



**2003 Summer Evaluation of the Extended
Learning Opportunities (ELO) Program
Evaluation Report**

Office of Shared Accountability

January 2004

**Kola K. Sunmonu, Ph.D.
Daniel Curry-Corcoran, Ph.D.
Joy Mordica, Ph.D.**



Montgomery County Public Schools

OFFICE OF SHARED ACCOUNTABILITY

Dr. Theresa Alban, Acting Director

Dr. Kola K. Sunmonu, Acting Coord. Program Evaluation Unit

850 Hungerford Drive

Rockville, Maryland 20850

301-279-3925

Dr. Jerry D. Weast
Superintendent of Schools

Dr. Frieda K. Lacey
Chief of Staff

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	6
INTRODUCTION	12
THE 2003 SUMMER EXTENDED LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES (ELO) PROGRAM.....	14
Program Structure	15
Curriculum and Assessments	15
Student Recruitment.....	16
Staffing and Training	17
STUDENT AND TEACHER PARTICIPATION IN.....	18
Student Registration.....	18
Student Attendance	18
ELO Summer Teachers.....	21
2003 SUMMER ELO STUDENT ACADEMIC OUTCOMES.....	24
Method	24
<i>Samples of Students</i>	24
<i>Outcome Measures</i>	25
<i>Statistical Analyses</i>	28
Results.....	29
<i>Kindergarten</i>	29
<i>Grade 1</i>	33
<i>Grade 2</i>	37
<i>Grade 3</i>	41
<i>Grade 4</i>	44
STAFF SATISFACTION SURVEY	48
Administrator Satisfaction	48
<i>Method</i>	48
<i>Results</i>	48
Teacher Satisfaction.....	53
<i>Method</i>	53
<i>Results</i>	53
PARENT SATISFACTION SURVEY.....	61
Overall Satisfaction of Participating Parents	62
Satisfaction with the Afternoon ELO Program.....	63
Reasons for Nonparticipation in the ELO Program.....	65
Parent Satisfaction with Improvements to the 2003 ELO Program.....	66
SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	68
Findings.....	68
Recommendations.....	72

REFERENCES	74
APPENDIX A	76
APPENDIX B	77
APPENDIX C	79
APPENDIX D	81
APPENDIX E	83
APPENDIX F	85
APPENDIX G	87
APPENDIX H	89

TABLES

Table 1. 2003 Summer ELO Registration Rates Among Eligible Students, by Demographic Groups.....	19
Table 2. ELO Summer Program Attendance Rates for Students with at Least One Day of Attendance, by Demographic Characteristics.....	20
Table 3. Comparison of Teacher Characteristics Among Those Who Taught in ELO, in Title 1 Schools, and in MCPS in Grades K–4	22
Table 4. 2003 Summer ELO Teachers: ELO Assignment v. Regular School-Year Assignment	23
Table 5. Sample Sizes for Grades 1 through 4.....	25
Table 6. Reliability Analyses of the Review Subtests of 2003 Summer ELO Program Mathematics Instruments	28
Table 7. Summary of Kindergarten ANCOVA Analyses.....	30
Table 8. Comparisons: Kindergarten Reading (Foundational Skills) Posttest Scores for Various Demographic Groups, by Level of 2003 Summer ELO Program Participation	31
Table 9. Comparisons: Kindergarten Mathematics (Review Place Value & Number Sense Concepts) Posttest Scores for Various Demographic Groups, by Level of 2003 Summer ELO Program Participation.....	32
Table 10. Summary of Grade 1 ANCOVA Analyses.....	33
Table 11. Comparisons: Grade 1 Pretest-Posttest Gains in Reading (Text Level) for Various Demographic Groups, by Level of 2003 Summer ELO Program Participation.....	35
Table 12. Comparisons: Grade 1 Pretest-Posttest Gains in Mathematics (Review Place Value & Number Sense Concepts) for Various Demographic Groups, by Level of 2003 Summer ELO Program Participation.....	36
Table 13. Summary of Grade 2 ANCOVA Analyses.....	37
Table 14. Comparisons: Grade 2 Pretest-Posttest Gains in Reading (Text Level) for Various Demographic Groups, by Level of 2003 Summer ELO Program Participation.....	38
Table 15. Comparisons: Grade 2 Pretest-Posttest Gains in Mathematics (Review Place Value & Number Sense Concepts) for Various Demographic Groups, by Level of 2003 Summer ELO Program Participation.....	39
Table 16. Summary of Grade 3 ANCOVA Analyses.....	41

Table 17. Comparisons: Grade 3 Pretest-Posttest Gains in Reading (Test Ready Composite Scores) for Various Demographic Groups, by Level of 2003 Summer ELO Program Participation.....	42
Table 18. Comparisons: Grade 3 Pretest-Posttest Gains in Mathematics (Review Place Value & Number Sense Concepts) for Various Demographic Groups, by Level of 2003 Summer ELO Program Participation.....	43
Table 19. Summary of Grade 4 ANCOVA Analyses.....	44
Table 20. Comparisons: Grade 4 Pretest-Posttest Gains in Reading (Test Ready Composite Scores) for Various Demographic Groups, by Level of 2003 Summer ELO Program Participation.....	45
Table 21. Comparisons: Grade 4 Pretest-Posttest Gains in Mathematics (Review Place Value & Number Sense Concepts) for Various Demographic Groups, by Level of 2003 Summer ELO Program Participation.....	46
Table 22. Individual Survey Questions with 75 percent Satisfaction Rating or Less.....	49
Table 23. Mean and Median Percentages for Principals and Assistant Principals on Overall Survey Questions and Individual Subsections.....	50
Table 24. Mean and Median Percentages for Administrators Who Participated in 2003 ELO Program Pre July/July-August and Post August Only on Overall Survey Questions and Individual Subsections	51
Table 25. Percentage of Teachers with Positive Satisfaction Rating for Individual Subsections of ELO Teacher Survey	55
Table 26. Comparison of the Percentage of ELO Teachers with the Same and Different Grade Assignments from Summer to Fall 2003, with 76% or Higher Favorable Rating on Subsections of Teacher Survey	56
Table 27. Top 10 Strengths of the 2003 Summer ELO Program from Teacher Survey (<i>N</i> = 396).....	57
Table 28. Top Ten Comments Regarding Weaknesses of 2003 Summer ELO Program. <i>N</i> = 317.....	58
Table 29. Top 10 Teachers' Recommended Changes for Future Summer ELO Programs (<i>N</i> =260).....	59
Table 30. Parent Satisfaction, by Grade Level	62
Table 31. Parent Satisfaction, by Educational Program	62
Table 32. Parent Satisfaction, by Satisfaction Category.....	63

Table 33. Parent Satisfaction, by Survey Question..... 64

Table 34. Parent Satisfaction with Afternoon ELO, by Survey Question 64

Table 35. Reasons for not Participating in ELO 65

Table 36. Summer Activities of Non-ELO Students 66

Table 37. Parent Perceptions of Improvements to ELO, by Survey Question 67

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Summer Extended Learning Opportunities (ELO) program was first implemented during the summer of 2002, with the objective of enhancing instruction and student achievement in the 18 elementary schools receiving federal Title I funds. The 2003 summer ELO program was designed to provide additional instruction in reading/language arts and mathematics to entering-kindergarten through Grade 4 students in schools with the highest concentration of children participating in the Free and Reduced-price Meals System (FARMS) and English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) services. This year's program is designed to meet the specific needs of each student. For students at or above grade level at the end of the 2002–2003 school year, the additional instruction is to be used to strengthen skills already acquired and to accelerate learning by previewing concepts and skills to be taught in the grade students will enter in the fall. On the other hand, for students who ended the 2002–2003 school year below grade level, the additional instruction is to be used to catch up on grade-level concepts and skills. Specifically, the 2003 summer ELO program seeks to do the following:

- Meet the academic needs of each student either by providing opportunity to catch up on grade-level concepts and skills or accelerating learning by previewing concepts and skills to be taught in the grade students will enter in the fall.
- Strengthen basic skills that are the preconditions of later learning.
- Alleviate the achievement loss that some students may experience over the summer months.
- Provide continuing English language instruction for speakers of other languages.

This report summarizes the findings of the evaluation of the Year 2 (summer 2003) implementation of the summer ELO program. The 2003 summer ELO program evaluation pursued three questions:

1. Did the 2003 summer ELO program produce overall academic benefits in reading/language arts and mathematics?
2. Did these academic benefits differ by racial/ethnic group and did these academic benefits differ by ESOL/FARMS groups?
3. Did the four-week intervention produce overall academic benefits in reading and math?

In addition, a full description of the program and how it was implemented in the 18 Title I schools are presented.

Findings

- Students who attended the 2003 summer ELO program for 16 days or more had higher posttest-pretest improvements in all grades and in both reading and mathematics when compared to their cohorts who did not attend the program or attended 5 days or fewer. The higher posttest-pretest improvement, however, was statistically and educationally significant (that is, had academic benefit) for only Grade 4 students in mathematics.

- Though the 2003 summer ELO program had overall academic benefits for only Grade 4 students in mathematics, results at the disaggregated levels vary for different demographic groups: student groups that are most impacted by limited English language proficiency and poverty tend to show academic benefits from participating in the program.
- FARMS students in Grades K, 1, 3, and 4 who attended 16 days or more of the 2003 summer ELO program had academic benefits in mathematics. In reading, academic benefits from participating in the program were limited to FARMS students in kindergarten and Grade 4. In contrast, in none of the 5 grades did non-FARMS students show academic benefit in either mathematics or reading.
- Among students receiving English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) services, academic benefits from the 2003 summer ELO program were limited to Grades K, 2, and 4 in mathematics and kindergarten and Grade 1 in reading. As with non-FARMS students, non-ESOL students did not show academic benefit in any of the 5 grades in both mathematics and reading.
- Among the ethnic groups, African American and Hispanics students in Grades 1 and 4 who attended 16 or more days of ELO posted higher academic achievement gains in both reading and mathematics, relative to those who did not attend or attended five or fewer days. In addition, Hispanic students in Grade 2 appear to benefit academically from attending 16 or more days of ELO. In reading, academic benefits from participating in the program were limited to African American students in Grade 1.
- The 2003 summer ELO program academic benefits for Asian American students are limited to students in Grades 2 and 4 in reading, and kindergarten and Grade 4 in mathematics. For white students, only those in kindergarten appear to have benefited academically in reading from participation in the summer program.

Summary of the findings at the disaggregated level are presented in Tables 1 and 2 for reading and mathematics, respectively.

Table 1
2003 Summer ELO Program - Overview of Student Achievement Results in Reading Comparing
Spring-to-Fall Gains of Full ELO Attendance Group to Non-ELO Attendance Group

Did the 2003 summer ELO program produce academic benefits to		Kinder.	Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 4
All Students		No	No	No	No	No
Ethnicity	Asian American	No	No	Yes	No	Yes
	African American	No	Yes	No	No	No
	White	Yes	No	No	No	No
	Hispanic	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Gender	Female	No	No	No	No	No
	Male	No	No	Yes	No	No
ESOL Status	Non-ESOL	No	Yes	N.A.	No	No
	ESOL	Yes	No	N.A.	No	Yes
FARMS Status	Non-FARMS	No	No	No	No	No
	FARMS	No	Yes	No	No	No
ESOL & FARMS	Not Both ESOL/FARMS	No	No	N.A.	No	No
	Both ESOL & FARMS	No	No	N.A.	No	No

Note: N.A. – Cell size too small for statistical comparison.

Table 2
2003 Summer ELO Program - Overview of Student Achievement Results in Mathematics
Comparing Spring-to-Fall Gains of Full ELO Attendance Group to Non-ELO Attendance Group

Did the 2003 summer ELO program produce academic benefits to		Kinder.	Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 4
All Students		No	No	No	No	Yes
Ethnicity	Asian American	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
	African American	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
	White	No	No	No	No	No
	Hispanic	No	No	No	No	No
Gender	Female	No	No	No	No	Yes
	Male	Yes	No	No	No	No
ESOL Status	Non-ESOL	No	No	No	No	No
	ESOL	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
FARMS Status	Non-FARMS	No	No	No	No	No
	FARMS	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
ESOL & FARMS	Not Both ESOL/FARMS	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
	Both ESOL & FARMS	No	No	No	No	No

- Student recruitment efforts and attendance strategies for the 2003 summer ELO program were largely successful, especially among families whose students are most impacted by limited English language proficiency, poverty, and students in the lower grades. Attendance rates were higher this year relative to last year's.
- Classroom teachers that taught during the 2003 summer ELO program have identical educational credentials as K through Grade 4 classroom teachers in Title I schools, but less so that all K through Grade 4 classroom teachers in MCPS.
- The 2003 summer ELO administrators (i.e., principals and assistant principals) expressed overall satisfaction with the implementation of the 2003 summer ELO program.
- Though overall satisfaction with the 2003 summer ELO program was high among administrators, satisfaction rates tend to vary by subgroup. Assistant principals and administrators who participated in the program before and during summer had lower satisfaction rates.
- 2003 summer ELO program teachers were highly satisfied with the program, though satisfaction rates vary by section areas.
- ELO teachers' satisfaction in the areas of math curriculum implementation and improvements made to the math curriculum from the 2002 summer ELO program varies by teaching experience. More experienced teachers were more satisfied with the program.
- ELO teachers expressed that the class sizes were too large during the 2003 summer ELO program, notwithstanding that class sizes during the program were still smaller than during the regular school year.
- Parents whose children attended the 2003 summer ELO program were overwhelmingly satisfied with all aspect of the program. The satisfaction rates did not vary appreciably by grade of level of their child.
- Parents of ELO students believe that the program helped their child academically and parents whose children participated in the 2003 summer ELO program would enroll their children in the program in the future and would recommend the program to other parents.
- A substantial percentage of the parents reported that they enrolled their children in the ELO program because of the availability of the afternoon program.
- The majority of parents of children who attended the ELO program in 2002 and 2003 indicated satisfaction with the improvements to the ELO program.

Recommendations

1. Review the student population that should be served by future summer ELO programs.

The evaluation findings of the 2003 summer ELO program suggest students who are the most impacted by limited English language proficiency and poverty received the most benefits from participating in the program. To ensure the program's cost-effectiveness/cost-efficiency, it is important to review existing literature of summer programs to identify those subgroups of students who will benefit most, academically, from programs similar to the MCPS summer ELO program. The summer ELO program should target these subgroups.

2. Intensify student attendance strategies.

While student attendance rates increased during the 2003 summer ELO program, ELO teachers expressed that students' tardiness and absenteeism were major problems that had a negative impact on their ability to complete daily instructional objectives. New strategies to encourage on-time student attendance should be developed for future summer ELO programs.

3. Continue to fund and seek additional funds for afternoon activities.

Parents reported that the afternoon activities in the area of arts, humanities, and recreation added value to the 2003 summer ELO program. In addition, 86% of parents whose children attended the afternoon activities stated that they needed full-day programming for their children during the summer. It is important to continue to provide afternoon activities during future summer ELO programs in order to attract parents who need full-day services. This also will help boost student attendance rates.

4. Review student class-size recommendation and enforce established class-size limit.

A review of student class assignments showed that a substantial number of classrooms had more than the recommended number of students, especially in the early grades (i.e., kindergarten through Grade 2). This finding is supported by information gathered from the ELO teacher survey. A substantial percentage of ELO teachers responding to the survey stated that the numbers of students in their classrooms were too high to meet daily instructional objectives. Reduction in class size was the most recommended change proposed by the teachers for future summer ELO programs. In this light, program planners should review the teacher-student ratio and develop a protocol to ensure that no future summer ELO classroom contains more than the recommended number of students.

5. Re-examine the ELO mathematics curriculum.

While ELO teachers noted improvements in the ELO mathematics curriculum over the 2002 program, a substantial percentage of them still expressed dissatisfaction with the curriculum. Items relating to the mathematics curriculum had the lowest satisfaction rates in the ELO teacher survey. The ELO mathematics curriculum should be re-examined to determine the sources of this dissatisfaction.

6. Review ELO assessment instruments.

Reliability and factor loading estimates reported in this report suggest that the assessment instruments from which the students' achievement outcome measures were gathered are

adequate (i.e., technically appropriate in terms of their internal consistency). This conclusion notwithstanding, it is still not known to what extent these instruments are sensitive enough to capture change in student academic achievement levels that is likely to result from a four-week program. In order to continue to use these instruments, a review and validity study of these instruments must be conducted to ensure that they produce valid and reliable measures of change in student achievement levels resulting from a four-week program.

The successful implementation of the 2003 summer ELO program and its demonstrated academic benefits to students that attended 16 days or more, especially students who are most impacted by limited English language proficiency and poverty, affirms the summer ELO program to be an effective tool to meet the policy initiatives of Our Call to Action. Effective programs aimed at the schools and students with the greatest academic need will contribute to closing the achievement gaps between those students and others. The accomplishments of the summer ELO program in its first two years of planning, recruitment, and implementation provide a framework that MCPS can build upon in future efforts. Implementation of future summer ELO programs will be enhanced with specific steps learned from the evaluation findings of the program's first two years.

INTRODUCTION

Over the past four years, the Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS) has developed and implemented a series of program initiatives with the primary objective of reducing the academic achievement gaps between children from the majority, middle-class white households and minority children, especially those from low-income households and households where English is a not the primary language. One of these program initiatives, which are collectively referred to as the Early Success Performance Plan, is the Extended Learning Opportunities (ELO) initiative.¹ The ELO initiative is composed of two parts: The ELO summer program and an extended day component during the school year. The implementation of the ELO initiative commenced in July 2002 with the 2002 summer ELO program. The evaluation on the 2003 ELO summer program is the focus of this report.

The Summer Extended Learning Opportunities (ELO) program was first implemented during the summer of 2002, and it retained its primary focus and content during the 2003 summer program period. Conceptually, the ELO program is designed to enhance instruction and student achievement in the 18 elementary schools receiving federal Title I funds (also known as Title I schools). Of the district's 121 elementary schools, the Title I schools are most affected by challenging demographics, especially high levels of students who live in poverty and with limited or no English language proficiency. See Appendix A for a list of the schools.

While the summer ELO programs as implemented during the summer of 2002 and 2003 have the same goals, there are some noteworthy programmatic changes. First, the 2002 summer ELO program was a preview program that introduced participating students to reading and mathematics concepts they would encounter in the next grade (i.e., grades they would be starting in the fall). In essence, the 2002 summer ELO was not intended to provide intensive remediation for academic skills that the students had failed to master during the school year. The 2003 summer ELO program was more global and flexible in its focus: students who ended the school year on-grade were provided with a preview of the concepts they would encounter in the following school year, while students who ended the school below-grade were provided with opportunities to review concepts they had not mastered.

The second programmatic change in the 2003 summer ELO program relative to the 2002 summer program is the population of eligible students. For the 2002 summer ELO program, only students entering kindergarten through Grade 3 in fall 2002 in Title I schools were eligible to participate in the 2002 summer ELO program. This year, students entering Grade 4 in the fall in these 18 schools were added to the program. As with last year's program, all eligible students were invited to participate, regardless of whether they ended the school year on- or below-grade.²

¹ For complete listing of the Early Success Performance Plan program initiatives and their detailed description, please see *Early Success Performance Plan: Educational Reform in the Montgomery County Public Schools* (May 2003). Rockville, MD: Montgomery County Public Schools.

² For description of the 2002 summer ELO program, see Sunmonu, K.K., Larson, J. Van Horn, Y., Cooper-Martin, E., and Nielsen, J. (2002) *Evaluation of the Extended Learning Opportunities Summer Program*. Rockville, MD: Montgomery County Public Schools.

This report presents the evaluation of the 2003 summer ELO program. Following the introduction, a full description of the program and how it was implemented in the 18 Title I schools is presented in the second section of this report. To provide the context in which student achievement was attributable to the 2003 ELO program (the primary objective of the evaluation), demographic details of the students and teachers that participated in program are presented in the third section of this report. The fourth section focuses on student academic outcomes. Sections five and six address staff and parent satisfaction with the program, respectively. A summary of the principal findings and a list of recommendations conclude the report.

THE 2003 SUMMER EXTENDED LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES (ELO) PROGRAM

The Office of Shared Accountability (OSA) conducted an evaluation of the 2002 summer ELO program in fall 2002 and released its findings in October 2002 (Sunmonu, Larson, Van Horn, Cooper-Martin, and Nielsen, 2002). In terms of student academic performance, the results of the 2002 summer ELO program evaluation show statistically significant, albeit modest, benefits in math and reading for first and second grade students, and in reading for third grade students who received the full ELO treatment.³ Accompanying these findings were recommendations that could improve the program in the future. These recommendations centered on enhancing the student recruitment and retention strategies and a revision of the mathematics curriculum.

Planning for the 2003 summer ELO program commenced immediately after the evaluation report of the 2002 summer program was made public. The ELO planning team, made up of staff from the Office of the Deputy Superintendent, the elementary mathematics and reading units of the Office of Curriculum and Instructional Programs (OCIP), Division of Academic Support, Federal and State Programs, and the Office of Shared Accountability started meeting (first monthly, then bi-weekly) in January 2003 to plan the 2003 summer ELO program. The team reviewed all aspects of the 2002 program and the evaluation findings and proposed modifications for the 2003 summer ELO program. Modifications to the program for summer 2003 that were approved are detailed in the sections below.

The 2003 summer ELO program was designed to provide additional instruction in reading and language arts and mathematics to entering-kindergarten through Grade 4 students in schools with the highest concentration of children participating in the Free and Reduced-price Meals System (FARMS) and English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) services. While the overall mission of the program has remained the same as it was last year, there is a major shift in the objective of the “additional instruction” being provided. Whereas the objective of last year’s program was primarily to accelerate learning by previewing concepts and skills to be taught in the grade students will enter in the fall, this year’s program is directed at meeting the specific needs of each student. For students at or above grade level at the end of the 2002–03 school year, the “additional instruction” is to be used to strengthen skills already acquired and to accelerate learning by previewing concepts and skills to be taught in the grade students will enter in the fall. On the other hand, for students who ended the 2002–03 school year below grade level, the “additional instruction” is to be used to catch up on grade-level concepts and skills. Specifically, the 2003 summer ELO program seeks to do the following:

- Meet the academic needs of each student by either providing opportunity to catch up on grade-level concepts and skills or to accelerate learning by previewing concepts and skills to be taught in the grade students will enter in the fall
- Strengthen basic skills that are the preconditions of later learning

³ It was not possible to access the academic benefits of the 2002 summer ELO program to kindergarten students and to third grade students in reading, because of lack of complete data. Pretest data were not available for kindergarten students while posttest reading data were not available for third grade students.

- Alleviate the achievement loss that some students may experience over the summer months
- Provide continuing English language instruction for speakers of other languages.

Program Structure

The 2003 summer ELO program consisted of four hours of academic instruction each morning and two to four hours of arts and recreational activities in the afternoon over a four-week period, starting on July 7 through August 1, 2002. The duration of the daily instruction component of the program was a minimum of three hours. The instructional period included a reading and language arts block of 1 hour 20 minutes; a writing block of 40 minutes; and mathematics for 1 hour. The student-teacher ratio was, on the average, 22.8 to 1, but varied by grade (kindergarten, 15:1; Grades 1 and 2, 17:1; and Grade 3 and 4, 25:1). All students received breakfast (during the first 30 minutes of the day) and lunch (at the end of the morning instruction period) at no cost. In addition, transportation to and from the program sites was provided.

After the morning instructional period, participating students had the option of participating in the afterschool arts and recreation activities. At 10 of the 2003 summer ELO sites, these arts and recreation activities were paid for with a 21st Century grant from the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE). In the remaining eight sites, parents paid for the afternoon component on a sliding fee scale. The Montgomery County Recreation Department and/or the Collaboration Council sponsored the arts and recreation activities at the eight sites not funded by 21st Century grant.

Curriculum and Assessments

The 2003 summer ELO program curriculum is connected directly to the MCPS core curriculum, in that it is based on the district's existing reading/language arts and mathematics curriculum frameworks and performance indicators. The 2003 summer ELO program curricula were both grade and content area-specific. Each of the mathematics curricula focused on "place value and number sense" concepts. "Place value and number sense" concepts were chosen as the focus of all 2003 summer program mathematics curricula because they constitute the fundamentals of mathematics and, by mastering them, students develop the capacity for higher-level mathematical reasoning. Contentwise, each grade's mathematics curriculum spans two grades; the grade the students just completed in spring and the grade they will be starting in fall. A specific mathematics lesson was written for each day of the ELO summer program. Each day's lesson includes a warm-up (5 minutes), focus lesson (25 minutes), independent practice (25 minutes), and closure (5 minutes). What students are taught and how they are taught was based on the specific skills students need. Before the start of the program, ELO summer teachers had the opportunity (during the ELO teacher training and the ELO teacher planning day) to review their respective students' academic performance levels. ELO teachers were provided with class reports containing each student's performance on the pretest assessments and end-of-year results and were instructed on how to use this information to guide their instruction. See Staffing and Training section, page 15.

The reading curriculum focused on development of foundational skills, reading for literary experience, and writing for personal experience. As with the mathematics curriculum, the Office of Curriculum and Instructional Programs (OCIP) provided model lessons (one lesson for each day of the program) focusing on each curriculum objective to the ELO teachers. Each reading/language arts lesson has a reading and a writing block. The reading block, an 80-minute period, is divided into three sub-blocks: shared reading; read aloud; and guided reading/phonics/word study/centers. The length of time recommended for each sub-block varies from one lesson to another. The writing block is 40 minutes long and is used for writers' workshop. Teachers were given specific strategies (see Staffing and Training section, page 15) on how to use the summer curriculum to achieve the program goals of reviewing/previewing essential knowledge and skills and preventing summer loss in reading.

Students in Grades 1 through 4 were assessed twice, a pretest and a posttest, in spring and fall in mathematics and reading/language arts. Kindergarten students, on the other hand, were assessed only once, in the fall, in both mathematics and language arts. These assessments are essentially diagnostic and their primary purpose is to provide teachers with information to guide instruction in the summer and fall. Student data from the pretest assessments were used to guide instruction during the summer ELO program, while the posttest assessment data informs the fall teachers where each student is at the beginning of the fall quarter. For technical issues, such as reliability, relating to the assessment instruments, please see the Outcome Measures sub-section of the ELO Students Academic Achievement section.

Student Recruitment

Students from the 18 Title I schools entering kindergarten through Grade 4 were eligible to participate in the 2003 summer ELO program. Current students, as well as new students entering kindergarten through Grade 4 in August 2003, were actively recruited. The entering-kindergarten students were identified in conjunction with Head Start, the Extended Elementary Education Program (EEEP), and the kindergarten orientation. Each school was responsible for recruiting students and in January 2003, principals started to include general information about the program in their regular newsletters to parents.

Active student recruitment started in February 2003, when a packet of community outreach materials detailing the summer ELO program was sent to all participating schools. The materials included a poster, an announcement of the program, and an information brochure. Among other things, these informational materials addressed issues such as services to be provided during the summer program and how to register for the program. Upon receiving the recruitment/information packages, the schools sent the brochure and registration form home with the students. These same materials were distributed to parents attending the New Student Orientation in each of the participating schools and at kindergarten orientation. Recruitment efforts extended to televised announcements about the program. Announcements describing the ELO program were continually broadcasted on the MCPS cable channel. A special television segment that presented information about the program in five languages was also broadcast on the channel.

ELO registration was tracked using a specially designed Web-based application. Each school had a paid staff member designated to track ELO registration and to follow up with parents whose children had not registered. Follow-up with parents was undertaken via parent conversations at conferences, by telephone, and/or during school activities. Additional sets of informational/recruitment materials were sent home with the students, as needed. MCPS central office staff, particularly staff from the Division of Academic Support, Federal and State Programs, provided assistance to the schools to ensure that as many students as possible were recruited.

Staffing and Training

Recruitment of ELO teachers and other support staff commenced in February 2003. While the application process to fill these positions was competitive (i.e., open to all staff), administrators in each participating school made special effort to attract staff within their respective schools. By getting more teachers and support staff to work in their respective schools during the summer, ELO teachers become informed of the skills and academic needs of the students they will be teaching in the fall, while the students are familiarized with the expectations of their teachers. Staffing of the positions at each school was based on student enrollment: an average of 22.8 students to a classroom teacher; 100 students to an instructional aide (with a maximum of 3 allowed in each school). Other instructional supports, including ESOL teachers, media specialist, and special education resource teachers, were provided. An assistant principal managed most of the 2003 summer ELO program sites.

In preparation for the 2003 summer ELO program, ELO teachers and teaching support personnel were provided with an eight-hour professional development session. This professional development session focused on (a) understanding the content and structure of the summer ELO reading and mathematics curricula; (b) instructional planning and strategies to meet the review/preview goal of the program; and (c) monitoring what students know and/or students' progress. Also discussed during the professional development session were specific topics such as instruction of ESOL students and the effective use of volunteers.

In addition to the one-day professional development session, ELO teachers were allotted one day for instructional planning, just before the commencement of the program. During this instructional planning session, teachers had the opportunity to review pretest data of the students they would be teaching during the ELO program. Academic support instructional specialists, who facilitated these sessions at each school, helped teachers to understand the pretest data and what conclusions can be drawn from the data for each student and the class as a whole. Thereafter, teachers then brainstormed among themselves on alternate strategies to address the specific needs of the students in their class.

STUDENT AND TEACHER PARTICIPATION IN THE 2003 SUMMER ELO PROGRAM

Student Registration

Of the 7,186 students who were determined to be eligible⁴ for the 2003 summer ELO program, 5,406 students (or approximately 75%) registered to participate in the program. The overall percentage of eligible students who were successfully recruited for the 2003 summer ELO program was slightly higher (two percentage points) than last year's. Among kindergarten through Grade 3 students (the group served last year), the recruitment success rate for the 2003 summer ELO program was 77%. This is four percentage points higher than last year's success rate. In summary, it appears that changes in recruitment strategies and the additional efforts expended this year were effective in attracting more families to want to participate in the summer ELO program.

Table 1 shows the breakdown of the registering and nonregistering students by selected demographic characteristics (ethnicity, gender, and participation in ESOL, FARMS, and special education), and grade levels. As the data reported in this table show, recruitment efforts for the 2003 summer ELO program were more successful among families whose students are most challenged academically. Whereas 76% and 78% of eligible African American and Hispanic students registered for the program, respectively, only 56% of white students registered. Similarly, while 85% of students receiving ESOL services and 80% of those participating in FARMS registered for the 2003 summer ELO program, only 67% of the non-FARMS group did so. When recruitment rates are compared across grades, we notice they decrease progressively the higher the grade level, from 87% among kindergarten students to 67% among Grade 4 students. The registration rates did not differ significantly by gender or special education status. The registration rates reported for the various socio-demographic groups in Table 1 mirror those reported last year.

Student Attendance

Of the 5,406 eligible students who registered to participate in the 2003 summer ELO program, 550, or approximately 10%, did not attend any ELO session. There were some slight differences in the rate of "no-shows" by grade and demographic grouping. The no-show rates were higher for Grade 4 (11%), African Americans (12%), and FARMS-only (12%) students. Demographic groups with the lowest no-show rates were kindergarten, whites, and ESOL/FARMS students, all of which had about 9% no-shows. Of the remaining 4,856 students who attended the 2003 summer ELO program, attendance varied from the minimum of one day to the maximum of 20 days, with an average of 16.3 days.

⁴ The number of eligible students in made up of returning students (i.e., students enrolled in the 18 participating schools in spring 2003 and returning for the fall 2003 quarter) in ELO grades and new students who, by June 2003, had indicated their intent to enroll in one of these schools and subsequently enrolled in August 2003.

Table 1. 2003 Summer ELO Registration Rates Among Eligible Students, by Demographic Groups

		Registered		Unregistered		Total Eligible
Grade Level	Kindergarten	1,045	87%	161	13%	1,206
	Grade 1	1,214	78%	349	22%	1,563
	Grade 2	1,162	76%	376	24%	1,538
	Grade 3	1,067	71%	433	29%	1,500
	Grade 4	918	67%	461	33%	1,379
Ethnicity	American Indian	18	67%	9	33%	27
	Asian American	536	78%	153	22%	689
	African American	1,436	76%	453	24%	1,889
	White	506	56%	403	44%	909
	Hispanic	2,910	79%	762	21%	3,672
Gender	Female	2,588	75%	858	25%	3,446
	Male	2,818	75%	922	25%	3,740
ESOL Status	Non-ESOL	3,659	71%	1,480	29%	5,139
	ESOL	1,746	85%	300	15%	2,046
FARMS Status	Non-FARMS	1,806	68%	854	32%	2,660
	FARMS	3,599	80%	926	20%	4,525
ESOL & FARMS	Not Both ESOL/FARMS	3,190	75%	1,087	25%	4,277
	Both ESOL & FARMS	2,216	76%	693	24%	2,909
Special Education	No	4,825	75%	1,584	25%	6,409
	Yes (IEP)	551	74%	196	26%	747
TOTAL		5,406	75%	1,780	25%	7,186

Note: The distribution reported here for current FARMS/ESOL and special education status are for students for which relevant data are available. Data on FARMS/ESOL status is missing for a student, while 30 students are missing data on special education status.

Though an average attendance of 16.3 days in a 20-day voluntary, half-day summer program is commendable, there was an appreciable number of students who attended less than the 16 days minimum for which the program was found effective last year (Sunmonu, Larson, Van Horn, Cooper-Martin, & Nielson, 2002). Table 2 shows the summary attendance data for all students who attended at least a day of the 2003 summer ELO program by selected demographic characteristics and grade levels. As indicated in Table 2, 73% of all registered students attended for 16–20 days, 16% attended 11–15 days, 5% attended 6–10 days, and the remaining 6%

attended five or fewer days. There were no appreciable differences in the attendance rates by grade, gender, and special education status. On the other hand, the attendance rates vary noticeably by ethnicity and FARMS/ESOL status. Among white and American Indian students, only 63% and 67% attended 16 or more days of ELO, respectively. These percentages are noticeably less than the 78% of Asian American students that attended 16 or more days of ELO. Among FARMS/ESOL groups, students participating in FARMS and receiving ESOL services (both ESOL and FARMS) had the lowest rate of attending 16 or more days of ELO, with 70%. On the other hand, 76% of ESOL students attended 16 or more days.

Table 2. ELO Summer Program Attendance Rates for Students with at Least One Day of Attendance, by Demographic Characteristics

		Attendance Rates								Total
		1–5 Days		6–10 Days		11–15 Days		16–20 Days		
Grade Level	Kindergarten	67	7%	47	5%	152	16%	683	72%	949
	Grade 1	55	5%	61	6%	210	19%	770	70%	1,096
	Grade 2	66	6%	59	6%	148	14%	772	74%	1,045
	Grade 3	57	6%	46	5%	144	15%	706	74%	953
	Grade 4	67	8%	44	5%	109	13%	593	73%	813
Ethnicity	American Indian	1	7%	1	7%	3	20%	10	67%	15
	Asian American	22	5%	22	5%	64	13%	374	78%	482
	African American	85	7%	54	4%	181	14%	946	75%	1,266
	White	36	8%	42	9%	91	20%	290	63%	459
	Hispanic	168	6%	138	5%	424	16%	1,904	72%	2,634
Gender	Female	156	7%	135	6%	353	15%	1,677	72%	2,321
	Male	156	6%	122	5%	410	16%	1,847	73%	2,535
ESOL Status	Non-ESOL	216	7%	195	6%	541	17%	2,300	71%	3,252
	ESOL	96	6%	62	4%	222	14%	1,223	76%	1,603
FARMS Status	Non-FARMS	99	6%	99	6%	246	15%	1,186	73%	1,163
	FARMS	213	7%	158	5%	517	16%	2,337	72%	3,225
ESOL & FARMS	Not Both ESOL/FARMS	179	6%	143	5%	431	15%	2,141	74%	2,894
	Both ESOL & FARMS	133	7%	114	6%	332	17%	1,383	70%	1,962
Special Education	No	272	6%	223	5%	684	16%	3,155	73%	4,334
	Yes (IEP)	38	8%	32	6%	74	15%	358	71%	502
Total		312	6%	257	5%	763	16%	3,524	73%	4,856

Relative to the 2002 summer ELO program, this year's attendance rates were higher among students who showed up for at least one day or better. During the 2002 summer program only

66% of students who showed up attended 16–20 days of the program. This is 7 percentage points lower than this year’s rate. In summary, it appears that the student retention strategies implemented for the current program year were successful.

ELO Summer Teachers

A total of 265 teachers participated in the 2003 summer ELO program as classroom teachers. Data on teaching experience, highest educational level, and certification of these teachers and their peers in Title 1 schools and districtwide are summarized in Table 3. Collectively, the mean total years of teaching of these 265 teachers is a little less than 8 years, of which approximately 6 years are with MCPS. Educationally, the highest degree obtained by the ELO teachers is a master’s degree. Of the 259 ELO teachers for whom certification data are available, 86 (approximately 33%) are certified in early childhood education, while 185 (67%) have elementary education certification (see Table 3).

As the data presented in Table 3 indicate, the 2003 summer ELO teachers are virtually identical to their peers in the district’s 18 Title I schools in total teaching experience (7.97 years for ELO teachers v. 8.24 years for Title 1 teachers), teaching experience with MCPS (5.91 years v. 5.84 years), highest education level (master’s degree for both groups), and number of certifications (2.08 v. 2.04) (see Table 3). The only statistically significant difference between ELO teachers and their peers in Title 1 schools is the proportions that have elementary education certification. Whereas approximately 67% of ELO teachers are certified in elementary education, 72% of all kindergarten through Grade 4 teachers in Title 1 schools have this certification. These data suggest that the objective of employing teachers for ELO with skills and experience identical to those in the 18 Title 1 schools was largely met.

However, data in Table 3 also show that 2003 summer ELO teachers have somewhat lower levels of teaching experience, advanced education credentials, and early childhood certification than do all teachers in kindergarten through Grade 4 in MCPS. For example, the mean average total teaching experience of 10.6 years for all kindergarten through Grade 4 teachers is about 2.5 years more than that of ELO teachers. This difference is statistically significant ($t = 13.92$ at $p < 0.001$). Similarly, MCPS teachers in kindergarten through Grade 4 have higher mean years of teaching within MCPS (8.24 years for all K-4 teachers in MCPS compared with 5.91 years for ELO teachers). A relatively higher percentage of all MCPS K–4 teachers have advanced degrees and are certified in early childhood and elementary education. All these differences are statistically significant at probability less than 0.001. The only area in which ELO teachers outperform their districtwide peers is the mean number of certifications. Whereas ELO teachers have a mean of more than 2 certifications, all K–4 teachers in MCPS have a mean of 1.89, with the difference being statistically significant ($t = -9.1$, $p < 0.001$) (see Table 3).

Table 3. Comparison of Teacher Characteristics Among Those Who Taught in ELO, in Title 1 Schools, and in MCPS in Grades K–4

	ELO Teachers (N=265)	All Title 1 Schools K–4 Teachers (N=418)	All MCPS K–4 Teachers (N=2,459)	ELO Teachers v. Title 1 Teachers		ELO Teachers v. All MCPS Teachers	
				t-Score	Prob.	t-Score	Prob.
Total Teaching Experience							
Mean	7.97	8.24	10.60	0.66	0.51	13.92	0.001
0–5 Years	61.6%	54.7%	43.5%				
6–10 Years	16.3%	18.6%	19.5%				
11–15 Years	5.8%	8.4%	11.1%				
16 or More Years	16.3%	18.3%	25.9%				
MCPS Teaching Experience							
Mean	5.91	5.84	8.24	-0.21	0.83	13.96	0.001
1–5 Years	77.7%	73.4%	58.6%				
6–10 Years	7.8%	8.7%	12.7%				
11–15 Years	4.7%	8.2%	10.5%				
16 or More Years	10.1%	9.7%	18.2%				
Highest Educational Level							
Mean (BS=1, MS=2, MS+ 30 Cr=3, MS+ 60 Cr=4, and PhD=5)	1.83	1.81	1.94	-0.53	0.60	6.45	0.001
Bachelors Degree	39.4%	40.9%	32.9%				
Master’s Degree	42.9%	41.4%	44.8%				
Master’s Degree + 30 Cr. Hrs	12.7%	13.9%	17.9%				
Master’s Degree + 60 Cr. Hrs	5.0%	3.6%	4.4%				
Doctorate Degree	0%	0.2%	0%				
Total Number of Certifications							
Mean	2.08	2.04	1.89	-0.70	0.49	-9.10	0.001
1–2	69.9%	68.8%	76.0%				
3–4	27.4%	29.2%	21.7%				
Above 4	2.7%	1.9%	2.3%				
Type of Education Certification							
Early Childhood Education Certification	33.2%	34.8%	35.8%	0.76	0.45	2.92	0.001
Elementary Education Certification	66.8%	71.7%	71.5%	2.14	0.03	4.90	0.001

Table 4 shows the percentage of 2003 summer ELO teachers who taught in the school and grade they normally teach during the regular school year. As indicated, 70% of 2003 summer ELO teachers taught in the same school and 55% taught the same grade as their regular school-year assignment. These percentages are slightly higher than the corresponding percentages attained during the 2002 summer ELO program. These data suggest not only that the objective of employing teachers from within their schools and for their regular grades was largely achieved, but that the additional efforts put forth towards attaining these objective were effective.

Table 4. 2003 Summer ELO Teachers: ELO Assignment v. Regular School-Year Assignment

	<i>N</i>	Percentage
Same School, Same Grade	116	43.8
Same School, Different Grade	70	26.4
Different School, Same Grade	30	11.3
Different School, Different Grade	49	18.5

2003 SUMMER ELO STUDENT ACADEMIC OUTCOMES

This section presents the results of the impact of the 2003 summer ELO program on student academic performance. Specifically, the evaluation of the program's impact on student academic performance tries to answer the following three questions:

- Did the 2003 summer ELO program produce overall academic benefits in reading/language arts and mathematics?
- Did these academic benefits differ by racial/ethnic group?
- Did these academic benefits differ by ESOL/FARMS groups?

As a preface to the results, it is important to describe the method used in the academic outcome evaluation. The following discussion summarizes the samples of students, the measures, and the analyses used to reach conclusions about the academic outcomes of the 2003 summer ELO program.

Method

Samples of Students

Although the ELO program served students entering kindergarten through Grade 4 in fall 2002, not all of these students were included in the evaluation of academic outcomes. For Grades 1 through 4, all students with complete ELO attendance data and valid pretest and posttest scores, with the exception of those that are classified as American Indians, were included. The number of American Indian students who participated in the 2003 summer ELO program was too small to allow for reliable results. Only 15 American Indian students participated in the program (see Table 2). By not including this group of students in the analyses, it was possible to attain a higher level of statistical and inferential rigor and achieve a compromise of clarity and simplicity in the presentation of results.

Based on the inclusion criteria discussed in the preceding paragraph, the number of Grades 1 through 4 students included in the analyses ranged from 857 (55% of the eligible students) for Grade 1 students in reading/language arts to 1,265 (82% of the eligible students) in Grade 2 in mathematics. See Table 5 for details of the sample sizes for Grades 1 through 4 by content area.

To identify the kindergarten students to be included in the analyses, first all kindergarten students were divided into homogeneous groups based on their ethnicity, gender, ESOL status, and FARMS status. This process yielded 49 ethnicity-gender-ESOL-FARMS groups varying in size from 1 to 187 students. Then each group was divided further into three subgroups based on attendance in the 2003 summer ELO program. The three subgroups are (a) students who did not attend ELO or attended five or fewer days; (b) students who attended 6 to 16 days of ELO; and (c) students who attended 16 days or more of ELO. Within each ethnicity-gender-ESOL-FARMS group, an equal number of students who attended 16 or more days of ELO (i.e., subgroup (a)) and those that did not attend or attended five or fewer days (subgroup (c)) were selected randomly. This sampling procedure is identical to the matched pair strategy with the randomly selected students who attended 16 or more days of ELO as the treatment group and their counterparts who did not attend or attended five or fewer days of ELO as the comparison

group. Students with 6 to 15 days of ELO from the selection process were excluded because they are very few (183 or 12%), and including them in the matching process would have produced a substantial reduction in the sample size.

Table 5. Sample Sizes for Grades 1 through 4

Grade	Eligible Students	Sample			
		Reading/Lang. Arts		Mathematics	
		<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
Grade 1	1,563	858	55	1,102	71
Grade 2	1,538	917	60	1,265	82
Grade 3	1,500	1,231	82	1,229	82
Grade 4	1,379	1,080	78	1,066	77

The grouping and selection process described in the preceding paragraph yielded 1,074 kindergarten students. The same inclusion criterion used for Grade 1 through 4 students was then applied to the 1,074 kindergarten students to yield kindergarten student samples of 965 (90% of eligible students) and 784 (73% of eligible students) for reading/language arts and mathematics, respectively.

Outcome Measures.

Two sets of outcome measures were used in this evaluation. The first set, used for Grades 1 through 4, is based on the gain in students’ scores on the pretest and posttest assessments. The second set of outcome measures, those used for kindergarten students’ outcome, are scores on the posttest assessments. Kindergarten students did not have pretest scores because it would have been difficult to assess them before since a substantial number of them have never received formal schooling. The assessment data on which these outcome measures were based were collected using the following three instruments:

- a. The Montgomery County Public Schools Assessment Program Primary Reading (MCPS AP-PR)
- b. *Test Ready PLUS*
- c. A mathematics instrument specifically designed for the 2003 summer ELO program.

The MCPS Assessment Program Primary Reading (MCPS AP-PR)—Data from the spring and fall 2003 assessments of this instrument were used to assess the reading performance of ELO students in Grades 1 and 2. For kindergarten students, only the fall 2003 assessment data were used. Two levels of reading development are assessed with this instrument—foundational reading skills and text-reading proficiency. The foundational skills component is used mainly to assess reading readiness in kindergarten and, thus, it is used only for analyzing ELO’s impact on kindergarten reading. The foundational reading skills component assesses six skills necessary for a student to become a strong reader—letter knowledge, print concepts, oral language, phonemic awareness, phonics, and reading vocabulary. Letter knowledge (the ability to identify alphabetic

symbols) is assessed based on students' ability to name upper-and lowercase letters or to identify a letter's sound with the Letter Identification assessment. Print concepts (the ability to demonstrate book-handling skills and print-awareness concepts) is assessed based on students' understanding of how printed language works in books (e.g., directional movement, one-to-one matching, and book conventions such as the front and back of the book) with the Concepts About Print assessment. Oral language (the ability to speak clearly and use a wide variety of words to convey ideas effectively) is assessed based on students' control of oral language and grammatical structures, with the Record of Oral Language assessment. Phonemic awareness, the ability to hear the distinct sounds in spoken words, is assessed based on students' ability to manipulate and understand sounds (e.g., beginning sounds and rhyming) with the Phonemic Awareness assessment. Phonics (the ability to use knowledge of letter/sound relationships to decode and write words) is assessed based on students' ability to associate and write letters for sounds heard in words in a dictated sentence with the Hearing and Recording Sounds assessment. Finally, reading vocabulary, the ability to accumulate a reading vocabulary or the words that readers and writers use most often, is assessed based on students' ability to read basic sight words by the Word Recognition lists. Students are scored a 1 for each foundational skill in which they meet the district's benchmark and a 0 otherwise. Thus, students' scores on the foundational skills range from 0 to 6.

The text-reading proficiency of the MCPS AP-PR instrument was used to assess the performance of students in Grades 1 and 2. Teachers administered the text-reading proficiency component individually to students. The teacher first selected a book at an appropriate level of difficulty and then asked the student to read it aloud. Errors in word recognition were recorded as the student read. If word recognition accuracy was less than 90%, the teacher selected a lower level text and repeated the procedure until the 90% criterion was met. There were 14 titles for all grade levels from kindergarten to Grade 2. With the assistance of seven Reading Recovery[®] teachers, the reading level of each title was identified to approximate the Reading Recovery[®] levels, and book-difficulty levels also were matched to the Fountas and Pinnell levels (Fountas & Pinnell, 1996). In the current study, the text-reading level variable equals the Reading Recovery[®] level for levels 2–16. Higher-level books, represented as J through P in the Fountas and Pinnell system, were set to reading levels 18 for level J, 20 for level K, 28 for Level M, 32 for Level N, and 40 for level P. Students who could not read a text received a text-reading level equal to 0. Thus, student reading/language arts achievement ranges from 0 to 40.

The pretest-posttest correlation of the text-reading levels was 0.89 and 0.91 for Grades 1 and 2, respectively. These results indicate that the text-reading assessments were adequate for use in the evaluation study of the ELO program. Additionally, there is evidence from a prior study of reliability and concurrent validity for the running record assessment used to assign text-reading levels (Raber, 2000). Details of administration of the reading assessments can be found in Nielsen & Cooper-Martin (2002).

Test Ready PLUS—Students in Grades 3 and 4 were assessed using the Test Ready PLUS instrument developed by Curriculum Associates, Inc. The Test Ready PLUS instrument is selected response (SR) in format and assesses vocabulary, comprehension, and structural analysis of English language. In addition, it assesses the main purposes for reading and reading

strategies/processes covered in the 2003 summer ELO program curriculum.⁵ The third grade Test Ready PLUS instrument has 15 items while there are 20 items in the fourth grade instrument. The Grade 3 instrument had reliability coefficients (an index of reliability or the homogeneity of the test items) of 0.75 and 0.78 for the pretest and posttest, respectively. The pretest-posttest correlation was 0.60. The Grade 4 test had a reliability coefficient of 0.82 on the pretest and 0.76 on the posttest, and the pretest-posttest correlation was 0.65. The Test Ready PLUS instruments also were assessed using principal component analysis. In three of the Test Ready PLUS instruments (Grade 3 pretest and posttest and Grade 4 pretest), all items had positive loadings of the first factor extracted. For Grade 4 posttest, one item (item 13) had a negative loading of 0.06 on the first factor extracted. The variance accounted for by the first factor of each instrument ranged from 20% to 25%. These results indicate that the *Test Ready PLUS* instruments demonstrated adequate reliability for use in the evaluation study of the ELO program. Student achievement is based on a summative score of all the items in each assessment.

Mathematics Assessment Instruments—MCPS staff developed the mathematics assessments specifically for the 2003 summer ELO program. For each grade, the assessments covered the concept of place value and number sense and computation. There are two sections to the mathematics assessment—a review subtest and a preview subtest. Review items cover concepts from the grade that ended in spring, while preview items cover concepts that will be taught starting in fall. For kindergarten through Grade 2, teachers were to give assessments individually and read each question from the assessment sheet to the students. For Grades 3 and 4, assessments could be given in small groups or to the whole class; these students either read the questions or had the teacher read them. The items in the mathematics assessment instruments range from 16 to 28. All items in the Grade 1 through 4 mathematics assessment instruments were selected response (SR), while the kindergarten instrument was made up of selected response and performance task items. For each item, the student received a score of 1, if the answer was correct, or 0, if the answer was incorrect or missing. Student achievement for the 2003 summer ELO program is based on the summative score on the review subtest of the instruments.

The number of items in the review subtests of the mathematics instruments that are used in this evaluation ranged from 8 (for the kindergarten assessment) to 19 (for Grade 3 assessment), with reliability coefficients ranging from 0.65 (for Grade 1 posttest assessment) to 0.84 (for Grade 3 pretest assessment). The pretest-posttest correlations for Grades 1 through 4 ranged from 0.40 to 0.67 (see Table 6 for details). Principal component analyses of the mathematics instruments show that all items within a given instrument loaded positively on the first factor extracted. The percentage of variance accounted for by each extracted factor ranged from 25% (for Grade 3 posttest) to 47% (for kindergarten posttest) (see Table 6). Both reliability and principal component analyses suggest that the mathematics instruments are reliably adequate for use in the evaluation of the 2003 summer ELO program.

⁵ The district has adopted the Test Ready PLUS instrument for systemwide assessment in reading/language arts for students in Grades 3 through 5, starting in fall 2003. Use of the instrument is being phased in over three years, with the implementation in Grade 3 during the 2003–04 school year. Please see Curriculum Associates, Inc. Web site for additional information on the Test Ready PLUS instrument.

Table 6. Reliability Analyses of the Review Subtests of 2003 Summer ELO Program Mathematics Instruments

Grade	# of Review Items	Reliability Coefficient		Pretest-Posttest Correlation	PCA—% Variance By First Factor Extracted	
		Pretest	Posttest		Pretest	Posttest
Kindergarten	8	n.a.	0.82	n.a.	n.a.	47
Grade 1	9	0.73	0.65	0.40	35	28
Grade 2	15	0.83	0.81	0.63	30	28
Grade 3	19	0.84	0.82	0.63	26	25
Grade 4	13	0.83	0.82	0.67	33	32

n.a.-not available

Statistical Analyses.

The statistical analytical method used in this evaluation is analysis of covariance (ANCOVA). In each of the ANCOVA analyses, the 10 grade content-area-specific outcomes measures summarized above served as the dependent variables. The primary independent variable in these analyses is the level of participation in the 2003 summer ELO program. For the purpose of this evaluation, three levels of ELO participation were established. These levels are non-ELO, partial ELO, and full ELO. Students who did not attend the 2003 summer ELO program or attended five or fewer days are classified as having received no ELO treatment; thus, non-ELO. Partial ELO included students with 6 to 15 days of ELO attendance and full ELO included students with 16 or more days of ELO attendance.

In addition to the level of ELO participation, other variables capturing race/ethnicity, gender, and level of socioeconomic/educational need that have been shown to be associated with differences in student academic performance also were included in the ANCOVA models as independent variables to control statistically for any extraneous effects on achievement scores. Race/ethnicity is a four-level categorical variable—whites, Asian American, African American, and Hispanic. Socioeconomic/educational need was captured by three two-level categorical variables—ESOL, FARMS, and both ESOL & FARMS. ESOL is defined by those who receive English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) services or do not receive those services (non-ESOL). The FARMS variable is defined by students who participate in the Free and Reduced-price Meals System (FARMS) and those who do not participate (non-FARMS). Students who receive ESOL services and participate in FARMS are Both ESOL/FARMS. For all Grades 1 through 4 analyses, pretest scores were included in the ANCOVA analyses as covariates.

The ANCOVA model resulting from the specification above produced four main effects and one covariate in the design. In addition, interaction terms were included in the design to examine the extent to which academic gains resulting from participation in the 2003 summer ELO program vary by students' gender, racial/ethnic groups, or socioeconomic/educational needs. In running the ANCOVA, METHOD=SSTYPE(1) (i.e., Type I sum-of-squares method) in SPSS GLM was used. Using this method, also known as the hierarchical decomposition of the sum-of-squares,

the independent variables were entered in the order specified in SPSS GLM DESIGN subcommand and each term is adjusted only for the terms that precede it. Use of the Type I sum-of-squares method was precipitated on the need to adjust for unequal cell sizes (which is the situation in these analyses) and to ensure that level of participation in the 2003 summer ELO program (whose impact on academic achievement is the object of this outcome evaluation) is the term entered first in the analyses. Entering the ELO participation level first ensures that its main effects are not attenuated by other variables in the design. For each analysis, the order of entry was specified as follows: pretest score (the covariate), level of participation in the 2003 ELO program, level of socioeconomic/educational need, race/ethnicity, and gender.

The ANCOVA analyses performed yielded adjusted group means on the outcome measures (pretest-posttest change in academic performance for Grades 1 through 4 and posttest score for kindergarten) and assessed the extent to which these adjusted group means differ from each other. While a statistically significant difference between any two adjusted group means inform to what extent these groups differ on their pretest-posttest gain, it does not inform on the educational significance of such difference. In order to determine the educational significance of any difference in adjusted group means, we calculated the effect size of each difference in adjusted group means. While opinions vary on an acceptable effect size for program relevancy, a consensus is developing within the education research field that an effect size of 0.20 is adequate for educational programs (Datnow, Borman, Stringfield, Overman, and Castellano, 2003). Consistent with the developing consensus, we have assumed an effect size of 0.20 or greater to be educationally significant. Effect sizes are calculated by dividing the difference in adjusted group means by the pooled standard deviation.

Academic benefits from the 2003 summer ELO program are determined by comparing the adjusted means of full-ELO and non-ELO students on the outcome measures. In a situation where the adjusted mean of full-ELO students on an outcome measure is greater than that of a similar group of students who did not attend the program or attended five or fewer days (i.e., the non-ELO students), and the difference is statistically and/or educationally significant; we conclude that the 2003 summer ELO program has an academic benefit for that group of students on the reference outcome measure.

The ANCOVA analyses conducted were grade-and content-area-specific. As such, the results of the analyses are presented below by grade level.

Results

Kindergarten

Table 7 shows the results of the main effects of the ANCOVA analyses for the impact of the 2003 summer ELO on kindergarten reading/language arts (as measured by number of foundational skills mastered) and mathematics (as measured by place value and number sense). As indicated in Table 7, the main effect of level of ELO participation was not statistically significant for reading, $F(1,964) = 1.21, p < .272$, but was statistically significant for mathematics, $F(1,783) = 10.40, p < .001$. Of the four remaining main effects in our ANCOVA designs, receiving ESOL services, participating in FARMS, and race/ethnicity were statistically

significant in both reading and mathematics. Participating in FARMS and receiving ESOL services were statistically significant for reading, but not for mathematics. Gender was found to be statistically significant for neither reading nor mathematics. Furthermore, none of the interaction effects were statistically significant. SPSS GLM's full parameterization of the ANCOVA design indicates that, all other things being equal, the adjusted mathematics posttest scores of kindergarten students who did not attend the 2003 summer ELO or attended five or fewer days, were on the average approximately 9 percentage points lower. This lower adjusted mean posttest score is statistically significant at $t = -2.37, p < .018$. See Appendix B for details of the analyses.

Table 7. Summary of Kindergarten ANCOVA Analyses

Source	Reading/Language Arts (Foundational Skills)					Mathematics (Place Value & Number sense)				
	Type I SS	df	MS	F	Prob.	Type I SS	df	MS	F	Prob.
ELO	2.2	1	2.2	1.21	.272	6367.5	1	6367.5	10.40	.001
ESOL	600.8	1	600.8	331.65	.000	49858.5	1	49858.5	81.43	.000
FARMS	118.9	1	118.9	65.64	.000	10698.8	1	10698.8	17.47	.000
ESOL/FARMS	40.0	1	40.0	22.07	.000	1161.3	1	1161.3	1.90	.169
Race/Ethnicity	58.6	3	19.5	10.78	.000	11102.1	3	3700.7	6.04	.023
Gender	5.1	1	5.1	2.82	.093	383.9	1	383.9	0.63	.429
ELO*ESOL	0.4	1	0.4	0.25	.620	1555.7	1	1555.7	2.54	.111
ELO*FARMS	0.1	1	0.1	0.07	.790	72.4	1	72.4	0.12	.731
ELO*ESOL/FARMS	1.0	1	1.0	0.56	.456	142.2	1	142.2	0.23	.630
ELO*Race	6.5	3	2.2	1.20	.309	394.0	3	131.3	0.21	.886
ELO*Gender	2.1	1	2.1	1.18	.277	59.1	1	59.1	0.10	.756
	<i>R Squared = .327</i>					<i>R Squared = .148</i>				

Tables 8 and 9 show the comparisons of the kindergarten students' adjusted mean posttest scores by ELO participation level for reading and mathematics, respectively. As the data in Table 8 indicate, in no single group was there a statistically significant advantage in posttest reading scores for kindergarten students that attended ELO for 16 or more days. Furthermore, there was no definitive trend in the difference in posttest scores in favor of either full-ELO or non-ELO groups; in some situations students who attended 16 days or more of ELO had higher, albeit, not statistically significant, adjusted mean scores than non-attendees or those that attended five days or fewer, and in other instances, they scored lower. While none of the full-ELO/non-ELO differences in posttest reading scores was statistically significant, the effect size of two of the differences met the established cut-off for educational significance. The full-ELO/non-ELO difference in reading posttest scores for white students and students receiving ESOL services favored full ELO with effect sizes of 0.29 and 0.31, respectively. The effect sizes of the

differences in posttest reading scores between full-ELO and non-ELO groups did not meet the established cutoff for educational significance for any of the FARMS nor gender groups. In summary, the ANCOVA analysis suggests that attending the 2003 summer ELO program for 16 or more days was educationally beneficial in reading/language arts for white students and students receiving ESOL services.

Table 8. Comparisons: Kindergarten Reading (Foundational Skills) Posttest Scores for Various Demographic Groups, by Level of 2003 Summer ELO Program Participation

		Full-ELO	Non-ELO	Difference in Adjusted Mean between Full-ELO & Non-ELO			
				Adj. Mean Diff (%)	Prob.	Pooled SD (%)	Effect Size
All Students	<i>N</i>	508	457				
	Adj. Mean	1.84	1.73	0.11	.408	1.63	0.07
Racial/Ethnic Groups							
White	<i>N</i>	59	47				
	Adj. Mean	2.36	1.86	0.50	.080	1.75	0.29
Asian American	<i>N</i>	57	55				
	Adj. Mean	1.91	1.93	0.03	.925	1.67	0.00
African American	<i>N</i>	132	120				
	Adj. Mean	1.81	1.70	0.11	.591	1.73	0.06
Hispanic	<i>N</i>	260	235				
	Adj. Mean	1.27	1.43	0.16	.305	1.22	0.13
ESOL							
Non-ESOL	<i>N</i>	276	244				
	Adj. Mean	2.61	2.69	0.08	.729	1.73	0.05
ESOL	<i>N</i>	232	213				
	Adj. Mean	1.07	0.77	0.29	.099	0.95	0.31
FARMS							
Non-FARMS	<i>N</i>	196	178				
	Adj. Mean	2.23	2.23	0.00	.995	1.79	0.00
FARMS	<i>N</i>	312	279				
	Adj. Mean	1.44	1.23	0.21	.144	1.39	0.15
ESOL & FARMS							
Not Both ESOL/FARMS	<i>N</i>	342	309				
	Adj. Mean	1.56	1.24	0.32	.053	1.71	0.19
Both ESOL/FARMS	<i>N</i>	166	148				
	Adj. Mean	2.12	2.22	0.10	.712	0.90	0.11
Gender							
Male	<i>N</i>	270	241				
	Adj. Mean	1.72	1.71	0.01	.944	1.64	0.01
Female	<i>N</i>	238	216				
	Adj. Mean	1.96	1.76	0.20	.202	1.62	0.12

Table 9. Comparisons: Kindergarten Mathematics (Review Place Value & Number Sense Concepts) Posttest Scores for Various Demographic Groups, by Level of 2003 Summer ELO Program Participation

		Full-ELO	Non-ELO	Difference in Adjusted Mean between Full-ELO & Non-ELO			
				Adj. Mean Diff (%)	Prob.	Pooled SD (%)	Effect Size
All Students	<i>N</i>	429	355				
	Adj. Mean	85.90%	81.25%	4.65	.073	26.55	0.18
Racial/Ethnic Groups							
White	<i>N</i>	51	42				
	Adj. Mean	88.10%	85.30%	2.80	.620	14.56	0.19
Asian American	<i>N</i>	50	46				
	Adj. Mean	90.57%	85.11%	5.45	.312	20.82	0.26
African American	<i>N</i>	115	92				
	Adj. Mean	84.54%	81.18%	3.36	.430	22.07	0.15
Hispanic	<i>N</i>	213	175				
	Adj. Mean	80.40%	73.39%	7.00	.028	29.87	0.23
ESOL							
Non-ESOL	<i>N</i>	235	193				
	Adj. Mean	91.96%	90.14%	1.82	.699	20.49	0.09
ESOL	<i>N</i>	194	162				
	Adj. Mean	79.84%	72.35%	7.49	.040	30.16	0.25
FARMS							
Non-FARMS	<i>N</i>	162	141				
	Adj. Mean	89.07%	85.48%	3.58	.401	23.11	0.15
FARMS	<i>N</i>	267	214				
	Adj. Mean	82.73%	77.01%	5.72	.050	27.77	0.21
ESOL & FARMS							
Not Both ESOL/FARMS	<i>N</i>	289	240				
	Adj. Mean	84.38%	78.10%	6.28	.060	23.03	0.27
Both ESOL/FARMS	<i>N</i>	140	115				
	Adj. Mean	87.42%	84.39%	3.03	.595	30.34	0.10
Gender							
Male	<i>N</i>	234	181				
	Adj. Mean	85.45%	80.24%	5.22	.093	26.31	0.20
Female	<i>N</i>	195	174				
	Adj. Mean	86.35%	82.25%	4.09	.204	26.86	0.15

Comparisons of the adjusted mean mathematics posttest scores between full-ELO and non-ELO groups show that the differences are statistically significant only for Hispanic students, students receiving ESOL services, and those participating in the FARMS (see Table 9). The statistically significant full-ELO/non-ELO differences in the adjusted mean mathematics posttest scores (7 percentage points for Hispanic students, 7.5 for ESOL students, and 5.7 for FARMS students) had effect sizes greater than 0.20. Thus, they are considered educationally significant. The ANCOVA analysis further shows that the differences in the adjusted mean mathematics posttest scores between the full-ELO and the non-ELO groups were educationally significant for Asian American students, students not participating in both ESOL and FARMS, and males. The effect size for the difference in adjusted mean posttest scores among Asian Americans was 0.26; not both ESOL and FARMS, 0.27; and males, 0.20. The results of this ANCOVA analysis suggest that the 2003 summer ELO program had academic benefits in mathematics for students with the highest educational needs (i.e., those receiving ESOL services and participating in FARMS).

Grade 1

ANCOVA analyses of academic achievement gains (as measured by difference in students' posttest and pretest scores) revealed that the main effect of participation in the 2003 summer ELO program was not statistically significant for reading, $F(2,856) = 1.62, p < .198$, or mathematics, $F(2,1100) = 1.23, p < .292$ (see Table 10). Of the five remaining main effects in our ANCOVA designs, ESOL status' main effect was statistically significant in both reading and mathematics, while participating in FARMS was statistically significant for reading. Participating in both ESOL and FARMS, ethnicity, and gender were statistically significant for neither reading nor mathematics.

Table 10. Summary of Grade 1 ANCOVA Analyses

Source	Reading/Language Arts (Foundational Skills)					Mathematics (Place Value & Number sense)				
	Type I SS	df	MS	F	Prob.	Type I SS	df	MS	F	Prob.
ELO	18.4	2	9.2	1.62	.198	540.6	2	270.3	1.23	.292
ESOL	44.5	1	44.5	7.82	.005	9406.4	1	9406.4	42.91	.000
FARMS	84.4	1	84.4	14.83	.000	253.3	1	253.3	1.16	.283
ESOL/FARMS	.0	1	.0	.00	.965	652.9	1	652.9	2.98	.085
Race/Ethnicity	40.3	3	13.4	2.36	.070	658.4	3	219.5	1.00	.392
Gender	21.2	1	21.2	3.73	.054	14.5	1	14.5	.07	.797
ELO*ESOL	1.9	2	.9	.16	.850	323.8	2	161.9	.74	.478
ELO*FARMS	9.4	2	4.7	.82	.439	825.3	2	412.7	1.88	.153
ELO*ESOL/FARMS	2.0	2	1.0	.18	.838	328.0	2	164.0	.75	.474
ELO*Race	17.4	6	2.9	.51	.801	774.3	6	129.1	.59	.740
ELO*Gender	3.2	2	1.6	.28	.758	26.7	2	13.3	.06	.941
	R Squared = .053					R Squared = .386				

Though these results suggest that, after adjusting for pretests scores, attending the 2003 summer ELO program did not affect pretest-posttest achievement gains in both reading and mathematics, data contained in the full parameterization table of the SPSS GLM output suggest that there is a disadvantage in mathematics for not attending the 2003 summer ELO or attending five days or fewer. The coefficient of non-ELO indicates that, all else being equal, the mean achievement gain in mathematics of Grade 1 students who did not attend the 2003 summer ELO or attended five or fewer days, was approximately 6 percentage points lower. This difference is statistically significant at $t = -2.12$, $p < .034$ (see Appendix C).

Table 11 shows the adjusted mean achievement gain in reading for Grade 1 students by various demographic groups and the comparisons of the adjusted mean achievement gains between the full-ELO and non-ELO for each group. As indicated in Table 11, students who attended 16 days or more of ELO (full-ELO) posted higher adjusted achievement gains (ranging from a little less than half a text level to approximately one text level) in reading relative to non-attendees or those with five or fewer days of attendance (non-ELO) in all demographic groups, except Asian Americans. However, none of these relatively higher adjusted gains was found to be statistically significant for any of the demographic groups. While not statistically significant, the full-ELO/non-ELO difference in adjusted achievement gains was educationally significant for five of the demographic groups—African Americans, Hispanics, non-ESOL, FARMS, and both ESOL and FARMS students. The differences in adjusted achievement gains favored full-ELO with effect sizes of 0.48 for Both ESOL and FARMS, 0.28 for African Americans, 0.24 for non-ESOL, and 0.21 for Hispanics and FARMS students (see Table 11).

The comparisons of the adjusted achievement gains in Grade 1 mathematics among the various demographic groups are presented in Table 12. As the data in Table 11 show, the difference in adjusted achievement gains in mathematics between the full-ELO and the non-ELO groups, though positive in favor of full-ELO for all demographic groups, is statistically significant ($p < .026$) only for FARMS students. In terms of educational significance, the full-ELO/non-ELO difference in adjusted achievement gains in mathematics for African Americans and FARMS students had effect sizes greater than the established 0.20. The full-ELO/non-ELO differences in adjusted achievement gains of 4.43 and 4.27 percentage points for African Americans and FARMS students, respectively, had effect sizes of 0.24 and 0.22. As with kindergarten students, the 2003 summer ELO tends to have academic benefits for Grade 1 students facing the highest educational challenge due to poverty; in this case, African Americans and students participating in FARMS (see Table 12).

Table 11. Comparisons: Grade 1 Pretest-Posttest Gains in Reading (Text Level) for Various Demographic Groups, by Level of 2003 Summer ELO Program Participation

		Full-ELO	Partial-ELO	Non-ELO	Difference in Adjusted Mean between Full-ELO & Non-ELO				
					Adj. Mean Diff	Prob.	Pooled SD	Effect Size	
All Students		<i>N</i>	409	146	303				
	Adj. Mean	1.14	1.04	0.82	0.33	.353	2.42	0.14	
Race/Ethnicity									
White	<i>N</i>	33	15	63					
	Adj. Mean	1.62	0.90	1.15	0.48	.60	3.34	0.14	
Asian American	<i>N</i>	50	22	36					
	Adj. Mean	0.73	1.43	0.89	-0.16	.593	3.19	0.05	
African American	<i>N</i>	114	39	86					
	Adj. Mean	1.31	1.15	0.77	0.54	.482	1.92	0.28	
Hispanic	<i>N</i>	212	70	118					
	Adj. Mean	0.91	0.67	0.46	0.45	.370	2.10	0.21	
ESOL									
Non-ESOL	<i>N</i>	329	117	275					
	Adj. Mean	1.40	1.27	0.79	0.61	.710	2.55	0.24	
ESOL	<i>N</i>	80	29	28					
	Adj. Mean	0.89	0.81	0.84	0.05	.667	1.46	0.03	
FARMS									
Non-FARMS	<i>N</i>	174	50	159					
	Adj. Mean	1.34	1.57	1.11	0.23	.440	2.80	0.08	
FARMS	<i>N</i>	235	96	144					
	Adj. Mean	0.94	0.51	0.52	0.43	.373	2.02	0.21	
ESOL & FARMS									
Not Both ESOL/FARMS	<i>N</i>	347	124	281					
	Adj. Mean	1.12	0.86	1.11	0.01	.600	2.52	0.00	
Both ESOL & FARMS	<i>N</i>	62	22	22					
	Adj. Mean	1.16	1.22	0.52	0.65	.890	1.35	0.48	
Gender									
Male	<i>N</i>	197	69	140					
	Adj. Mean	0.94	1.01	0.66	0.28	.395	2.42	0.12	
Female	<i>N</i>	212	77	163					
	Adj. Mean	1.34	1.06	0.97	0.38	.398	2.41	0.16	

Table 12. Comparisons: Grade 1 Pretest-Posttest Gains in Mathematics (Review Place Value & Number Sense Concepts) for Various Demographic Groups, by Level of 2003 Summer ELO Program Participation

		Full-ELO	Partial-ELO	Non-ELO	Difference in Adjusted Mean between Full-ELO & Non-ELO				
					Adj. Mean Diff (%)	Prob.	Pooled SD (%)	Effect Size	
All Students		<i>N</i>	582	203	317				
		Adj. Mean	0.08%	-2.33%	-2.49	2.57	.157	18.68	0.14
Race/Ethnicity									
White		<i>N</i>	43	18	46				
		Adj. Mean	2.21%	-4.72%	0.30%	1.91	.579	15.11	0.13
Asian American		<i>N</i>	52	23	25				
		Adj. Mean	-0.87%	-1.18%	-2.01%	1.15	.767	17.13	0.07
African American		<i>N</i>	159	62	105				
		Adj. Mean	0.14%	-2.07%	-4.30%	4.43	.067	18.4	0.24
Hispanic		<i>N</i>	328	100	141				
		Adj. Mean	-1.16%	-1.35%	-3.95%	2.79	.125	19.66	0.14
ESOL									
Non-ESOL		<i>N</i>	396	150	266				
		Adj. Mean	1.54%	-1.86%	-1.21%	2.75	.489	17.20	0.16
ESOL		<i>N</i>	186	53	51				
		Adj. Mean	-1.38%	-2.81%	-3.77%	2.38	.530	22.35	0.11
FARMS									
Non-FARMS		<i>N</i>	211	63	127				
		Adj. Mean	-0.68%	-2.55%	-1.54%	0.87	.723	16.80	0.05
FARMS		<i>N</i>	371	140	190				
		Adj. Mean	0.84%	-2.12%	-3.43%	4.27	.026	19.67	0.22
Both ESOL & FARMS									
Not Both ESOL/FARMS		<i>N</i>	437	162	272				
		Adj. Mean	1.78%	2.53%	0.79%	0.99	.781	17.62	0.06
Both ESOL & FARMS		<i>N</i>	145	41	45				
		Adj. Mean	-1.62%	-7.19%	-5.77%	4.15	.370	22.28	0.19
Gender									
Male		<i>N</i>	301	99	158				
		Adj. Mean	-0.10%	-2.11%	-2.69%	2.59	.210	18.73	0.14
Female		<i>N</i>	281	104	159				
		Adj. Mean	0.26%	-2.55%	2.29%	2.55	.229	18.64	0.14

Grade 2

As with Grade 1, the ANCOVA analyses of academic achievement gains (as measured by change in students' pretest and posttest scores) revealed that the main effect of participation in the 2003 summer ELO program was not statistically significant for reading, $F(2,915) = 2.17$, $p < .115$, nor for mathematics, $F(2,1264) = 0.07$, $p < .936$ (see Table 13). Among the socio-demographic variables included in the ANCOVA design, ESOL, FARMS, and gender were statistically significant for reading, while ESOL and race/ethnicity were statistically significant for mathematics. It was not possible to determine the main effects for ESOL and FARMS for reading because the sums of squares were not estimable. All interaction effects for which the F-ratio were calculated were not statistically significant. While not attending the 2003 summer ELO or attending five or fewer days is associated with reduced achievement gains, these achievement gains were not statistically significant for both reading and mathematics (see Appendix D).

Table 13. Summary of Grade 2 ANCOVA Analyses

Source	Reading/Language Arts (Foundational Skills)					Mathematics (Place Value & Number sense)				
	Type I SS	df	MS	F	Prob.	Type I SS	df	MS	F	Prob.
ELO	71.0	2	35.5	2.17	.115	38.7	2	19.4	0.07	.936
ESOL	111.8	1	111.8	6.82	.009	7530.1	1	7530.1	25.72	.000
FARMS	76.7	1	76.7	4.68	.031	63.1	1	63.1	0.22	.643
ESOL FARMS ¹	753.2	1	753.2	2.57	.109
Race/Ethnicity	184.9	3	61.6	3.76	.011	3101.7	3	1033.9	3.53	.014
Gender	97.1	1	97.1	5.93	.015	278.2	1	278.2	0.95	.330
ELO*ESOL	1.8	2	.9	0.05	.948	433.7	2	216.8	0.74	.477
ELO*FARMS	15.8	2	7.9	0.48	.618	1406.1	2	703.0	2.40	.091
ELO*ESOL FARMS ¹	742.6	2	371.3	1.27	.282
ELO*Race	336.6	6	56.1	3.42	.002	636.4	6	106.1	.36	.903
ELO*Gender	9.7	2	4.8	0.30	.744	621.3	2	310.7	1.06	.346
	<i>R Squared = .061</i>					<i>R Squared = .256</i>				

Note: ¹Adjusted Means not estimable.

Comparisons of achievement gains in reading indicate that the difference between the mean achievement gains between full-ELO and non-ELO was statistically significant only among Asian Americans. Asian American students in Grade 2 who attended the 2003 summer ELO program for 16 or more days posted an adjusted achievement gain of more than three text levels, on the average, higher than their cohorts who did not attend ELO or attended five or fewer days. This difference in adjusted achievement gain in text-reading level was statistically significant at $p < .001$ with effect size of 0.63 (see Table 14). In addition, the differences in adjusted text-reading level gains among whites, Hispanics, and males were found educationally significant.

Table 14. Comparisons: Grade 2 Pretest-Posttest Gains in Reading (Text Level) for Various Demographic Groups, by Level of 2003 Summer ELO Program Participation

		Full-ELO	Partial-ELO	Non-ELO	Difference in Adjusted Gain Mean between Full-ELO & Non-ELO				
					Adj. Mean Diff (%)	Prob.	Pooled SD (%)	Effect Size	
All Students		<i>N</i>	461	117	339				
		Adj. Mean	1.20	1.43	0.54	0.67	.187	4.13	0.16
Race/Ethnicity									
White	<i>N</i>	34	17	78					
	Adj. Mean	0.01	3.19	1.72	-1.71	.069	4.99	0.34	
Asian American	<i>N</i>	39	13	36					
	Adj. Mean	2.48	1.39	-0.73	3.21	.001	5.09	0.63	
African American	<i>N</i>	125	20	71					
	Adj. Mean	1.56	1.39	1.41	0.16	.833	3.84	0.04	
Hispanic	<i>N</i>	263	67	154					
	Adj. Mean	0.76	0.90	-0.25	1.01	.057	3.73	0.27	
ESOL¹									
Non-ESOL	<i>N</i>	342	96	300					
	Adj. Mean						4.46		
ESOL	<i>N</i>	119	21	39					
	Adj. Mean						2.18		
FARMS									
Non-FARMS	<i>N</i>	120	38	157					
	Adj. Mean	1.37	1.72	0.70	0.67	.324	5.12	0.13	
FARMS	<i>N</i>	341	79	182					
	Adj. Mean	1.03	1.14	0.37	0.66	.221	3.47	0.19	
ESOL & FARMS¹									
Not Both ESOL/FARMS	<i>N</i>	96	96	300					
	Adj. Mean						4.46		
Both ESOL & FARMS	<i>N</i>	21	21	39					
	Adj. Mean						2.18		
Gender									
Male	<i>N</i>	252	53	172					
	Adj. Mean	0.93	1.25	0.08	0.86	.138	4.26	0.20	
Female	<i>N</i>	209	64	167					
	Adj. Mean	1.47	1.62	1.00	0.48	.419	3.97	0.12	

Note: ¹Adjusted Means not estimable.

Table 15. Comparisons: Grade 2 Pretest-Posttest Gains in Mathematics (Review Place Value & Number Sense Concepts) for Various Demographic Groups, by Level of 2003 Summer ELO Program Participation

		Full-ELO	Partial-ELO	Non-ELO	Difference in Adjusted Mean between Full-ELO & Non-ELO				
					Adj. Mean Diff (%)	Prob.	Pooled SD (%)	Effect Size	
All Students		<i>N</i>	655	174	436				
		Adj. Mean	-3.92%	-3.58%	-4.90%	0.98	.598	19.65	0.05
Race/Ethnicity									
White		<i>N</i>	42	20	90				
		Adj. Mean	-4.86%	-4.53%	-6.29%	1.44	.687	18.47	0.08
Asian American		<i>N</i>	58	21	50				
		Adj. Mean	0.93%	-2.89%	-0.82%	1.75	.623	18.19	0.10
African American		<i>N</i>	183	28	88				
		Adj. Mean	-6.65%	-5.01%	-7.68%	1.03	.706	18.96	0.05
Hispanic		<i>N</i>	372	105	208				
		Adj. Mean	-5.11%	-1.90%	-4.82%	-0.29	.880	20.39	0.01
ESOL¹									
Non-ESOL		<i>N</i>	459	130	370				
		Adj. Mean	-0.65%	2.10%	3.95%	-4.60	.207	19.37	0.24
ESOL		<i>N</i>	196	44	66				
		Adj. Mean	-7.19%	-9.26%	-13.75%	6.57	.045	20.52	0.32
FARMS									
Non-FARMS		<i>N</i>	207	57	206				
		Adj. Mean	-5.13%	0.39%	-4.11%	-1.01	.686	18.55	0.05
FARMS		<i>N</i>	448	117	230				
		Adj. Mean	-2.72%	-6.78%	-5.69%	2.98	.138	20.15	0.15
ESOL & FARMS¹									
Not Both ESOL/FARMS		<i>N</i>	496	90	384				
		Adj. Mean	-4.31%	-6.67%	-10.47%	6.16	.040	19.42	0.32
Both ESOL & FARMS		<i>N</i>	159	34	52				
		Adj. Mean	-3.53%	-0.49%	0.67%	-4.20	.346	20.56	0.20
Gender									
Male		<i>N</i>	353	84	224				
		Adj. Mean	-4.91%	-5.03%	-4.53%	-0.38	.855	19.82	0.02
Female		<i>N</i>	302	90	212				
		Adj. Mean	-2.93%	-2.13%	-5.28	2.35	.284	19.47	0.12

Note: ¹Adjusted Means not estimable.

However, the difference among whites was not in the hypothesized direction, that is, white students who did not attend ELO or attended five days or fewer posted higher adjusted gains (almost two levels) in text-reading level (see Table 14). As for mathematics, the full-ELO/non-ELO differences in adjusted achievement gains were statistically significant for ESOL and Not Both ESOL/FARMS groups. These statistically significant differences for ESOL and Not Both ESOL/FARMS were also found to be educationally significant, both with an effect size of 0.32 (see Table 15). The full-ELO/non-ELO differences in adjusted achievement gains for non-ESOL and Both ESOL/FARMS also met the level for educational significance; however, the effects were not in the expected direction. The data suggest that non-ESOL and Both ESOL/FARMS students who did not attend ELO or attended five or fewer days posted higher adjusted achievement gains in mathematics. To summarize, the 2003 summer ELO program had academic benefits in reading for Grade 2 Asian American students, while in mathematics, the academic benefits were to ESOL and not Both ESOL/FARMS students.

Grade 3

Table 16 shows the results of the main effects of the ANCOVA analyses for the impact of the 2003 summer ELO on Grade 3 reading/language arts (as measured by gain in composite score on (Test Ready PLUS 2) and mathematics (gain in total score). As indicated in Table 16, the main effect of level of ELO participation was statistically significant for reading, $F(2,1229) = 3.36$, $p < .035$, but was not statistically significant for mathematics, $F(2,1227) = 1.75$, $p < .174$. For Grade 3 reading, the main effects of all demographic groups, except gender, were statistically significant, while ESOL and race/ethnicity were found to be statistically significant for mathematics. Other things being equal, students who attended 15 or fewer days of ELO posted lower achievement gains in both reading and mathematics. However, these lower achievement gains were not statistically significant (see Appendix E).

Table 16. Summary of Grade 3 ANCOVA Analyses

Source	Reading/Language Arts (Test Ready)					Mathematics (Place Value & Number Sense)				
	Type I SS	df	MS	F	Prob.	Type I SS	df	MS	F	Prob.
ELO	1921.1	2	960.6	3.36	.035	779.8	2	389.9	1.75	.174
ESOL	13089.9	1	13089.9	45.82	.000	5546.3	1	5546.3	24.92	.000
FARMS	6094.1	1	6094.1	21.33	.000	537.3	1	537.3	2.41	.121
ESOL/FARMS	1251.2	1	1251.2	4.38	.037	234.2	1	234.2	1.05	.305
Race/Ethnicity	5034.4	3	1678.1	5.87	.001	3343.3	3	1114.4	5.01	.002
Gender	643.7	1	643.7	2.25	.134	5.2	1	5.2	0.02	.878
ELO*ESOL	138.4	2	69.2	.24	.785	603.9	2	302.0	1.36	.258
ELO*FARMS	995.9	2	498.0	1.74	.175	2624.6	2	1312.3	5.90	.003
ELO* ESOL FARMS	152.2	2	76.1	.27	.766	988.4	2	494.2	2.22	.109
ELO*Race	2951.8	6	492.0	1.72	.112	2038.8	6	339.8	1.53	.166
ELO*Gender	84.5	2	42.3	.15	.862	112.9	2	56.5	.25	.776
	R Squared = 0.216					R Squared = 0.267				

The full-ELO/non-ELO differences of the adjusted achievement gains made in reading among the various demographic groups did not show any definite pattern, in favor of full ELO or otherwise. Further, none of the differences was statistically or educationally significant (see Table 17). As for mathematics, only the difference in achievement gain among FARMS students was statistically significant. Educationally, the differences in achievement gains in mathematics among non-FARMS, FARMS, and not Both ESOL & FARMS students were found to be significant. However, the difference among non-FARMS students was not in the expected direction. That is, for this group, students who did not attend ELO or who attended five days or fewer posted higher adjusted gains in mathematics (see Table 18). In summary, findings from

the ANCOVA analyses indicate that there was no academic benefit for attending ELO in reading, but there were some academic benefits in mathematics to FARMS students.

Table 17. Comparisons: Grade 3 Pretest-Posttest Gains in Reading (Test Ready Composite Scores) for Various Demographic Groups, by Level of 2003 Summer ELO Program Participation

		Full-ELO	Partial-ELO	Non-ELO	Difference in Adjusted Mean between Full-ELO & Non-ELO				
					Adj. Mean Diff (%)	Prob.	Pooled SD (%)	Effect Size	
All Students		<i>N</i>	604	165	462				
		Adj. Mean	-2.18%	-7.99%	-2.29%	0.11	.952	18.91	0.01
Race/Ethnicity									
White		<i>N</i>	45	23	106				
		Adj. Mean	1.46%	-11.86%	-0.93%	2.40	.472	19.23	0.12
Asian American		<i>N</i>	67	11	31				
		Adj. Mean	1.49%	-7.77%	2.14%	-0.65	.866	17.53	0.04
African American		<i>N</i>	170	32	118				
		Adj. Mean	-6.24%	-7.68%	-4.92%	-1.32	.601	18.12	0.07
Hispanic		<i>N</i>	322	99	207				
		Adj. Mean	-5.44%	-4.57%	-5.45%	0.01	.996	19.31	0.00
ESOL									
Non-ESOL		<i>N</i>	405	121	381				
		Adj. Mean	3.64%	-2.57%	2.17%	1.47	.682	16.90	0.09
ESOL		<i>N</i>	199	44	81				
		Adj. Mean	-8.00%	-13.37%	-6.75%	-1.25	.696	23.55	0.05
FARMS									
Non-FARMS		<i>N</i>	162	49	219				
		Adj. Mean	-0.82%	-5.08%	0.94%	-1.76	.487	16.75	0.11
FARMS		<i>N</i>	442	116	243				
		Adj. Mean	-3.55%	-10.86%	-5.52%	1.97	.296	19.90	0.10
ESOL & FARMS									
Not Both ESOL/FARMS		<i>N</i>	432	126	398				
		Adj. Mean	-5.26%	-9.41%	-3.36%	-1.90	.522	17.18	0.11
Both ESOL & FARMS		<i>N</i>	172	39	64				
		Adj. Mean	0.89%	-6.53%	-1.22%	2.11	.620	23.88	0.09
Gender									
Male		<i>N</i>	298	99	253				
		Adj. Mean	-3.21%	-8.32%	-2.86%	-0.35	.863	19.07	0.02
Female		<i>N</i>	306	66	209				
		Adj. Mean	-1.15%	-7.62%	-1.72%	0.57	.788	18.74	0.03

Table 18. Comparisons: Grade 3 Pretest-Posttest Gains in Mathematics (Review Place Value & Number Sense Concepts) for Various Demographic Groups, by Level of 2003 Summer ELO Program Participation

		Full-ELO	Partial-ELO	Non-ELO	Difference in Adjusted Mean between Full-ELO & Non-ELO				
					Adj. Mean Diff (%)	Prob.	Pooled SD (%)	Effect Size	
All Students		<i>N</i>	612	159	458				
		Adj. Mean	3.47%	2.10%	2.94%	0.53	.737	17.25	0.03
Race/Ethnicity									
White		<i>N</i>	46	20	101				
		Adj. Mean	3.02%	-6.66%	2.44%	0.58	.843	14.90	0.04
Asian American		<i>N</i>	71	10	30				
		Adj. Mean	8.08%	10.18%	6.62%	1.46	.670	16.68	0.09
African American		<i>N</i>	173	31	121				
		Adj. Mean	1.30%	5.22%	0.82%	0.47	.832	17.58	0.03
Hispanic		<i>N</i>	322	98	206				
		Adj. Mean	1.47%	-0.30%	1.88%	-0.41	.809	17.60	0.02
ESOL									
Non-ESOL		<i>N</i>	404	118	376				
		Adj. Mean	5.28%	16.27%	6.91%	-1.63	.602	16.84	0.10
ESOL		<i>N</i>	208	41	82				
		Adj. Mean	1.66%	-12.06%	-1.02%	2.68	.334	18.34	0.15
FARMS									
Non-FARMS		<i>N</i>	167	47	213				
		Adj. Mean	2.38%	2.58%	5.71%	-3.33	.137	16.19	0.21
FARMS		<i>N</i>	445	112	245				
		Adj. Mean	4.56%	1.64%	0.18%	4.39	.008	17.78	0.25
ESOL & FARMS									
Not Both ESOL/FARMS		<i>N</i>	433	122	394				
		Adj. Mean	4.20%	-8.63%	0.31%	3.89	.127	17.01	0.23
Both ESOL & FARMS		<i>N</i>	179	37	64				
		Adj. Mean	2.74%	12.85%	5.57%	-2.83	.446	18.06	0.16
Gender									
Male		<i>N</i>	303	95	245				
		Adj. Mean	3.25%	2.84%	2.73%	0.52	.775	17.32	0.03
Female		<i>N</i>	309	64	213				
		Adj. Mean	3.69%	1.38%	3.15%	0.54	.771	17.19	0.03

Grade 4

After controlling for the pretest scores, the main effect of level of ELO participation was not statistically significant for reading, $F(2,1078) = 1.70, p < .183$, or for mathematics, $F(2,1064) = 1.58, p < .206$ among Grade 4 students (see Table 19). Of the socio-demographic variables included in the ANCOVA designs, the main effects of ESOL, FARMS, and ethnicity were statistically significant for Grade 4 reading. On the other hand, only the main effects of ESOL and ethnicity were found to be statistically significant for Grade 4 mathematics. All interaction effects were statistically insignificant. As with Grade 3 students, not attending ELO or attending for 15 or fewer days is associated with lower relative achievement gains in both reading and mathematics among Grade 4 students. Similarly, these lower relative achievement gains were not statistically significant (see Appendix F).

Table 19. Summary of Grade 4 ANCOVA Analyses

Source	Reading/Language Arts (Foundational Skills)					Mathematics (Place Value & Number sense)				
	Type I SS	df	MS	F	Prob.	Type I SS	df	MS	F	Prob.
ELO	541.3	2	270.6	1.58	.206	914.2	2	457.1	1.70	.183
ESOL	6570.3	1	6570.3	38.39	.000	2096.9	1	2096.9	7.79	.005
FARMS	1176.0	1	1176.0	6.87	.009	687.1	1	687.1	2.55	.110
ESOL/FARMS	239.8	1	239.8	1.40	.237	875.3	1	875.3	3.25	.072
Race/Ethnicity	1854.5	3	618.2	3.61	.013	3739.2	3	1246.4	4.63	.003
Gender	244.3	1	244.3	1.43	.232	25.8	1	25.8	.10	.757
ELO*ESOL	1245.1	2	622.5	3.64	.027	608.1	2	304.0	1.13	.324
ELO*FARMS	717.3	2	358.6	2.10	.124	995.9	2	498.0	1.85	.158
ELO* ESOL/FARMS	96.4	2	48.2	.28	.755	220.3	2	110.2	.41	.664
ELO*Race	958.0	6	159.7	.93	.470	1334.7	6	222.5	.83	.549
ELO*Gender	29.8	2	14.9	.09	.917	508.9	2	254.5	.95	.389
	<i>R Squared = .347</i>					<i>R Squared = .307</i>				

Adjusted mean achievement gains in reading for Grade 4 students by demographic groups and comparisons of the adjusted mean achievement gains between the full-ELO and non-ELO for each group are presented in Table 20. As indicated, the full-ELO/non-ELO differences in achievement gain were not statistically significant for every socio-demographic group. However, the effect sizes of two of the differences in achievement gain, those for Asian American and ESOL students, met the cut-off for educational significance (see Table 20).

Table 20. Comparisons: Grade 4 Pretest-Posttest Gains in Reading (Test Ready Composite Scores) for Various Demographic Groups, by Level of 2003 Summer ELO Program Participation

		Full-ELO	Partial-ELO	Non-ELO	Difference in Adjusted Mean between Full-ELO & Non-ELO				
					Adj. Mean Diff (%)	Prob.	Pooled SD (%)	Effect Size	
All Students		<i>N</i>	492	124	464				
		Adj. Mean	-2.44%	-6.01%	-3.65%	1.21	.453	16.01	0.08
Race/Ethnicity									
White		<i>N</i>	35	13	95				
		Adj. Mean	-3.03%	-0.65%	-0.79%	-2.34	.449	13.50	0.17
Asian American		<i>N</i>	50	10	35				
		Adj. Mean	0.25%	-5.81%	-4.05%	4.30	.162	16.45	0.26
African American		<i>N</i>	127	33	117				
		Adj. Mean	-3.52%	-8.54%	-5.95%	2.43	.266	15.49	0.16
Hispanic		<i>N</i>	280	68	217				
		Adj. Mean	-3.45%	-9.04%	-3.80%	0.35	.028	16.76	0.02
ESOL									
Non-ESOL		<i>N</i>	383	105	419				
		Adj. Mean	1.56%	-1.73%	2.71%	-1.14	.755	15.56	0.07
ESOL		<i>N</i>	109	19	45				
		Adj. Mean	-6.44%	-10.30%	-10.00%	3.56	.306	18.13	0.20
FARMS									
Non-FARMS		<i>N</i>	152	43	202				
		Adj. Mean	-1.77%	-7.59%	-1.82%	0.05	.982	14.98	0.00
FARMS		<i>N</i>	340	81	262				
		Adj. Mean	-3.11%	-4.43%	-5.48%	2.37	.167	16.56	0.14
ESOL & FARMS									
Not Both ESOL/FARMS		<i>N</i>	402	108	425				
		Adj. Mean	-4.16%	-3.40%	-5.54%	1.20	.715	15.56	0.08
Both ESOL & FARMS		<i>N</i>	90	16	39				
		Adj. Mean	-0.72%	-8.62%	-1.94%	1.22	.777	18.65	0.07
Gender									
Male		<i>N</i>	257	69	219				
		Adj. Mean	-2.76%	-6.82%	-4.22%	1.46	.419	16.36	0.09
Female		<i>N</i>	235	55	245				
		Adj. Mean	-2.12%	-5.20%	-3.08%	0.96	.269	15.63	0.06

Table 21. Comparisons: Grade 4 Pretest-Posttest Gains in Mathematics (Review Place Value & Number Sense Concepts) for Various Demographic Groups, by Level of 2003 Summer ELO Program Participation

		Full-ELO	Partial-ELO	Non-ELO	Difference in Adjusted Mean between Full-ELO & Non-ELO				
					Adj. Mean Diff (%)	Prob.	Pooled SD (%)	Effect Size	
All Students		<i>N</i>	494	124	448				
		Adj. Mean	4.13%	2.36%	0.11%	4.02	.050	19.49	0.21
Race/Ethnicity									
White		<i>N</i>	37	13	90				
		Adj. Mean	4.15%	1.43%	4.51%	-0.35	.923	19.38	0.02
Asian American		<i>N</i>	51	9	31				
		Adj. Mean	8.66%	6.92%	-0.06%	8.72	.029	17.47	0.50
African American		<i>N</i>	123	31	117				
		Adj. Mean	2.17%	1.22%	-2.72%	4.89	.077	18.36	0.27
Hispanic		<i>N</i>	283	71	210				
		Adj. Mean	1.53%	-0.12%	-1.28%	2.82	.592	20.38	0.14
ESOL									
Non-ESOL		<i>N</i>	388	102	405				
		Adj. Mean	7.35%	5.44%	7.76%	-0.41	.932	19.10	0.02
ESOL		<i>N</i>	106	22	43				
		Adj. Mean	0.91%	-0.72%	-7.54%	8.45	.067	21.34	0.36
FARMS									
Non-FARMS		<i>N</i>	150	43	196				
		Adj. Mean	3.82%	5.19%	1.01%	2.82	.289	18.40	0.15
FARMS		<i>N</i>	344	81	252				
		Adj. Mean	4.44%	-0.47%	-0.78%	5.22	.016	20.08	0.26
ESOL & FARMS									
Not Both ESOL/FARMS		<i>N</i>	407	106	410				
		Adj. Mean	1.74%	1.88%	-5.19%	6.93	.113	19.04	0.36
Both ESOL & FARMS		<i>N</i>	87	18	38				
		Adj. Mean	6.53%	2.84%	5.42%	1.11	.845	22.09	0.05
Gender									
Male		<i>N</i>	253	71	215				
		Adj. Mean	4.11%	0.31%	0.36%	3.75	.101	19.36	0.19
Female		<i>N</i>	241	53	233				
		Adj. Mean	4.15%	4.41%	-0.13%	4.28	.067	19.64	0.22

Though the main effect of ELO participation was not statistically significant for Grade 4 mathematics, the difference (4 percentage points) in adjusted achievement gain between students who attended 16 days or more of ELO and non-attendees or those with five or fewer days of attendance was found to be statistically significant at $p < 0.050$ for all students (see Table 21). This difference also was educationally significant (effect size = 0.21). In addition, the full-ELO/non-ELO differences in adjusted achievement gains in mathematics also were found to be statistically and educationally significant in favor of full-ELO among Asian American students and students participating in the FARMS program. Of the remaining socio-demographic groups, the full-ELO/non-ELO differences in adjusted achievement gain in mathematics were educationally significant for African Americans (effect size = 0.27), ESOL (effect size = 0.36), Not Both ESOL and FARMS (effect size = 0.36), and female (effect size = 0.22) students. These findings suggest that the 2003 summer ELO program did not have academic benefit in reading for Grade 4 students, but had overall academic benefit in mathematics, with Asian Americans and FARMS students benefiting the most.

STAFF SATISFACTION SURVEY

Administrator Satisfaction

Method

Administrator surveys were delivered to all principals and assistant principals who worked with the 2003 summer ELO program and analyzed administrators' perceptions regarding planning and implementation. The survey instrument contains 23 items with 20 Likert-scale and three open-ended questions. The 20 Likert-scale questions asked Title I administrators to indicate the degree to which they agreed or disagreed with questions pertaining to (a) program design, planning, and implementation; (b) student recruitment; and (c) staffing and administrative support activities. Questions pertaining to the design, planning, and implementation assessed administrators' levels of agreement regarding the receipt of information on the program; the ease of working with assistant principals and teachers, often from other schools; the procedures used to facilitate the arrival and dismissal of students; and administrators' perceived effect of the program on students. Student recruitment questions assessed administrators' agreement regarding the strategies and materials used to recruit ELO participants. Questions pertaining to staffing and administrative support activities analyzed the recruitment of teachers, support levels from central office, and perceptions regarding staffing needs at individual ELO sites. The open-ended questions on the survey provided administrators with space to provide detailed comments regarding the program and changes they would make for upcoming sessions. The administrator survey instrument is included as Appendix G.

Administrator surveys were assigned individual number codes to monitor returns, and were delivered to each 2003 summer ELO program site via interdepartmental mail. Surveys were returned via interdepartmental mail to the OSA, where they were coded and analyzed.

Satisfaction-rating indexes were calculated for the survey as a whole, and for individual subsections. These rating indexes were calculated based on the number of administrators who selected that they strongly agreed or agreed with each question. Administrators who selected either of these responses were given a code of 1 for each applicable question. Administrators who selected any of the other answer choices were given a code of 0. The total number of 1s counted on each administrator's survey was then computed for the entire survey and each subsection. Each administrator's total count was then divided by the total number of questions on the survey and/or in each subsection. The percentages computed from these calculations were totaled to provide a mean and median score for each section of the survey. Each satisfaction-rating index ranged from 0 to 100%.

Results

In total, 28 surveys were returned from participating administrators. The overall return rate was 70%. Average satisfaction ratings were first calculated based on responses provided on all survey questions. Administrators had a mean satisfaction rating of 80% with the 2003 summer ELO program. Half of the total number of administrators had a satisfaction rating of 83% or higher, which emphasizes the positive sentiments the majority of administrators had for the program as a whole.

Individual survey questions also were analyzed to determine if administrators' satisfaction ratings varied by specific areas. Individual questions that received a satisfaction rating of 75% or lower were analyzed. These survey questions and the percentages of administrators who agreed with them are listed in Table 22.

Table 22. Individual Survey Questions with 75 percent Satisfaction Rating or Less

Item Number	Question	% of Administrators Agreeing (N=28)
7	Transferring daily ELO administrative responsibilities from school principals to the APs went smoothly and efficiently.	75
11	Adding an afternoon component enhanced the effectiveness of the ELO summer program (in terms of recruitment and outcome).	71
12	The student recruitment materials (brochures, posters, and fliers) were provided to my school in a timely manner.	61
13	My school had an adequate amount of ELO student recruitment materials.	68
15	Sending the recruitment materials home in students' backpacks was an effective recruitment strategy.	57
16	Staff recruitment commenced early enough to allow the recruitment of qualified and highly skilled teachers and instructional assistants.	75
17	I was able to recruit highly skilled teachers and instructional assistants in my school to participate in the ELO summer program.	68
18	I did not experience any difficulty in recruiting teachers from the Summer ELO teacher FirstClass folder.	43
19a	I was satisfied with the support I received from central office staff in recruiting staff.	61
19b	I was satisfied with the support I received from central office staff in procuring materials and supplies.	71

The survey questions in Table 22 have the lowest satisfaction ratings among administrators. Among these questions, the satisfaction ratings were as low as 43% for item 18 ("I did not experience any difficulty in recruiting teachers from the Summer ELO teacher FirstClass folder"). In examining these statements in more detail, it appears that the majority of questions in Table 22 focus on some aspect of the recruiting process used for students and/or teachers. Given the fact that at least 25% of administrators felt different aspects of recruitment were an issue last summer, it may be beneficial to discuss possible ways of alleviating these concerns for future administrations of the summer ELO program.

Survey items were analyzed next, in regard to the three individual sections that contained Likert-scale statements. Questions in these sections were grouped together to measure the administrator's perceptions regarding program design, planning, and implementation (Part II), student recruitment (Part III), and staffing and administrative support activities (Part IV).

The subsection pertaining to program design, planning, and implementation received the highest satisfaction rating. There was a mean satisfaction rating of 86%, with a median score of 93%. This median score reflects the fact that half of all administrators' responses fell above this percentage. The satisfaction rating for staffing and administrative support activities was slightly lower, with a mean score of 76% and a median score of 81%. Staff recruitment questions received some of the lowest satisfaction ratings on the survey, which invariably affected the overall mean and median scores for this section. The lowest satisfaction ratings were recorded regarding the student recruitment subsection of the survey. The mean score for all administrators' responses was 66% with a median score of 75%. Looking at these three sections independently, administrators had the lowest satisfaction with the strategies and resources used for student recruitment.

The next analyses examined the responses of principals and assistant principals separately. Typically, assistant principals were those administrators who were more involved in the day-to-day management of the ELO program. Table 23 highlights the mean and median satisfaction scores from principals and assistant principals for the overall survey and for each individual section.

Table 23. Mean and Median Percentages for Principals and Assistant Principals on Overall Survey Questions and Individual Subsections

		All Questions	Part II	Part III	Part IV
Principals (n=13)	Mean (%)	85	87	79	85
	Median (%)	87	93	88	82
Assistant Principals (n=15)	Mean (%)	75	86	55	68
	Median (%)	70	87	75	82

As seen in Table 23, the satisfaction scores provided by assistant principals were consistently lower than those provided by school principals. For all questions on the survey, assistant principals had a less favorable response rate. While half of principals had a satisfaction level above 87%, only half of assistant principals had a satisfaction score above 70%. The average percentage of assistant principals (75%) who responded favorably was also 10 percentage points lower than that of principals (85%). The mean scores for assistant principals were even lower in regard to how they responded to the subsection for student recruitment (Part III). Here, the average percentage score for assistant principals dropped to 55%, with a median score of 75%. This was the lowest favorable percentage score for any individual subsection of the survey.

The final analyses conducted on these Likert-scale items examined trends in the participation rates of administrators in the 2003 ELO program. Using administrators as the unit of analysis, notable differences emerged in how administrators who participated, both pre-July and July-August, responded in comparison to those administrators who participated post-August. Ten administrators responded that they participated pre-July and during the program's implementation, and 10 administrators stated that they participated only after the program ended.

In general, those administrators who participated pre-July and July-August had a less favorable rating than those administrators who participated post-August. These results are presented in Table 24.

Table 24. Mean and Median Percentages for Administrators Who Participated in 2003 ELO Program Pre July/July-August and Post August Only on Overall Survey Questions and Individual Subsections

	Overall Satisfaction	Part II Satisfaction	Part III Satisfaction	Part IV Satisfaction
	Mean %	Mean %	Mean %	Mean %
Pre-July and July-August	77	82	60	75
Post-August	87	91	89	81

Administrators who participated before and during the program’s implementation had a much less favorable approval rating on the survey as a whole and for Part III than administrators who participated only after the program ended. These findings highlight the differences that exist in administrators’ perceptions, depending on when they participated in the 2003 summer ELO program.

While those administrators who were involved with ELO before the program began and during the actual implementation had a lower satisfaction rating in all sections, in no subsection was this discrepancy more glaring than in the questions contained in the subsection regarding student recruitment (Part III). Administrators who were involved in the planning and implementation of the program responded less favorably to questions and issues such as the strategies and materials used to recruit students. Problems surrounding student recruitment were issues that surfaced throughout the analyses used to examine the administrator survey, and may be important variables to reconsider in planning sessions for future ELO programs.

The open-ended questions provided administrators with an opportunity to reflect on the positive and negative aspects of the ELO program at their schools and to suggest changes to improve program effectiveness. Administrators’ comments were grouped into mutually exclusive categories for analysis. The majority of positive comments were coded into two distinct categories of staff involvement and benefits for students. In total 14 administrators (50%) commented positively on some aspect of staff involvement, and 10 administrators (36%) commented positively on the benefits of the ELO for students.

Positive staffing comments relating to the excellence of teachers/assistant staff and food service employees came from five administrators. Other comments mentioned by one or two administrators focused on such aspects of staffing as second-year staffing being more complete, having the majority of ELO teachers at their regular school sites, having valuable secretarial staff, the positive impact of the reading recovery teacher, having an ELO principal present and involved, and receiving exceptional support from the ELO coordinator and Title I specialist.

In the benefits to student's category, the one comment mentioned by more than one administrator is the impact of ELO in helping incoming kindergarten students become more comfortable with school. Other positive comments mentioned by single administrators focused on aspects such as providing high-risk students with more instruction, helping students start the upcoming school year more prepared, helping to enhance reading and math skills, previewing upcoming curriculum, and having a positive effect on student performance in the fall.

Administrators' negative comments were grouped into the three categories—(a) problems regarding staffing, (b) materials and curriculum, and (c) other general concerns. Under staffing problems, 29% of administrators reflected on some of the concerns at their schools. Two comments highlighted problems with ESOL staffing, and two comments emphasized concerns with volunteer training and commitment. Additional individual statements focused on such concerns as a general need for more staffing, more time to access the list of teacher applicants, problems with a general lack of instructional assistants, and teachers who made a commitment but later backed out.

Problems with materials and curriculum were cited by 36% of administrators. Three administrators recorded comments regarding the need for schools to share student data and/or have access to student data at other schools. Two administrators each commented on the need to have fifth grade included in the program and on confusion regarding accessing and distributing materials. This latter comment reiterates some of the negative sentiments recorded on the Likert-scale questions regarding student recruitment. Other comments that were cited singularly by administrators included the need to design curriculum for different ability levels, allowing teachers to be responsible for the implementation of the ELO curriculum, and inadequate funds for translating parent letters.

The final area of concern focused on general problems encountered during the implementation of the ELO program. A total of 32% of administrators commented on specific issues that arose. Three comments specifically emphasized the importance of ensuring that the afternoon component of the ELO program is organized and expanded for future sessions. Other problems focused on the general scheduling of the ELO program itself. Three individual comments highlighted concerns regarding the difficulty of organizing ELO during the regular school year, getting ready for back-to-school, given the late-summer ending date, and the idea that teachers have no break before the start of the fall semester.

Administrators' recommendations for future ELO sessions were recorded on the final open-ended question. The one category that received a substantial number of responses focused on ELO staffing. Overall, 43% of administrators recommended some staffing change for future administrations of the ELO program. This sentiment also was emphasized in the analysis of the Likert-scale questions regarding staffing and administrative support activities. With all of the recommendations provided, only two were repeated twice. These suggestions emphasized the need to have specific and comprehensive job descriptions for all ELO staff and ensure that assistant principals are assigned to sites in close proximity to their home schools. There was no one recommendation that was common among three or more administrators. All other comments, recorded once for this category, included a need to improve such aspects of the program as ensuring additional clerical support during the recruitment phase of ELO, ensuring

assistant principals are involved early enough in the program to guide recruitment and advertisement, providing administrators with a schedule for volunteer availability, creating a media specialist position, and increasing the time of instructional assistants.

Teacher Satisfaction

Method

Teacher surveys were sent via interdepartmental mail to all classroom, ESOL, and resource teachers who participated in the 2003 summer ELO program. After describing their teaching assignments during the regular school year and the ELO program, teachers indicated the degree to which they agreed or disagreed with questions pertaining to teacher training, professional development activities, and curriculum implementation. Teachers who participated in both the 2002 and 2003 ELO programs were also asked to reflect on the extent to which training and program implementation changed. Three open-ended questions provided teachers with an opportunity to comment specifically on the strengths, weaknesses, and suggestions for future implementation. The teacher survey is included as Appendix H.

Each teacher survey was assigned a number code to document the number of surveys delivered and the number of surveys returned to OSA via interdepartmental mail. Once surveys were returned and coded, individual questions were analyzed. The first analysis examined the degree to which ELO teachers had the opportunity to teach the same grade and/or in the same school where they were assigned during the fall 2003 semester. Satisfaction-rating indexes were calculated next for the questions in each subsection of the survey.

These satisfaction-rating indexes were calculated based on the percentage of teachers who selected that they strongly agreed or agreed with each question. Teachers who selected either of these responses were coded with a 1 for each question. Disagreed or strongly disagreed responses were given a code of 0. The total number of questions that individual teachers strongly agreed or agreed with then were summed and divided by the total number of questions in that subsection. The percentages computed from these calculations were totaled to obtain each teacher's satisfaction rating. Each satisfaction-rating index ranged from 0 to 100%.

Teachers' responses on the open-ended section of the survey were coded into various mutually exclusive categories. Categories emerged after examining all teachers' responses and grouping them into similar themes. A number of distinct categories developed regarding the strengths, weaknesses, and suggestions for improvement.

Results

A total of 269 of the 306 teacher surveys were returned for coding and analysis. The overall return rate was 88%. There was also a range from 1% to 10% of teachers who did not respond to individual questions. The percentages included in the following analyzes are based on the percentage of valid responses recorded.

The first few questions on the survey asked teachers to describe their teaching assignments during the 2003 spring semester, the summer ELO program, and the 2003 fall semester. One underpinning of the ELO program was to provide teachers with the opportunity to familiarize themselves with the strengths and weaknesses of students who would enroll in their classrooms during the upcoming fall semester. While teachers' spring 2003 assignments did not have an impact on the relationships they would develop with students entering during the fall semester, similar trends developed in analyzing these two data sets.

Of the 189 teachers who responded to these questions, 45% ($n=85$) stated that they were assigned to the same school and the same grade during ELO as that of their 2003 spring assignments. A total of 54% ($n=102$) of teachers stated that they were stationed at the same school but were assigned a different grade level. During the 2003 fall semester, only 43% ($n=82$) of teachers were assigned to the same school and grade as that of ELO. A total of 56% ($n=105$) of teachers were assigned to the same school but a different grade. This finding suggests that a large percentage of the ELO teaching staff did not have the opportunity to develop relationships with future students before the school year began. Many teachers were left to start the school year in a more traditional manner instead of being able to use this time to prepare for the strengths and weaknesses of many incoming students. This issue reaffirms some of the negative comments raised by administrators regarding teacher recruitment.

The survey's individual Likert-scale questions next were grouped into a number of mutually exclusive categories to compute the degree to which teachers responded positively or negatively to individual aspects of the teacher survey. The categories that emerged focused on teachers' perceptions regarding their training in reading and math, the impact of professional development activities, time allotted for planning, teaching, access to materials, ELO curriculum implementation in reading and math, and the degree to which improvements were made from the 2002 ELO program. Teachers' satisfaction indexes for these subsections are listed in Table 25. These values reflect the percentage of teachers who recorded a favorable rating of 25% or less, 26%–50%, 51%–75%, or 76% or higher to the questions in each subsection.

High percentages of teachers responded with a favorable rating of 76% or higher on each individual subsection of the teacher survey. The subsections of professional development (88%), reading curriculum improvements (88%), and math curriculum improvements (81%) had the highest percentages of teachers who responded with a 76% or higher favorable rating. The math curriculum implementation subsection had the lowest percentage of teachers (52%) responding in the 76% or higher range, but still reflected the perceptions of more than half of the teachers in the ELO program. It also is apparent from Table 25 that each subsection had a very minute percentage of teachers reporting a 25% or less favorable rating for any subsection.

Teachers' perceptions on each subsection of the survey were also examined in terms of their teaching experience and teaching assignments from summer to fall. Teachers were first grouped into the four experience categories of 0–2, 3–7, 8–15, and more than 15 years' experience in MCPS and over their entire teaching career. Statistical differences in the percentages of teachers with favorable ratings of 76% or higher on each subsection were determined using the *z*-Test of Proportions.

Table 25. Percentage of Teachers with Positive Satisfaction Rating for Individual Subsections of ELO Teacher Survey

<i>N</i> =269	<i>n</i>	0%–25% Positive Responses	26%–50% Positive Responses	51%–75% Positive Responses	76%–100% Positive Responses
Reading Training (13 Questions)	242	5	12	14	69
Math Training (11 Questions)	242	5	17	17	62
Prof. Development (11 Questions)	266	1	3	8	88
Time & Materials (6 Questions)	265	5	13	19	64
Reading Curriculum Implementation (4 Questions)	263	1	11	27	61
Math Curriculum Implementation (4 Questions)	263	9	12	27	52
Reading Curriculum Improvements (5 Questions)	258	0	5	7	88
Math Curriculum Improvements (5 Questions)	258	2	7	10	81

Note: Percentages rounded to the nearest whole percent.

The perceptions of teachers with differing teaching experience were statistically significant from one another on only a few subsections. These subsections are the math curriculum implementation and improvements made to the math curriculum from the 2002 ELO program. Among teachers with more than 15 years’ teaching experience, 67% (*n*=29) reported a favorable rating of 75% or higher on the math curriculum implementation subsection. The corresponding percentages of teachers reporting a 76% or higher favorable rating was 44% (*n*=51) for teachers with 3–7 years’ experience and 43% for teachers with 8–15 years’ experience. These differences are statistically significant with *z* scores of 2.7 and 2.38.

Teachers with 3–7 years experience in MCPS also recorded a lower percentage with a favorable rating of 76% or higher regarding the math curriculum than all other teacher groups. Only 40% (*n*=118) of teachers with 3–7 years experience reported a 75% or higher favorable rating in comparison to 63% (*n*=47) of teachers with 0–2, 61% (*n*=17) of teachers with 8–15, and 67% (*n*=18) of teachers with more than 15 years’ experience. These findings are statistically different with *z* scores of 3.20, 2.05, and 2.79 respectively.

A lower percentage of teachers with 3–7 years’ total experience and experience in MCPS also responded with a favorable rating of 76% or higher to questions regarding improvements made to the math curriculum from the 2002 ELO program. The 77% (*n*=91) of teachers with 3–7 years’ total experience was statistically significantly lower than the 91% (*n*=38) of teachers with more than 15 years’ experience with a *z* score of 2.39. The 77% (*n*=92) of teachers with 3–7 years’ experience in MCPS also was statistically significantly lower than the 93% (*n*=25) of teachers with more than 15 years’ experience in MCPS with a *z* score of 2.56.

Since the framework underlying ELO staffing was geared to ensure that teachers would have the opportunity to familiarize themselves with students before the fall semester began, teachers' responses were studied to determine if statistically significant differences existed among teachers with differing teaching assignments from the summer program to the fall semester. There were no statistically significant differences in terms of teachers who taught the same grade or a different grade when the fall term began. The majority of responses in both groupings had a 76% or higher favorable rating. These results are highlighted in Table 26.

Table 26. Comparison of the Percentage of ELO Teachers with the Same and Different Grade Assignments from Summer to Fall 2003, with 76% or Higher Favorable Rating on Subsections of Teacher Survey

	Different Position Summer–Fall		Same Position Summer–Fall	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Reading Training (13 Questions)	142	70	100	68
Math Training (11 Questions)	142	65	100	57
Prof. Development (11 Questions)	156	87	110	90
Time & Materials (6 Questions)	156	64	109	64
Reading Curriculum Implementation (4 Questions)	155	59	108	63
Math Curriculum Implementation (4 Questions)	153	52	105	51
Reading Curriculum Improvements (5 Questions)	157	89	107	87
Math Curriculum Improvements (5 Questions)	157	80	104	83

None of the differences in these favorable ratings were statistically different. Regardless of assignment, teachers responded overwhelmingly in a positive manner. While teacher assignments necessarily affect the type of relationships they can build with students, it made no difference in their perceptions of the program as a whole. Given the high number of teachers who were assigned to a different grade when the fall 2003 semester began and the teacher recruitment issues mentioned by administrators, many teachers did not have the opportunity to familiarize themselves with the actual students they would work with when the fall semester began. Instead of starting the school year being familiar with the strengths and weaknesses of their students, many teachers were forced to develop these relationships in a more traditional manner.

Many of the findings presented above were detailed in the open-ended questions of the teacher survey. These questions provided teachers with the opportunity to expand on their perceptions of the strengths and weaknesses of the ELO program and to suggest changes for future implementations.

In terms of the strengths of the 2003 ELO program, seven mutually exclusive categories emerged. These categories focused on the benefits of the ELO program for students and teachers, flexibility of lessons, improvements to the curriculum, planning opportunities, training and support, materials, and assistance in the classroom.

The benefit of the ELO program for students and teachers category received numerous comments reiterated by participating teachers. Three specific comments emphasized the benefits of allowing students to preview new curricula ($n=22$), the enhancement of skills through the review and continuation of past material ($n=46$), and the impact of allowing teachers to become familiar with the strengths and needs of incoming students ($n=15$) (see Table 27). While the last comment was described as a benefit of the program as a whole, only 43% of teachers (see Page 52) had the same grade and school assignment from the summer to fall semester. Multiple teachers also made individual comments on the benefits of allowing teachers to have flexibility in lesson development. The one comment in this category reiterated by many teachers was related to the impact that flexibility can have on allowing differentiation for individual student needs ($n=25$).

Table 27. Top 10 Strengths of the 2003 Summer ELO Program from Teacher Survey ($N = 396$)

Strengths	<i>n</i>	%
Continuation, review, and enhancement of skills	46	12
Allows differentiation for student needs	25	6
Preview of new curriculum	22	6
Cooperative/collaborative time with teachers/teams	22	6
Positive support of entire school staff	19	5
Administration positive	18	5
Great benefit of volunteers	16	4
Become familiar with strengths and needs of incoming students	15	4
Great improvement	13	3
Available instructional materials	10	3
Other teachers	10	3
Reading guide very useful	10	3

Percentages rounded to the nearest whole percent.

The curriculum, planning, and support categories were three areas that received a variety of statements from teachers. The inclusion of a reading and math guide was one benefit that multiple teachers commented on specifically ($n=16$). In terms of planning, a number of teachers emphasized the time available for collaboration among teachers and/or teams ($n=22$). Comments regarding support and/or assistance in the classroom focused specifically on mentioning such activities as positive support from school staff ($n=19$), the impact of a positive administration ($n=18$), and the benefits of volunteers ($n=16$).

In reflecting on the weaknesses of the 2003 ELO summer program, teachers' responses were grouped into six distinct categories. One category focused on issues relevant to class size across all grade levels. A total of 40 out of 317 (or 13%) comments specifically mentioned the idea that classes contained too many students (see Table 28). A second category focused on issues with breakfast and lunch in the classroom. The majority of the comments in this category described this period as unpleasant and messy ($n=23$). A third category focused on issues regarding general curriculum problems. While there were a few comments on the reading curriculum, the majority of responses emphasized specific issues teachers had regarding the math curriculum. The two comments that were mentioned the most among teachers described the curriculum as being inappropriate ($n=14$) and addressed concerns regarding content (e.g., lessons and activities) and structure ($n=13$).

Table 28. Top Ten Comments Regarding Weaknesses of 2003 Summer ELO Program. $N = 317$

Weakness	n	%
Grade level classes too large/too many students	40	13
Not enough supplies, books, big books, or math manipulatives	29	9
Breakfast and lunch gross, unpleasant, and messy	23	7
Students need physical break (20 min outside, PE, music)	19	6
Need individual/team planning time	16	5
Absentee/tardiness interrupt instructional time	14	4
Math Curriculum inappropriate	14	4
Mathematics content (e.g., lessons and activities) and structure	13	4
Class make-up needs to be balanced (size, ability, speed)	9	3
Too much material to cover in 4 weeks	8	3
Math curriculum moves too quickly	8	3
No student data received	8	3

Percentages rounded to the nearest whole percent.

Having appropriate materials was another category mentioned by a number of ELO teachers. A total of 29 teachers expressed general concern for an inadequate supply of books and/or math manipulatives. Planning time and general program problems were two final categories where teachers highlighted some of their perceived weaknesses in the 2003 ELO program. In regard to planning, 16 teachers specifically mentioned the need to have more time dedicated to individual/team planning. General program concerns focused on the need for students to have some type of physical break (e.g., 20 minutes outside, physical education, or music) during the program ($n=19$) and the impact that absenteeism and tardiness have on interrupting instructional time ($n=14$). On the Likert-scale questions of the survey itself, 62% of all teachers stated that absenteeism affected instructional time.

The final question on the survey asked teachers to suggest changes for future ELO programs. There were 10 categories that emerged after all teachers' comments were compiled. Only the categories of breakfast and lunch in the classroom and general class improvements had statements reiterated by more than 20 teachers. Twenty-four teachers stated that the cafeteria should be used for meals instead of the classroom, and 33 teachers emphasized a need for smaller class size. This total accounts for 12% of the teachers who completed the survey, and who felt that class size was enough of an issue to emphasize it specifically in their open-ended responses. The 10 top comments regarding future changes reported by seven teachers are listed in Table 29.

Table 29. Top 10 Teachers' Recommended Changes for Future Summer ELO Programs ($N=260$)

Recommended Change	<i>n</i>	%
Smaller class size	33	13
No meals in classroom – use cafeteria	25	10
More planning time needed	16	6
Add more lessons and resource ideas for math curriculum	14	5
Provide break in instructional time	12	5
Change days of program (Mon-Thurs)/shorten day/start later	11	4
Provide materials/ resources necessary for lessons/centers	10	4
Need instructional aide support/volunteers	9	3
Add ESOL/special education class	9	3
Add a writing component to curriculum	7	3

Percentages rounded to the nearest whole percent.

While these numbers reported in Table 29 do not individually reflect a majority of the 269 teachers who completed the ELO survey, they serve as a guide for potential improvements that could be made to the program overall. These comments reflect some of the needs of teachers working in each of the ELO sites throughout MCPS. While providing program developers with needed talking points regarding the structure of the ELO program, they also serve as potential topics to reflect upon in future teacher training sessions. This type of communication will help investigate these concerns in more detail, and may help to assure teachers that their comments are invaluable for program improvements, thus, encouraging more detailed comments on future surveys.

PARENT SATISFACTION SURVEY

A 34-item Parent Satisfaction Survey was developed specifically for the ELO program. The majority of the survey questions utilized a Likert response scale that asked parents to indicate how strongly they agreed or disagreed with descriptive statements about the program. The survey was translated into Spanish and Vietnamese for parents who were fluent in these languages. The English language version of the Parent Satisfaction Survey is shown in Appendix H.

In September 2003, teachers distributed the survey to all students in the 18 participating ELO schools. Three weeks after distribution, a total of 1,412 completed surveys were returned to school staff via the students, yielding a response rate of 19.8%. The response rate was slightly higher for parents whose children attended the 2003 summer ELO program. Completed parent surveys were returned by 1,001 of the 4,856 participants who attended at least one day of ELO, yielding a response rate of 20.6%. Of the 2,270 students who were eligible to participate but did not attend ELO, 411 (or 18.1%) returned completed parent surveys. Though the overall response rates appear low, it is not atypical for surveys that are distributed and collected within a brief time span. One advantage of distributing the parent survey early in the school year and then encouraging a quick response is that the details of the summer activities are still easy for parents to remember. However, given the low response rates, the findings of the survey represent the views of those who completed the survey but cannot be generalized to the entire population of parents in the 18-school service area.

For parents of students who participated in the program, the Parent Satisfaction Survey assessed satisfaction with key indicators that are critical to the success of enrichment programs such as the following:

- Satisfaction with the curriculum
- Convenience of scheduling
- Communication between program staff and parents
- Perceived academic benefits to the student
- The likelihood that parents would enroll a student in future ELO programs
- Whether parents would recommend the ELO program to other parents

The survey also questioned the perceptions of parents whose students were eligible to participate in ELO, but did not enroll in the program. For parents who chose not to enroll a student in the program, the parent satisfaction survey assessed the following:

- Reasons for not enrolling in the program
- Summer activities in which the student participated
- The likelihood that the parent would enroll a student in future ELO programs

Overall Satisfaction of Participating Parents

Among the surveys returned, parent satisfaction ratings indicated overwhelmingly positive satisfaction with the ELO program. Ninety-three percent of the responding parents indicated that they would recommend the ELO program to other parents and 94% said they planned to enroll their child in the ELO program next summer, if it is offered.

An overall satisfaction index was created from 11 survey items on which responses could range from 1 = strongly disagree to 4 = strongly agree. The average of the responses across all 11 questions formed the index score. When parent responses were separated according to the child's grade level, overall parent satisfaction was uniformly high across all grade levels, with average ratings that ranged from 3.40 to 3.52 on a 4-point scale. The differences between ratings at each grade level were not statistically significant. The overall satisfaction ratings of parents with children enrolled in ESOL, Gifted and Talented, magnet programs and Linkages to Learning programs showed similarly high levels of satisfaction with average ratings ranging from 3.35 to 3.61. Some differences that exist in the average ratings were statistically significant. The results are shown in Tables 30 and 31.

Table 30. Parent Satisfaction, by Grade Level

	Mean	SD	<i>n</i>
Kindergarten	3.52	.50	153
Grade 1	3.46	.48	157
Grade 2	3.52	.52	152
Grade 3	3.48	.46	118
Grade 4	3.40	.48	79

Table 31. Parent Satisfaction, by Educational Program

	Mean	SD	<i>n</i>
ESOL	3.59	.46	205
Linkages to Learning	3.61	.42	73
Magnet Program	3.49	.49	24
Special Education	n.a.	n.a.	53
Gifted and Talented	3.35	.47	45
Other	3.44	.47	48

n.a. - data not available

The Parent Satisfaction Survey did not include demographic information, so the satisfaction ratings of racial/ethnic groups could not be compared.

The items of the parent satisfaction survey were aggregated into the following four content categories to provide a more detailed analysis of parent views:

- **Information**—Adequacy and timeliness of information provided by the ELO program
- **Curriculum**—quality of staff and educational program
- **Benefit**—perceived benefits to the child
- **Schedule**—convenience of ELO session dates and daily schedule

Questions that shared the same thematic content were grouped together to create the satisfaction categories. Thereafter, the average of the respondents’ scores across all of the questions in the category was calculated. Table 32 shows the average satisfaction rating for each content category. The satisfaction ratings ranged from 3.44 to 3.54 on a 4-point scale, indicating an exceptionally high degree of satisfaction across all of the content categories.

Table 32. Parent Satisfaction, by Satisfaction Category

	Mean	SD	<i>n</i>
Information	3.45	.52	897
Curriculum	3.54	.52	942
Benefit	3.50	.56	967
Schedule	3.44	.63	762

In addition to considering parent responses to specific satisfaction categories, analyses also considered parent responses to individual questions. With the exception of one question, the percentage of parents who reported that they agreed or strongly agreed with the positive content of the satisfaction statements ranged from 83% to 95%. Fewer parents (74%) were satisfied with the scheduling of the daily ending time of the ELO program (Question 13). The results are shown in Table 33.

Satisfaction with the Afternoon ELO Program

Among the surveys returned, 215 parents indicated that their children attended the afternoon activities of the ELO program. Responses to five survey items on the satisfaction survey involving the afternoon ELO program ranged from 1 = strongly disagree to 4 = strongly agree. Parent satisfaction ratings indicated overwhelming positive satisfaction with the afternoon ELO program. The analysis of these data included calculations of the mean of parent responses to individual items as well as the percentages of parents who reported that they agreed or strongly agreed with the positive content of the satisfaction statements involving the curriculum and benefits of the afternoon ELO program. The results are shown in Table 34. The percentage of parents who reported that they agreed or strongly agreed ranged from 86% to 88%. However, fewer parents (77%) agreed that the afternoon activities added to the morning lessons. It is

important to note that 86% of parents whose children attended the afternoon ELO program needed a full-day program so that their children could participate. It appears that adding the afternoon session to the ELO program resulted in 158 additional participants who would not have participated otherwise.

Table 33. Parent Satisfaction, by Survey Question

Survey Item #	Question	Content Area	Mean	SD	Agreed or Strongly Agreed	
					<i>n</i>	%
Q1	Brochure easy to understand	Information	3.49	.57	966	95
Q2	Received info. in time	Information	3.60	.58	939	92
Q11	Received regular feedback	Information	3.25	.77	962	83
Q12	Satisfied with start time	Schedule	3.46	.64	915	87
Q13	Satisfied with end time	Schedule	3.36	.68	799	74
Q14	Satisfied with July	Schedule	3.49	.58	977	95
Q15	Satisfied with ELO teachers	Curriculum	3.52	.61	970	93
Q16	Small class size was helpful	Curriculum	3.57	.56	966	95
Q17	Satisfied with education received	Curriculum	3.53	.59	979	95
Q18	Helped child with school work	Benefit	3.48	.61	978	93
Q19	Child was better prepared for next grade	Benefit	3.45	.64	978	92
Q21	Child enjoyed ELO	Benefit	3.54	.60	985	95

Table 34. Parent Satisfaction with Afternoon ELO, by Survey Question

Survey Item #	Question	Content Area	Mean	SD	Agreed or Strongly Agreed	
					<i>n</i>	%
Q27	Satisfied with activities offered	Curriculum	3.50	.61	200	88
Q30	Afternoon activities added to lessons in the morning	Curriculum	3.28	.77	192	77
Q28	Increased child's interest in ELO	Benefit	3.45	.72	201	87
Q29	Child enjoyed afternoon activities	Benefit	3.49	.72	199	86
Q31	Needed full-day program for child to participate	Schedule	3.38	.75	184	86

Reasons for Nonparticipation in the ELO Program

Twenty-nine percent of the returned surveys were completed by parents who chose not to enroll their students in the 2003 summer ELO program. Six survey items asked parents about factors that influenced their decision. For each factor, analyses identified the number of parents who indicated that the factor was influential. The results are shown in Table 35.

The most common reasons that parents gave for not participating were “conflict with vacation plans,” and “wanting the child to have a break from school activities.” Only 99 parents (24% of the responding parents) reported more than one reason for their nonparticipation, suggesting that the presence of one obstacle is enough for parents to decide not to participate.

Table 35. Reasons for not Participating in ELO

	<i>n</i>	%	Survey Item #
Conflicted with family vacation	122	30	5A
Wanted my child to take a break from school	90	21	5C
Child did not want to attend	52	13	5B
Conflicted with child care arrangements	38	9	5E
Did not know how to enroll in ELO	30	7	5D
Was not able to register for the afternoon	15	4	5F

Responses to a survey question about whether nonparticipating parents intended to enroll a child in the ELO program in 2003 indicated that the largest proportion of nonparticipating parents (45%) might enroll a child in the ELO program next year, while 24% of the nonparticipating parents indicated that they would enroll a child in ELO next year. Only 27% of the parents stated that they would not participate in future ELO programs. The large percentage (69%) of nonparticipating parents who would consider enrolling a child in future ELO programs suggests that the expressed obstacles to ELO participation are not insurmountable. For example, parents may be more likely to enroll if they are informed early enough to schedule vacation dates and camp plans so as not to conflict with the ELO session dates.

As shown in Table 36, the majority of students who did not participate in ELO, attended summer camp or remained at home with family members.

Table 36. Summer Activities of Non-ELO Students

	<i>n</i>	%	Survey Item #
Stayed at home with family members	226	55	6B
Went to summer camp	141	34	6A
Other	108	26	6F
Went to child day care center or babysitter	63	15	6D
Went to tutor to help him/her with school work	4	1	6E

Few parents relied on babysitting and informal tutoring as their primary summer activities. Instead, parents who send children to camp and parents who provide summer activities at home seek to provide a variety of recreational, academic, and social activities in a safe environment with caring adults. Thus, expanding the academic learning component of ELO to include structured afternoon activities in a supportive setting might have great appeal to this large group of parents who are considering enrolling students in future ELO programs.

Parent Satisfaction with Improvements to the 2003 ELO Program

Approximately 52% of the parents who completed the satisfaction survey indicated that their children attended the 2002 ELO program. These parents completed five survey items that involved improvements evident in the 2003 ELO program that were not included in the 2002 program. Possible responses on these survey items were strongly disagree (coded a 1); disagree (2); neutral (3); agree (4); and strongly agree (5). The analysis of these data included calculations of the mean of parent responses to individual items as well as the percentages of parents who reported that they agreed or strongly agreed that the program improved in the content areas of information, curriculum, and benefits. The results are shown in Table 37. The percentage of parents who reported that they agreed or strongly agreed ranged from 83% to 90%, indicating overwhelming satisfaction with the improvements made to the 2003 summer ELO program.

Table 37. Parent Perceptions of Improvements to ELO, by Survey Question

Survey Item #	Question	Content Area	Mean	SD	Agreed or Strongly Agreed	
					<i>n</i>	%
Q33a	Improved on informing me about the program	Information	4.24	.79	472	88
Q33b	Improved in giving information in time to plan given other summer plans	Information	4.36	.74	478	90
Q33c	Improved program by adding the afternoon activities	Curriculum	4.11	.93	441	80
Q33d	Improved the overall organization of the program	Curriculum	4.22	.79	450	84
Q33e	Improved by providing more opportunities to build relationship with my child's teacher	Benefit	4.12	.89	457	83

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Extended Learning Opportunities (ELO) initiative is part of the MCPS' Early Success Performance Plan, whose primary objective is to reduce the academic achievement gaps between children from the majority, middle-class white households and minority children, especially those from low-income households and households where English is not the primary language. The 2003 summer Extended Learning Opportunities (ELO) program seeks to meet the academic needs of each student either by providing opportunity to catch up on grade-level concepts and skills or by accelerating learning by previewing concepts and skills to be taught in the grade students will enter in the fall, with the ultimate goal of having all students on grade at the beginning of the school year. The evaluation of the 2003 summer ELO program, presented in this report, is designed to provide information that will assist MCPS leadership team and program managers to (a) determine if the goals of the 2003 ELO summer program were achieved and (b) make more appropriate decisions about the design of instruction delivery systems of the ELO summer program in subsequent years. The findings and recommendations derived from the evaluation of the 2003 summer ELO program are summarized below.

Findings

Student recruitment efforts for the 2003 summer ELO program were largely successful, especially among families whose students are most impacted by limited English language proficiency, poverty, and students in the lower grades.

- Approximately 75% of eligible students registered to participate in the 2003 summer ELO program.
- The recruitment rate for the 2003 summer ELO program year was 7 percentage points higher than last year's rate.
- Whereas 76% of eligible African American and 78% of eligible Hispanic students registered for the program, only 56% of white students registered. Similarly, while 85% of students receiving ESOL services and 80% of those participating in FARMS registered for the 2003 summer ELO program, only 67% of the non-FARMS group did so.
- Recruitment rates decreased progressively the higher the grade level, from 87% among kindergarten students to 67% among Grade 4 students.

Students' attendance strategies for the current program year were more successful relative to last year's attendance strategies.

- The average attendance for students that showed up and enrolled was 16.3 days.
- More than 73% of the students that showed up attended 16 or more days of ELO programming. This is 7 percentage points higher than last year's attendance.

Classroom teachers that taught during the 2003 summer ELO program have identical educational credentials as kindergarten through Grade 4 classroom teachers in Title I schools, but less so than all kindergarten through Grade 4 classroom teachers in MCPS.

- 2003 summer ELO teachers are virtually identical to their peers in the district's 18 Title I schools in total teaching experience (7.97 years for ELO teachers v. 8.24 years for Title I

teachers), teaching experience with MCPS (5.91 years v. 5.84 years), highest education level (master's degree for both groups), and number of certifications (2.08 v. 2.04).

- MCPS' teachers in K through Grade 4 have a mean average total teaching experience of 2.5 years higher than ELO teachers and a relatively higher percentage of all MCPS K–4 teachers have advanced degrees and are certified in early childhood and elementary education.

Students who attended the 2003 summer ELO program for 16 days or more had higher posttest-pretest improvements in all grades and in both reading and mathematics when compared with cohorts who did not attend the program or attended 5 days or fewer. However, the higher posttest-pretest improvement was statistically and educationally significant for only Grade 4 students in mathematics.

On the average, the 2003 summer ELO program had academic benefits in both reading/language arts and mathematics for the student groups that are most impacted by limited English language proficiency and poverty.

- Among kindergarten students, white and ESOL students who attended 16 days or more of the ELO program posted higher posttest scores in reading. White students who attended 16 days or more of the 2003 summer ELO program demonstrated mastery of about a 0.5 foundational skill higher than those who did not attend ELO or attended five or fewer days. In mathematics, the subgroups of kindergarten students that showed the academic benefits of ELO are Hispanics, ESOL, and FARMS.
- African American and FARMS Grade 1 students who attended 16 or more days of ELO posted higher academic achievement gains in both reading and mathematics, relative to those who did not attend or attended five or fewer days. In addition, Hispanic, non-ESOL, and Both ESOL/FARMS students appear to benefit academically from attending 16 or more days of ELO.
- The 2003 summer ELO program had academic benefits in reading for Grade 2 Asian American students, while ESOL and Not Both ESOL/FARMS students had academic benefits in mathematics for attending the ELO program for 16 or more days.
- Among Grade 3 students, only the FARMS subgroup saw academic benefits in mathematics for attending ELO the program. None of the subgroups benefited academically in reading as a result of participating in the 2003 summer ELO program.
- Among Grade 4 students, the 2003 summer ELO program did not have academic benefit in reading for students who attended 16 or more days, but almost all subgroups of students had academic benefits in mathematics for attending 16 or more days of ELO.

The 2003 summer ELO administrators (i.e., principals and assistant principals) expressed overall satisfaction with the implementation of the 2003 summer ELO program.

- Survey questions pertaining to program design, planning, and implementation received a mean satisfaction rating of 86% with a median satisfaction rating of 93%.
- The satisfaction rating for staffing and administrative support activities was slightly lower, with a mean score of 76% and a median score of 81%.
- Administrators recorded the lowest satisfaction ratings regarding the strategies and resources used for student recruitment, with a mean score of 66% and a median score of 75%.

Though overall satisfaction with the 2003 summer ELO program was high among administrators, satisfaction rates tended to vary by subgroup. Assistant principals and administrators who participated in the program before and during the summer had lower satisfaction rates.

- Overall, assistant principals recorded a mean satisfaction rating of 75% compared with an 85% satisfaction rating for principals.
- The largest percentage difference in overall satisfaction rates was recorded for the subsection of the survey regarding student recruitment. The average satisfaction rating for assistant principals dropped to 55% compared with 79% for principals.
- Administrators who participated before and during the program's implementation recorded an average satisfaction score of 77% compared with 87% recorded for administrators who participated in ELO sites after the program ended.
- The largest percentage difference between administrators who participated in the program during and after summer was recorded, also, for the subsection of the survey regarding student recruitment. The average satisfaction rating for administrators who participated before and during the program's implementation was 60% compared with 89% for administrators who participated in ELO schools after the program ended.

2003 summer ELO program teachers were highly satisfied with the program, though satisfaction rates varied by section areas.

- Overall satisfaction rate among ELO teachers was 77%.
- The survey subsections of professional development (88%), reading curriculum improvements (88%), and math curriculum improvements (81%) had the highest percentages of teachers who responded with a 76% or higher favorable rating.
- The math curriculum implementation subsection had the lowest percentage of teachers (52%) responding in the 76% or higher satisfaction range, but still reflected positive perceptions of more than half of the teachers who completed the survey.

ELO teachers' satisfaction in the areas of math curriculum implementation and improvements made to the math curriculum from the 2002 summer ELO program varied by teaching experience. More experienced teachers were more satisfied with the program.

- Among teachers with more than 15 years' teaching experience, 67% ($n=29$) reported a favorable rating of 75% or higher on the math curriculum implementation subsection. The corresponding percentages of teachers reporting a 76% or higher favorable rating was 44% ($n=51$) for teachers with 3–7 years experience and 43% for teachers with 8–15 years experience.
- A lower percentage of teachers with 3–7 years total experience, including experience in MCPS, also responded with a favorable rating of 76% or higher to questions regarding improvements made to the math curriculum from the 2002 ELO program.

More than half of the ELO teachers stated that they did not have the opportunity to teach the same grade as their regular school year assignments during the ELO program.

- During the 2003 fall semester, only 43% ($n=82$) of teachers were assigned to the same school and grade as they were in the ELO program. A total of 56% ($n=105$) of teachers were assigned to the same school, but a different grade.

- Teachers with different assignments from summer to fall did not record statistically different satisfaction ratings. Differing assignments did not affect teachers' satisfaction levels.

ELO teachers expressed that class sizes were too large during the 2003 summer ELO program, notwithstanding that class sizes during the program were still smaller than during the regular school year.

- Class size is one of the most mentioned negative features of the 2003 summer ELO program. Class size being a negative feature was mentioned by 40 teachers.
- Reduction in class size was the recommended change in future summer ELO programs suggested most by the teachers. Thirty-three teachers made this recommendation.

Parents whose children attended the 2003 summer ELO program were overwhelmingly satisfied with all aspect of the program. The satisfaction rates did not vary appreciably by the grade or level of their child.

- Parents' satisfaction rates with the information provided them about the 2003 summer ELO program ranged from 83% for receiving regular feedback to 95% for the 2003 summer ELO program brochures being easy to read and understand.
- Satisfaction rates for curriculum items were equally high, in the 95 percentile range among responding parents.

Parents of ELO students believe that the program helped their child academically.

- Ninety-two percent of parents agreed that the 2003 summer ELO program helped prepared the child for the next grade.
- The percentages of parents who indicated that they were satisfied with the ELO teachers, class size, and the education their children received ranged from 93% to 95%.

A substantial percentage of parents reported that they enrolled their children in the ELO program because of the availability of the afternoon program.

- Eighty-six percent of parents whose children attended the afternoon ELO program reported that they needed a full-day program so that their children could participate.

The majority of parents of children who attended the ELO program in 2002 and 2003 indicated satisfaction with the improvements to the ELO program.

- The percentages of parents who reported that they agreed with the survey items involving the improvements to communication of information, curriculum, and academic benefits evident in the 2003 ELO program ranged from 83% to 90%.
- It is recommended that these improvements continue.

Parents whose children participated in the 2003 summer ELO program would enroll their children in program in the future and would recommend the program to other parents.

- The percentage of parents who indicated that they planned to enroll their child in the ELO program next summer and that they would recommend the ELO program to other parents ranged from 93% to 94%.

Conflict with vacation was the most cited reason for not participating in the 2003 summer ELO program among parents whose students were eligible for ELO but did not participate

- Thirty percent of parents reported conflict with family vacation as reason for their student not attending the 2003 summer ELO program. Another 21% of parents reported that their child needed a break from school.

The majority of students who were eligible for ELO but did not participate stayed at home with family members or went to summer camp.

- Fifty-five percent of parents indicated that their children stayed at home with family members, while 34% indicated that their child went to summer camp.

Recommendations

1. Review the student population that should be served by future summer ELO programs.

The evaluation findings of the 2003 summer ELO program suggest students who are the most impacted by limited English language proficiency and poverty received the most benefits from participating in the program. To ensure the program's cost-effectiveness/cost-efficiency, it is important to review existing literature of summer programs to identify those subgroups of students who will benefit most academically from programs similar to the MCPS summer ELO program. The summer ELO program should target these subgroups.

2. Intensify student attendance strategies.

While student attendance rates increased during the 2003 summer ELO program, ELO teachers expressed that students' tardiness and absenteeism were major problems that had a negative impact on their ability to complete daily instructional objectives. New strategies to encourage on-time student attendance should be developed for future summer ELO programs.

3. Continue to fund and seek additional funds for afternoon activities.

Parents reported that the afternoon activities in the area of arts, humanities, and recreation added value to the 2003 summer ELO program. In addition, 86% of parents whose children attended the afternoon activities stated that they needed full-day programming for their children during the summer. It is important to continue to provide afternoon activities during future summer ELO programs in order to attract parents who need full-day services. This also will help boost student attendance rates.

4. Review student class-size recommendation and enforce established class-size limit.

A review of student class assignments showed that a substantial number of classrooms had more than the recommended number of students, especially in the early grades (i.e., kindergarten through Grade 2). This finding is supported by information gathered from the ELO teacher survey. A substantial percentage of ELO teachers responding to the survey stated that the numbers of students in their classrooms were too high to meet daily instructional objectives. Reduction in class size was the most recommended change proposed by the teachers for future summer ELO programs. In this light, program planners

should review the teacher-student ratio and develop a protocol to ensure that no future summer ELO classroom contains more than the recommended number of students.

5. Re-examine the ELO mathematics curriculum.

While ELO teachers noted improvements in the ELO mathematics curriculum over the 2002 program, a substantial percentage of them still expressed dissatisfaction with the curriculum. Items relating to the mathematics curriculum had the lowest satisfaction rates in the ELO teacher survey. The ELO mathematics curriculum should be re-examined to determine the sources of this dissatisfaction.

6. Review ELO assessment instruments.

Reliability and factor loading estimates reported in this report suggest that the assessment instruments from which the students' achievement outcome measures were gathered are adequate (i.e., technically appropriate in terms of their internal consistency). This conclusion notwithstanding, it is still not known to what extent these instruments are sensitive enough to capture change in student academic achievement levels that is likely to result from a four-week program. In order to continue to use these instruments, a review and validity study of these instruments must be conducted to ensure that they produce valid and reliable measures of change in student achievement levels resulting from a four-week program.

REFERENCES

- Datnow, A, Borman, G.D., Stringfield, S., Overman, L.T., & Castellano, M. (2003). Comprehensive school reforming culturally and linguistically diverse contexts: Implication and outcomes from a four-year study. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* (2) 25, pp. 143–170.
- Fountas, I.C., & Pinnell, G.S. (1996). *Guided reading: Good first teaching for all children*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Montgomery County Public Schools. (2003, May). *Early success performance plan: Educational reform in the Montgomery County Public Schools*. Rockville, MD: Board of Education.
- Montgomery County Public Schools. (1999, November). *Raising the bar and closing the gap because all children matter*. Rockville, MD: Board of Education.
- Nielsen, J.L., & Cooper-Martin, E. (2002). *Evaluation of the Montgomery County Public Schools assessment program: Kindergarten and Grade 1 reading report*. Rockville, MD: Montgomery County Public Schools, Office of Shared Accountability.
- No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*, 170th Cong., 1st Sess. (January 3, 2001).
- Raber, S. (2000). *Reading initiative study, year 2 assessment report*. Rockville, MD: Montgomery County Public Schools, Office of Shared Accountability.
- Sunmonu, K.K, Larson, J, Van Horn, Y, Cooper-Martin, & Nielsen (2002). *Evaluation of the Extended Learning Opportunities Summer Program*. Rockville, MD: Montgomery County Public Schools, Office of Shared Accountability.

Appendices

APPENDIX A

Title I Schools

1. Broad Acres Elementary School
2. Burnt Mills Elementary School
3. East Silver Spring Elementary School
4. Gaithersburg Elementary School
5. Harmony Hills Elementary School
6. Highland Elementary School
7. Highland View Elementary School
8. Kemp Mill Elementary School
9. Montgomery Knolls Elementary School
10. New Hampshire Estates Elementary School
11. Oak View Elementary School
12. Pines Crest Elementary School
13. Rolling Terrace Elementary School
14. Rosemont Elementary School
15. Summit Hall Elementary School
16. Viers Mill Elementary School
17. Weller Road Elementary School
18. Wheaton Woods Elementary School

APPENDIX B

ANOVA Parameter Estimates for Kindergarten Mathematics (Review Place Value and Number Sense Concepts) Posttest Percentage Scores

Parameter	<i>B</i>	Std. Error	<i>t</i>	Sig.	95% Conf. Interval		Partial Eta Squared	Noncent. Parameter	Observed Power (a)
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound			
Intercept	73.130	2.499	29.265	.000	68.224	78.035	.527	29.265	1.000
Non-ELO	-8.725	3.679	-2.372	.018	-15.946	-1.504	.007	2.372	.659
Non-ESOL	12.122	4.574	2.650	.008	3.143	21.102	.009	2.650	.754
Non-FARMS	6.336	3.502	1.809	.071	-.539	13.212	.004	1.809	.439
Not Both ESOL/FARMS	-3.046	5.282	-.577	.564	-13.416	7.323	.000	.577	.089
White	7.712	4.576	1.685	.092	-1.272	16.695	.004	1.685	.391
Asian American	10.176	3.990	2.550	.011	2.343	18.008	.008	2.550	.721
African American	4.148	3.284	1.263	.207	-2.297	10.594	.002	1.263	.243
Male	-.894	2.441	-.366	.714	-5.686	3.898	.000	.366	.065
Non-ELO * Non-ESOL	5.671	6.636	.855	.393	-7.356	18.697	.001	.855	.137
Non-ELO * Non-FARMS	2.140	5.161	.415	.679	-7.992	12.272	.000	.415	.070
Non-ELO * Not Both ESOL/FARMS	-3.244	7.765	-.418	.676	-18.487	11.999	.000	.418	.070
Non-ELO * White	4.199	6.740	.623	.533	-9.032	17.431	.001	.623	.095
Non-ELO * Asian American	1.557	5.825	.267	.789	-9.878	12.991	.000	.267	.058
Non-ELO * African American	3.645	4.902	.743	.457	-5.979	13.268	.001	.743	.115
Non-ELO * Male	-1.124	3.617	-.311	.756	-8.224	5.977	.000	.311	.061

Note: (a) Computed using alpha = .05

ANOVA Parameter Estimates for Kindergarten Reading (Total # of Foundational Skill) Posttest

Parameter	B	Std. Error	t	Sig.	95% Conf. Interval		Partial Eta Squared	Noncent. Parameter	Observed Power(a)
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound			
Intercept	.500	.124	4.041	.000	.257	.743	.017	4.041	.981
Non-ELO	-.022	.181	-.122	.903	-.376	.332	.000	.122	.052
Non-ESOL	1.541	.224	6.883	.000	1.102	1.981	.048	6.883	1.000
Non-FARMS	.793	.174	4.559	.000	.452	1.134	.021	4.559	.995
Not Both ESOL/FARMS	-.561	.262	-2.144	.032	-1.075	-.048	.005	2.144	.572
White	1.094	.226	4.839	.000	.650	1.538	.024	4.839	.998
Asian American	.642	.203	3.167	.002	.244	1.040	.010	3.167	.886
African American	.545	.162	3.359	.001	.227	.863	.012	3.359	.919
Male	-.241	.121	-1.981	.048	-.479	-.002	.004	1.981	.508
Non-ELO * Non-ESOL	.374	.324	1.155	.248	-.261	1.009	.001	1.155	.211
Non-ELO * Non-FARMS	.216	.255	.846	.398	-.284	.715	.001	.846	.135
Non-ELO * Not Both ESOL/FARMS	-.419	.377	-1.110	.267	-1.159	.322	.001	1.110	.198
Non-ELO * White	-.658	.336	-1.957	.051	-1.318	.002	.004	1.957	.498
Non-ELO * Asian American	-.133	.291	-.457	.648	-.705	.439	.000	.457	.074
Non-ELO * African American	-.270	.237	-1.138	.255	-.736	.196	.001	1.138	.206
Non-ELO * Male	.192	.176	1.088	.277	-.154	.537	.001	1.088	.192

Note: (a) Computed using alpha = .05

APPENDIX C

ANOVA Parameter Estimates for Grade 1 Reading (Text Reading Level) Pretest-Posttest Change

Parameter	<i>B</i>	Std. Error	<i>t</i>	Sig.	95% Conf. Interval		Partial Eta Squared	Noncent. Parameter	Observed Power(a)
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound			
Intercept	1.185	.346	3.420	.001	.505	1.865	.014	3.420	.927
Pretest Reading Level	-.068	.020	-3.377	.001	-.108	-.029	.014	3.377	.921
Non-ELO	-.638	.634	-1.006	.315	-1.882	.607	.001	1.006	.171
Partial-ELO	-.549	.653	-.841	.401	-1.831	.732	.001	.841	.134
Non-ESOL	.516	.621	.831	.406	-.703	1.736	.001	.831	.132
Non-FARMS	.397	.273	1.457	.145	-.138	.933	.003	1.457	.307
Not Both ESOL/FARMS	-.042	.709	-.060	.952	-1.435	1.350	.000	.060	.050
White	.716	.464	1.545	.123	-.194	1.626	.003	1.545	.338
Asian American	-.173	.395	-.439	.660	-.948	.601	.000	.439	.072
African American	.403	.289	1.394	.164	-.164	.970	.002	1.394	.286
Male	-.402	.238	-1.686	.092	-.870	.066	.003	1.686	.391
Non-ELO * Non-ESOL	-.559	1.183	-.473	.637	-2.882	1.763	.000	.473	.076
Partial-ELO * Non-ESOL	-.059	1.178	-.051	.960	-2.371	2.252	.000	.051	.050
Non-ELO * Non-FARMS	.199	.412	.484	.629	-.609	1.007	.000	.484	.077
Partial-ELO * Non-FARMS	.658	.560	1.176	.240	-.441	1.756	.002	1.176	.217
Non-ELO * Not Both ESOL/FARMS	.636	1.345	.473	.636	-2.004	3.276	.000	.473	.076
Partial-ELO * Not Both ESOL/FARMS	-.318	1.354	-.235	.814	-2.975	2.339	.000	.235	.056
Non-ELO * White	-.025	.615	-.040	.968	-1.232	1.183	.000	.040	.050
Non-ELO * Asian American	.611	.602	1.016	.310	-.570	1.793	.001	1.016	.174
Non-ELO * African American	-.090	.454	-.198	.843	-.982	.802	.000	.198	.055
Partial-ELO * White	-.491	.878	-.560	.576	-2.215	1.232	.000	.560	.087
Partial-ELO * Asian American	.934	.710	1.314	.189	-.461	2.328	.002	1.314	.259
Partial-ELO * African American	.075	.574	.130	.897	-1.053	1.202	.000	.130	.052
Non-ELO * Male	.097	.365	.266	.790	-.620	.814	.000	.266	.058
Partial-ELO * Male	.347	.466	.745	.456	-.568	1.262	.001	.745	.115

Note: (a) Computed using alpha = .05

ANOVA Parameter Estimates for Grade 1 Mathematics (Review Place Value and Number Sense Concepts) Pretest-Posttest
Percentage Change

Parameter	B	Std. Error	t	Sig.	95% Conf Interval		Partial Eta Squared	Noncent. Parameter	Observed Power(a)
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound			
Intercept	54.926	2.592	21.189	.000	49.840	60.013	.294	21.189	1.000
Pretest Math Review Score (%)	-.675	.027	-25.177	.000	-.727	-.622	.371	25.177	1.000
Non-ELO	-5.870	2.768	-2.121	.034	-11.301	-.439	.004	2.121	.563
Partial-ELO	-3.311	3.026	-1.094	.274	-9.248	2.626	.001	1.094	.194
Non-ESOL	2.923	2.674	1.093	.275	-2.323	8.169	.001	1.093	.194
Non-FARMS	-1.514	1.548	-.979	.328	-4.551	1.522	.001	.979	.165
Not Both ESOL/FARMS	3.392	3.065	1.107	.269	-2.623	9.407	.001	1.107	.198
White	3.370	2.515	1.340	.181	-1.565	8.304	.002	1.340	.268
Asian American	.295	2.262	.130	.896	-4.144	4.733	.000	.130	.052
African American	1.296	1.512	.857	.391	-1.670	4.262	.001	.857	.137
Male	-.360	1.236	-.291	.771	-2.784	2.065	.000	.291	.060
Non-ELO * Non-ESOL	-.370	6.879	-.054	.957	-13.867	13.128	.000	.054	.050
Partial-ELO * Non-ESOL	-1.971	5.633	-.350	.726	-13.024	9.081	.000	.350	.064
Non-ELO * Non-FARMS	3.406	2.456	1.387	.166	-1.413	8.225	.002	1.387	.283
Partial-ELO * Non-FARMS	1.085	3.145	.345	.730	-5.087	7.257	.000	.345	.064
Non-ELO * Not Both ESOL/FARMS	3.166	7.397	.428	.669	-11.347	17.680	.000	.428	.071
Partial-ELO * Not Both ESOL/FARMS	6.327	6.379	.992	.321	-6.189	18.843	.001	.992	.168
Non-ELO * White	.880	3.715	.237	.813	-6.409	8.168	.000	.237	.056
Non-ELO * Asian American	1.642	3.983	.412	.680	-6.172	9.457	.000	.412	.070
Non-ELO * African American	-1.645	2.545	-.646	.518	-6.639	3.349	.000	.646	.099
Partial-ELO * White	-6.736	4.905	-1.373	.170	-16.361	2.888	.002	1.373	.279
Partial-ELO * Asian American	-.119	4.173	-.029	.977	-8.307	8.069	.000	.029	.050
Partial-ELO * African American	-2.011	2.972	-.677	.499	-7.843	3.821	.000	.677	.104
Non-ELO * Male	-.038	2.079	-.018	.985	-4.117	4.041	.000	.018	.050
Partial-ELO * Male	.795	2.431	.327	.744	-3.976	5.565	.000	.327	.062

Note: (a) Computed using alpha = .05

APPENDIX D

ANOVA Parameter Estimates for Grade 2 Reading (Text Reading Level) Pretest-Posttest Gain

Parameter	<i>B</i>	Std. Error	<i>t</i>	Sig.	95% Conf. Interval		Partial Eta Squared	Noncent. Parameter	Observed Power(a)
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound			
Intercept	.423	.475	.891	.373	-.509	1.355	.001	.891	.144
Pretest Reading Level	.002	.022	.096	.924	-.040	.044	.000	.096	.051
Non-ELO	-.676	.802	-.844	.399	-2.250	.897	.001	.844	.134
Partial-ELO	.092	1.043	.088	.930	-1.956	2.139	.000	.088	.051
Non-ESOL	.803	.490	1.640	.101	-.158	1.764	.003	1.640	.374
Non-FARMS	.336	.479	.701	.483	-.604	1.276	.001	.701	.108
White	-.749	.783	-.957	.339	-2.285	.787	.001	.957	.159
Asian American	1.725	.720	2.395	.017	.312	3.139	.006	2.395	.667
African American	.804	.459	1.752	.080	-.097	1.705	.003	1.752	.417
Male	-.541	.383	-1.414	.158	-1.292	.210	.002	1.414	.292
Non-ELO * Non-ESOL	-.270	.882	-.306	.759	-2.002	1.461	.000	.306	.061
Partial-ELO * Non-ESOL	-.316	1.165	-.271	.786	-2.601	1.970	.000	.271	.058
Non-ELO * Non-FARMS	-.013	.700	-.019	.985	-1.387	1.361	.000	.019	.050
Partial-ELO * Non-FARMS	.246	1.065	.231	.817	-1.844	2.337	.000	.231	.056
Non-ELO * White	2.715	1.004	2.704	.007	.744	4.687	.008	2.704	.771
Non-ELO * Asian American	-2.202	1.036	-2.126	.034	-4.236	-.169	.005	2.126	.565
Non-ELO * African American	.854	.755	1.131	.259	-.628	2.336	.001	1.131	.204
Partial-ELO * White	3.039	1.471	2.066	.039	.152	5.926	.005	2.066	.541
Partial-ELO * Asian American	-1.240	1.437	-.863	.389	-4.060	1.581	.001	.863	.138
Partial-ELO * African American	-1.459	1.172	-1.245	.213	-3.759	.840	.002	1.245	.238
Non-ELO * Male	-.380	.586	-.649	.516	-1.529	.769	.000	.649	.099
Partial-ELO * Male	.177	.862	.205	.837	-1.515	1.869	.000	.205	.055

Note: (a) Computed using alpha = .05

ANOVA Parameter Estimates for Grade 2 Mathematics (Review Place Value and Number Sense Concepts) Pretest-Posttest
Percentage Change

Parameter	B	Std. Error	t	Sig.	95% Conf. Interval		Partial Eta Squared	Noncent. Parameter	Observed Power(a)
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound			
Intercept	25.675	2.083	12.326	.000	21.588	29.761	.109	12.326	1.000
Pretest Math Review Score (%)	-.441	.022	-19.658	.000	-.485	-.397	.238	19.658	1.000
Non-ELO	-3.470	2.978	-1.165	.244	-9.311	2.372	.001	1.165	.214
Partial-ELO	-.439	3.619	-.121	.903	-7.539	6.661	.000	.121	.052
Non-ESOL	6.534	3.233	2.021	.043	.191	12.876	.003	2.021	.524
Non-FARMS	-2.412	1.738	-1.388	.165	-5.822	.998	.002	1.388	.284
Not Both ESOL/FARMS	-.784	3.575	-.219	.826	-7.797	6.229	.000	.219	.056
White	.258	2.975	.087	.931	-5.578	6.094	.000	.087	.051
Asian American	6.044	2.472	2.444	.015	1.193	10.895	.005	2.444	.685
African American	-1.536	1.645	-.934	.350	-4.764	1.691	.001	.934	.154
Male	-1.976	1.351	-1.462	.144	-4.628	.675	.002	1.462	.309
Non-ELO * Non-ESOL	11.170	5.848	1.910	.056	-.303	22.644	.003	1.910	.480
Partial-ELO * Non-ESOL	4.822	6.955	.693	.488	-8.823	18.467	.000	.693	.107
Non-ELO * Non-FARMS	3.988	2.603	1.532	.126	-1.118	9.095	.002	1.532	.334
Partial-ELO * Non-FARMS	8.801	3.775	2.331	.020	1.395	16.207	.004	2.331	.644
Non-ELO * Not Both ESOL/FARMS	-10.360	6.623	-1.564	.118	-23.353	2.633	.002	1.564	.346
Partial-ELO * Not Both ESOL/FARMS	-5.397	7.925	-.681	.496	-20.944	10.151	.000	.681	.105
Non-ELO * White	-1.732	3.843	-.451	.652	-9.271	5.807	.000	.451	.074
Non-ELO * Asian American	-2.045	3.697	-.553	.580	-9.299	5.209	.000	.553	.086
Non-ELO * African American	-1.320	2.782	-.474	.635	-6.779	4.139	.000	.474	.076
Partial-ELO * White	-2.886	5.434	-.531	.595	-13.546	7.774	.000	.531	.083
Partial-ELO * Asian American	-7.031	4.860	-1.447	.148	-16.567	2.504	.002	1.447	.304
Partial-ELO * African American	-1.571	4.179	-.376	.707	-9.770	6.628	.000	.376	.066
Non-ELO * Male	2.727	2.136	1.277	.202	-1.464	6.918	.001	1.277	.248
Partial-ELO * Male	-.926	3.001	-.309	.758	-6.813	4.960	.000	.309	.061

Note: (a) Computed using alpha = .05

APPENDIX E

ANOVA Parameter Estimates for Grade 3 Reading Pretest-Posttest Change

Parameter	<i>B</i>	Std. Error	<i>t</i>	Sig.	95% Conf. Interval		Partial Eta Squared	Noncent. Parameter	Observed Power(a)
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound			
Intercept	22.192	2.238	9.918	.000	17.802	26.582	.075	9.918	1.000
Pretest Reading Score (%)	-.437	.026	-17.108	.000	-.488	-.387	.195	17.108	1.000
Non-ELO	-2.976	2.808	-1.060	.290	-8.485	2.534	.001	1.060	.185
Partial-ELO	-2.547	3.407	-.747	.455	-9.232	4.139	.000	.747	.116
Non-ESOL	11.640	3.691	3.154	.002	4.399	18.881	.008	3.154	.883
Non-FARMS	2.725	1.876	1.453	.147	-.955	6.405	.002	1.453	.306
Not Both ESOL/FARMS	-6.149	3.982	-1.544	.123	-13.962	1.664	.002	1.544	.339
White	6.900	2.870	2.404	.016	1.269	12.531	.005	2.404	.671
Asian American	6.925	2.306	3.003	.003	2.401	11.449	.007	3.003	.851
African American	-.805	1.704	-.473	.636	-4.148	2.537	.000	.473	.076
Male	-2.062	1.384	-1.490	.137	-4.778	.654	.002	1.490	.319
Non-ELO * Non-ESOL	-2.722	5.805	-.469	.639	-14.111	8.666	.000	.469	.076
Partial-ELO * Non-ESOL	-.834	8.962	-.093	.926	-18.416	16.749	.000	.093	.051
Non-ELO * Non-FARMS	3.732	2.702	1.381	.167	-1.569	9.032	.002	1.381	.281
Partial-ELO * Non-FARMS	3.047	3.857	.790	.430	-4.520	10.614	.001	.790	.124
Non-ELO * Not Both ESOL/FARMS	4.009	6.411	.625	.532	-8.570	16.587	.000	.625	.096
Partial-ELO * Not Both ESOL/FARMS	3.268	9.714	.336	.737	-15.790	22.326	.000	.336	.063
Non-ELO * White	-2.386	3.735	-.639	.523	-9.713	4.941	.000	.639	.098
Non-ELO * Asian American	.661	4.011	.165	.869	-7.209	8.531	.000	.165	.053
Non-ELO * African American	1.332	2.688	.496	.620	-3.942	6.607	.000	.496	.079
Partial-ELO * White	-14.196	5.020	-2.828	.005	-24.044	-4.347	.007	2.828	.807
Partial-ELO * Asian American	-10.130	6.199	-1.634	.102	-22.292	2.031	.002	1.634	.372
Partial-ELO * African American	-2.314	4.010	-.577	.564	-10.181	5.553	.000	.577	.089
Non-ELO * Male	.915	2.110	.434	.665	-3.225	5.056	.000	.434	.072
Partial-ELO * Male	1.357	3.077	.441	.659	-4.681	7.394	.000	.441	.073

Note: (a) Computed using alpha = .05

ANOVA Parameter Estimates for Grade 3 Mathematics (Review Place Value and Number Sense Concepts) Pretest-Posttest
Percentage Change

Parameter	<i>B</i>	Std. Error	<i>t</i>	Sig.	95% Conf. Interval		Partial Eta Squared	Noncent. Parameter	Observed Power(a)
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound			
Intercept	30.335	1.935	15.675	.000	26.538	34.132	.169	15.675	1.000
Pretest Math Review Score (%)	-.437	.022	-19.472	.000	-.481	-.393	.239	19.472	1.000
Non-ELO	-2.257	2.458	-.918	.359	-7.079	2.566	.001	.918	.151
Partial-ELO	-5.176	3.038	-1.704	.089	-11.137	.785	.002	1.704	.398
Non-ESOL	3.613	3.162	1.143	.253	-2.591	9.818	.001	1.143	.208
Non-FARMS	-2.188	1.642	-1.333	.183	-5.410	1.033	.001	1.333	.265
Not Both ESOL/FARMS	1.459	3.418	.427	.670	-5.248	8.165	.000	.427	.071
White	1.551	2.506	.619	.536	-3.366	6.468	.000	.619	.095
Asian American	6.609	1.987	3.326	.001	2.711	10.506	.009	3.326	.914
African American	-.178	1.507	-.118	.906	-3.134	2.778	.000	.118	.052
Male	-.436	1.209	-.361	.718	-2.808	1.936	.000	.361	.065
Non-ELO * Non-ESOL	4.314	5.009	.861	.389	-5.513	14.142	.001	.861	.138
Partial-ELO * Non-ESOL	24.716	8.738	2.829	.005	7.573	41.858	.007	2.829	.807
Non-ELO * Non-FARMS	7.718	2.394	3.223	.001	3.020	12.415	.009	3.223	.896
Partial-ELO * Non-FARMS	3.129	3.465	.903	.367	-3.670	9.928	.001	.903	.147
Non-ELO * Not Both ESOL/FARMS	-6.717	5.544	-1.211	.226	-17.594	4.161	.001	1.211	.228
Partial-ELO * Not Both ESOL/FARMS	-22.929	9.359	-2.450	.014	-41.291	-4.568	.005	2.450	.687
Non-ELO * White	-.993	3.310	-.300	.764	-7.487	5.501	.000	.300	.060
Non-ELO * Asian American	-1.873	3.548	-.528	.598	-8.834	5.088	.000	.528	.082
Non-ELO * African American	-.883	2.372	-.372	.710	-5.537	3.772	.000	.372	.066
Partial-ELO * White	-7.910	4.635	-1.706	.088	-17.004	1.185	.002	1.706	.400
Partial-ELO * Asian American	3.865	5.722	.675	.500	-7.361	15.091	.000	.675	.104
Partial-ELO * African American	5.696	3.589	1.587	.113	-1.345	12.737	.002	1.587	.354
Non-ELO * Male	.019	1.862	.010	.992	-3.634	3.673	.000	.010	.050
Partial-ELO * Male	1.893	2.760	.686	.493	-3.521	7.307	.000	.686	.105

Note: (a) Computed using alpha = .05

APPENDIX F

ANOVA Parameter Estimates for Grade 4 Reading Pretest-Posttest Change

Parameter	B	Std. Error	t	Sig.	95% Conf. Interval		Partial Eta Squared	Noncent. Parameter	Observed Power(a)
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound			
Intercept	30.920	1.998	15.475	.000	26.999	34.840	.185	15.475	1.000
Pretest Reading Score (%)	-.518	.022	-23.023	.000	-.562	-.474	.334	23.023	1.000
Non-ELO	-3.629	2.702	-1.343	.179	-8.930	1.672	.002	1.343	.269
Partial-ELO	-7.462	3.959	-1.885	.060	-15.231	.307	.003	1.885	.469
Non-ESOL	8.000	3.290	2.431	.015	1.543	14.456	.006	2.431	.681
Non-FARMS	1.339	1.489	.899	.369	-1.583	4.260	.001	.899	.146
Not Both ESOL/FARMS	-3.446	3.620	-.952	.341	-10.550	3.658	.001	.952	.158
White	.423	2.517	.168	.867	-4.516	5.362	.000	.168	.053
Asian American	3.703	2.040	1.816	.070	-.299	7.706	.003	1.816	.442
African American	-.071	1.445	-.049	.961	-2.907	2.765	.000	.049	.050
Male	-.635	1.198	-.530	.596	-2.985	1.716	.000	.530	.083
Non-ELO * Non-ESOL	4.704	6.375	.738	.461	-7.804	17.212	.001	.738	.114
Partial-ELO * Non-ESOL	.570	8.685	.066	.948	-16.472	17.613	.000	.066	.050
Non-ELO * Non-FARMS	2.326	2.061	1.128	.259	-1.719	6.370	.001	1.128	.204
Partial-ELO * Non-FARMS	-4.499	3.150	-1.428	.154	-10.680	1.683	.002	1.428	.297
Non-ELO * Not Both ESOL/FARMS	.029	6.944	.004	.997	-13.597	13.654	.000	.004	.050
Partial-ELO * Not Both ESOL/FARMS	8.660	9.530	.909	.364	-10.039	27.360	.001	.909	.148
Non-ELO * White	2.588	3.107	.833	.405	-3.508	8.684	.001	.833	.132
Non-ELO * Asian American	-3.945	3.151	-1.252	.211	-10.128	2.238	.001	1.252	.240
Non-ELO * African American	-2.074	2.131	-.973	.331	-6.256	2.108	.001	.973	.163
Partial-ELO * White	7.968	4.840	1.646	.100	-1.530	17.466	.003	1.646	.376
Partial-ELO * Asian American	-.465	4.988	-.093	.926	-10.252	9.322	.000	.093	.051
Partial-ELO * African American	.574	3.294	.174	.862	-5.889	7.037	.000	.174	.053
Non-ELO * Male	-.505	1.707	-.296	.767	-3.854	2.843	.000	.296	.060
Partial-ELO * Male	-.992	2.670	-.371	.710	-6.232	4.248	.000	.371	.066

Note: (a) Computed using alpha = .05

ANOVA Parameter Estimates for Grade 4 Mathematics (Review Place Value and Number Sense Concepts) Pretest-Posttest
Percentage Change

Parameter	B	Std. Error	t	Sig.	95% Conf. Interval		Partial Eta Squared	Noncent. Parameter	Observed Power(a)
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound			
Intercept	26.437	2.180	12.125	.000	22.159	30.716	.124	12.125	1.000
Pretest Math Review Score (%)	-.444	.021	-20.928	.000	-.486	-.402	.296	20.928	1.000
Non-ELO	-5.805	3.430	-1.693	.091	-12.535	.925	.003	1.693	.394
Partial-ELO	-4.547	4.735	-.960	.337	-13.837	4.744	.001	.960	.160
Non-ESOL	6.433	4.106	1.567	.118	-1.625	14.490	.002	1.567	.347
Non-FARMS	-.613	1.857	-.330	.741	-4.257	3.030	.000	.330	.063
Not Both ESOL/FARMS	-4.790	4.551	-1.052	.293	-13.720	4.141	.001	1.052	.183
White	2.621	3.055	.858	.391	-3.374	8.616	.001	.858	.137
Asian American	7.130	2.537	2.810	.005	2.152	12.108	.008	2.810	.802
African American	.641	1.819	.352	.725	-2.930	4.211	.000	.352	.064
Male	-.039	1.488	-.026	.979	-2.959	2.880	.000	.026	.050
Non-ELO * Non-ESOL	8.862	8.538	1.038	.300	-7.891	25.616	.001	1.038	.179
Partial-ELO * Non-ESOL	-.270	9.815	-.027	.978	-19.528	18.989	.000	.027	.050
Non-ELO * Non-FARMS	2.406	2.581	.932	.351	-2.658	7.470	.001	.932	.154
Partial-ELO * Non-FARMS	6.277	4.023	1.560	.119	-1.617	14.172	.002	1.560	.344
Non-ELO * Not Both ESOL/FARMS	-5.822	9.236	-.630	.529	-23.946	12.302	.000	.630	.097
Partial-ELO * Not Both ESOL/FARMS	3.834	10.853	.353	.724	-17.462	25.130	.000	.353	.064
Non-ELO * White	3.168	3.831	.827	.409	-4.351	10.686	.001	.827	.131
Non-ELO * Asian American	-5.904	4.059	-1.454	.146	-13.869	2.061	.002	1.454	.306
Non-ELO * African American	-2.073	2.686	-.772	.440	-7.343	3.196	.001	.772	.120
Partial-ELO * White	-1.073	6.052	-.177	.859	-12.949	10.803	.000	.177	.054
Partial-ELO * Asian American	-.091	6.385	-.014	.989	-12.621	12.439	.000	.014	.050
Partial-ELO * African American	.704	4.257	.165	.869	-7.649	9.058	.000	.165	.053
Non-ELO * Male	.533	2.151	.248	.804	-3.689	4.754	.000	.248	.057
Partial-ELO * Male	-4.056	3.349	-1.211	.226	-10.627	2.515	.001	1.211	.227

Note: (a) Computed using alpha = .05

Extended Learning Opportunities (ELO) Summer Program, 2003

PROGRAM ADMINISTRATOR SURVEY

Dear Principal/Assistant Principal:

We are requesting that you complete this short questionnaire focusing on the planning and administrative issues related to the **Extended Learning Opportunities (ELO) summer program, 2003**. Your answers will help central office staff plan future summer programs. We would appreciate it if you complete and return the survey via fax (301-279-3849) or the PONY to Dr. Kola Sunmonu, Office of Shared Accountability, CESC Room 11, by **Friday, September 26, 2003**. If you have any questions about the survey, please contact Dr. Sunmonu at (301) 279-7690. Thank you for your assistance.

DIRECTIONS: Please respond to each item by checking the appropriate box. If an item is **NOT APPLICABLE** to you please check the 'Not Applicable' box.

PART I – BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. **What was your position when the 2003 ELO Summer program was implemented?**
 Principal Assistant Principal/ELO Summer Administrator Other _____ Please specify
2. **What was the name of your home school during SPRING 2003?** _____
3. **When were you involved with the administration/management of the 2002 ELO Summer program?** Please check ALL that apply.
 Pre-July 2003 July to August 2003 Post August 2003

PART II - PROGRAM DESIGN, PLANNING & IMPLEMENTATION

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
4. I was provided with information on the ELO Summer Program that I needed to implement the program in my school.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Assigning assistant principals as ELO administrators was a good idea.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. The AP assigned to my school (or the principal of the school I was assigned to) and I met before the start of ELO to plan for the implementation of the ELO Summer program.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Transferring daily ELO administrative responsibilities from school principals to the APs went smoothly and efficiently.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Working with teachers from other schools presented few administrative or supervisory challenges.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. The established procedures for the following activities worked well in my school					
a. Student Arrival	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Breakfast	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Lunch	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Student Dismissal	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. The ELO Summer program, as designed, met the needs of my school's....					
a. Kindergarten students	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Grade 1 students	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Grade 2 students	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Grade 3 students	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Grade 4 students	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Adding an afternoon component enhanced the effectiveness (in terms of recruitment and outcome) of the ELO Summer program	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

PART III – STUDENT RECRUITMENT

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
12. The student recruitment materials (brochures, posters, and fliers) were provided to my school in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. My school had an adequate amount of ELO student recruitment materials.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14. My school supplemented the student recruitment materials provided by the central office with local school communication	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15. Sending the recruitment materials home in students’ backpacks was an effective recruitment strategy.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

PART IV – STAFFING AND ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT ACTIVITIES

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
16. Staff recruitment commenced early enough to allow the recruitment of qualified and highly skilled teachers and instructional assistants.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
17. I was able to recruit highly skilled teachers and instructional assistants in my school to participate in the ELO Summer program.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
18. I did not experience any difficulty in recruiting teachers from the Summer ELO teacher First Class folder.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
19. I was satisfied with the support I received from central office staff in...					
a. Recruiting staff	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Procuring materials and supplies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Addressing administrative concerns	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
20. During the ELO Summer program, the positions listed below were adequately staffed in my school					
a. ESOL teacher	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Special education teacher	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Instructional assistant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Administrative secretary/clerical support	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Food service staff	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

PART V - GENERAL COMMENTS

21. What, if any, were the **POSITIVE** aspects of the ELO Summer program as implemented in your school?

22. What, if any, were the **NEGATIVE** aspects of the ELO Summer program as implemented in your school?

23. What, if any, **CHANGES** would you make in the ELO Summer program to improve on its effectiveness?

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME

APPENDIX H
Extended Learning Opportunities (ELO) Summer Program
TEACHER SURVEY

This survey is being conducted by the Office of Shared Accountability to improve the planning and implementation of future ELO programs. **ALL INFORMATION YOU PROVIDE IS CONFIDENTIAL.** The code number above is simply to track completed and returned surveys. Upon completion, please return the survey via PONY to **Kola K. Sunmonu, Office of Shared Accountability, CESC Rm. 11.** If you have questions, please call Kola Sunmonu at (301) 279-7690. Thank you for your assistance.

PART I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

4. What is the name of the school where you taught in SPRING 2003? _____
5. What grade(s) did you teach in SPRING 2003? Please check ALL that apply
 PreK K 1 2 3 4 5 6
 Media Specialist Special Ed Teacher ESOL Other _____ Please specify
6. What is the name of the school where you will teach in FALL 2003? _____
7. What grade will you teach in FALL 2003? Please ALL that apply
 PreK K 1 2 3 4 5 6
 Media Specialist Special Ed Teacher ESOL Other _____ Please specify
8. What is the HIGHEST degree you presently hold?
 Associate Bachelor's Master's Doctorate
9. Please list all areas and grade levels that you are certified to teach.

10. How many years have you been teaching? _____ Total _____ in MCPS
11. Which of the sessions (Reading and Mathematics) offered during the ELO Teacher Training did you attend?
 Both (Reading and Mathematics) Sessions Reading Session Only
 Mathematics Session Only Neither - **Please SKIP to Item 16**

PART 2: ELO TEACHER TRAINING AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

Indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with the following statements. Please focus your answers on the **1-day Teacher training session** offered on June 27, 2003.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
8. Sufficient time was allotted during training to cover all sections of the curriculum and the instructional strategies for delivering them in ...				
a. Reading	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Mathematics	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Instructional strategies presented from the curriculum were appropriate to meet the needs of all the diverse learners I had in...				
a. Reading	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Mathematics	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Resources that support effective implementation of instructional strategies were presented during ELO training sessions in...				
a. Reading	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	b. Mathematics	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12.	The ELO training sessions provided time and techniques for understanding and interpreting student ELO pre-test data in...				
	a. Reading	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b. Mathematics	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13.	Methods for using data to adjust instruction were presented during the ELO training sessions in...				
	a. Reading	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b. Mathematics	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please respond to Item 14 if you attended the READING training session. Otherwise, please skip to Item 15.

14.	The Reading session of the ELO Teacher Training improved my knowledge of...				
	a. Components and structure of successful grade level and ELO lessons.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b. Design and content of lessons.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c. Reading components of balanced literacy.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	d. 'Before, during, and after' reading strategies.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	e. Small group instruction.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	f. How to embed reading comprehension questions into daily instruction.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	g. Tools for analyzing students' work (and data) for evidence of learning.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	h. How to use students' work to guide instruction.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please respond to Item 15 if you attended the MATHEMATICS training session. Otherwise, please skip to Item 16.

15.	The Mathematics session of the ELO Teacher Training improved my knowledge of...				
	a. Components of an effective mathematics block.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b. Small group mathematics instruction.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c. Concepts that develop an understanding of number knowledge and computation.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	d. Strategies that support the development of number knowledge.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	e. How to use student work (and data) to guide instruction.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	f. Design and content of lessons.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	g. Components and structure of successful grade level and ELO lessons	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

WEEKLY PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
16.	The weekly professional development sessions....				
	a. Provided opportunities to plan in grade-level teams.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b. Reviewed tools to monitor students' progress.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b. Reinforced the value of using students' work samples to inform instruction.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c. Supported the 'assess-plan-instruct' model.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
17.	The weekly Professional Development sessions enhanced my ability to...				
	a. Use strategies that support number sense and number relationships.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b. Closely examine student work against the standards and indicators.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c. Match appropriate instructional strategies to specific student needs.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	d. Collaboratively reflect on and gather ideas for revising teacher practices and student learning.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

21. Please indicate to what extent you found the Professional Development activities listed below helpful in your classroom instruction and professional development.

	Very Helpful	Somewhat helpful	Not at all Helpful	Not Used
a. Time allotted to discuss lesson content with colleagues	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Assessment of students' work	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Building a professional community	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

PART 3: ELO CURRICULUM IMPLEMENTATION

Indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with the following statements.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
19. Sufficient time was provided for setting up my classroom.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
20. Sufficient time was provided during the program for lesson planning.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
21. I had an adequate number of the following materials in my classroom...				
a. Leveled texts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Big books	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Supplies (paper, markers, pens, pencils, erasers, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
22. Information contained in the Students' Pre-Assessment Reports was useful in planning lessons and instruction in...				
a. Reading	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Mathematics	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
23. I was able to incorporate the strategies presented during the ELO Teacher Training into my classroom instruction for...				
a. Reading	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Mathematics	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
24. I found the content of lessons supported the learning needs of my students in...				
a. Reading	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Mathematics	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
25. The curriculum guide provided differentiated instructional strategies to meet the learning needs of my students in:				
a. Reading	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Mathematics	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

PART 4: CONCLUDING QUESTIONS

26. Did you TEACH in last summer's ELO program?

- Yes – Continue to question 27 No – Please SKIP to Question 32

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
27. I feel significant improvements were made to the curriculum content in comparison with last year's program in...				
a. Reading	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Mathematics	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
28.	I feel the training provided to teachers in comparison with last year's program was adequate in...				
	a. Reading	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b. Mathematics	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
29.	I had substantially more time during the week to plan my lessons in comparison with last year's program in...				
	a. Reading	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b. Mathematics	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
30.	Overall, I felt the ELO model was successful in helping students' review previous academic work AND preview work they will encounter in the upcoming school year in...				
	a. Reading	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b. Mathematics	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
31.	With reduced responsibilities outside of the classroom (e.g., cafeteria duties), I was better able to address the specific learning needs of my students.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
32.	With this year's focus on individualized instruction, I felt better able to address the individual learning needs of each student.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
33.	I felt ELO was successful at helping me familiarize myself with the ability levels of students I may have in the upcoming year.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
34.	I couldn't complete as many lessons as I had hoped because a lot of students were absent.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

PART 5: GENERAL COMMENTS

Please answer the following questions in as much detail as possible. You may use the back of your survey if you require more space.

35. What are the **STRENGTHS** of the ELO Summer program as implemented in your school?

36. What are the **WEAKNESSES** of the ELO Summer program as implemented in your school?

37. What **CHANGES** would you make in the ELO Summer program to improve on its effectiveness?

Thank you for completing this survey. If you would like an Evaluation Specialist or the ELO Administrator to contact you personally regarding concerns you expressed, please indicate in the space provided below.

Please Contact Me.

Name: _____

School: _____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME