only one)

- ☐ Mostly not on time
- ☐ Usually not on time
- ☐ Usually on time
- ☐ Mostly on time

13. To what extent does the departure of the buses typically align with the schedule of the school?

(Select only one)

- ☐ Mostly not on time
- ☐ Usually not on time
- ☐ Usually on time
- ☐ Mostly on time

Instruction

The items that follow pertain ONLY to the Third Grade Summer Reading Camps

14. How sufficient is the amount of curricular materials (i.e., books, workbooks, manipulatives, etc.) available?

(Select only one)

- ☐ Much less than needed
- ☐ Somewhat less than needed
- ☐ An appropriate level
- ☐ More than needed
- ☐ Much more than needed

15. How sufficient is the amount of instructional supplies (i.e., computers, whiteboards, pencils, paper, etc.) available?

(Select only one)

- ☐ Much less than needed
- ☐ Somewhat less than needed
- ☐ An appropriate level
- ☐ More than needed
- ☐ Much more than needed

Branch1

16. Does After the Bell (developed by Scholastic) operate in your school?

(Select only one)

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Don't know

Curriculum

17. How many days per week is instruction in After the Bell typically delivered to students?

(Select only one)

- ☐ 1
- ☐ 2
- ☐ 3
- ☐ 4
- ☐ 5

18. On the days in which it is used, for how many minutes daily was After the Bell provided?

(Select only one)

- ☐ 60 or less
- ☐ 61 to 120
- ☐ 121 to 180
- ☐ 181 to 240
- ☐ 241 to 300
- ☐ 300 or more

19. How would you rate the ability of After the Bell to remediate different students with different learning problems in the same classroom at the same time?

(Select only one)

- ☐ Poor
- ☐ Fair
- ☐ Average
- ☐ Good
- ☐ Very Good

20. How would you rate the engagement of students in the subject matter covered by After the Bell?

(Select only one)

- ☐ Poor
- ☐ Fair
- ☐ Average
- ☐ Good
- ☐ Very good

21. How would you rate the effectiveness of After the Bell at addressing the skills deficits of the students?

(Select only one)

- ☐ Poor
- ☐ Fair
- ☐ Average
- ☐ Good
- ☐ Very Good

Branch4

22. Did any other component of the Reading Camps other than After the Bell operate in the school during the regular school day of the present summer session?

(Select only one)

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Don't know

Other

23. Please provide the name and a description of the program that includes publisher/developer, series, and materials used.

(Provide only one response)

24. Which of the following skills were addressed by the program?

(Select all that apply)

- ☐ Phonemic Awareness
- ☐ Phonics
- ☐ Vocabulary development
- ☐ Fluency
- ☐ Reading comprehension
- ☐ Writing
- ☐ Test preparation
- ☐ Other (specify):

25. How many days per week was instruction in the program typically delivered to students?

(Select only one)

- ☐ 1
- ☐ 2
- ☐ 3
- ☐ 4
- ☐ 5

26. On the days in which it is used, for how many minutes daily was the program provided?

(Select only one)

- ☐ 60 or less
- ☐ 61 to 120
- ☐ 121 to 180
- ☐ 181 to 240
- ☐ 241 to 300
- ☐ 300 or more

27. How would you rate the ability of the program to remediate different groups of students with different learning problems in the same classroom at the same time?

(Select only one)

- ☐ Poor
- ☐ Fair
- ☐ Average
- ☐ Good
- ☐ Very Good

28. How would you rate the engagement of students by the program?

(Select only one)

- ☐ Poor
- ☐ Fair
- ☐ Average
- ☐ Good
- ☐ Very good

29. How would you rate the effectiveness of the program at addressing the skills deficits of the students?

(Select only one)

- ☐ Poor
- ☐ Fair
- ☐ Average
- ☐ Good
- ☐ Very Good

Summary1

The question that follow pertain to your overall impression of all aspects of the Third Grade Summer Reading Camps

30. How would you characterize the technical support provided by staff from curriculum and instruction?

(Select only one)

- ☐ Poor
- ☐ Fair
- ☐ Average
- ☐ Good
- ☐ Very Good
- ☐ Not applicable

Summary2

31. How effective do you believe the Third Grade Summer Reading Camps were at helping students to improve their reading skills?

(Select only one)

- ☐ Poor
- ☐ Fair
- ☐ Average
- ☐ Good
- ☐ Very Good
- ☐ Not applicable

32. To what extent do you agree that the program should continue to operate in its current form?

(Select only one)

- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Unsure
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly agree

33. Optionally, use the space below to provide any suggestions you might have on how the Summer Reading Camps can be improved.

(Provide only one response)